Improving Students' Reading Comprehension of Report Text Using KWL Strategy

Nudiya Afiya Farha, Rohani Rohani ✉

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Abstract

This research attempted to find out the translation techniques and grammatical errors in students' Indonesian-English text translation. The objectives of this research were to describe the choice of translation techniques and grammatical errors of the students' translation of a narrative text. This research used descriptive qualitative method. The translation techniques analysis was done by using Molina and Albir's (2002) classification of translation techniques while grammatical errors of the students' translation were analyzed using the guide for correcting writing errors by Betty Azar (1941). The translation technique analysis was done by comparing the students' translation work with the source text of a narrative entitled Lari Kepagian then grammatical errors analysis was done to find out their errors in the use of grammatical rules. The result of the study found that there were 3012 data of translation techniques and 429 grammatical errors. The data showed that the most used translation techniques were literal translation technique (30.1%) and modulation technique (22.6%) and the most grammatical errors made were capitalization (18.2%) and verb tense (16.6%). The most used translation technique that resulted in most grammatical errors was modulation technique (17%) in the translation done by 24 students.

© 2019 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondent Address:
B3 Building FBS Unnes
Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
E-mail: nudiya.farha@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the essential skills for learning language. It is a receptive skill which is important to be mastered in learning English as a second language. Reading is the process of connecting written symbols with reader's knowledge to comprehend the content of the text. So, the reader can get the information of the text.

According to Spratt, Pulverness, and Williams (2003), reading is a relationship between the writer and the reader through a text and a process to connect the text with the readers' knowledge to understand the whole-text (p.21). It is the process of gaining information from text by connecting words, sentences, even paragraphs with meaning and information that are already known to understand the text (Grabe and Stoller, 2002, p.9). This is supported by the definition from Clark and Silberstein (as cited in Simanjutak, 1988) stating that "reading is an active cognitive process of interacting with print and monitoring comprehension to establish meaning (p.15)".

Furthermore, Reading comprehension is the process blending of the readers' several kinds of knowledge and the interaction of the reader and the text. In addition, Woolley (2011) also stated that "reading comprehension is the process of making meaning from text." There is text, reader's background knowledge, and reader's language ability in the process of making meaning.

Based on *The Structure of The Senior High School Curriculum in 2013 revised 2017*, the total hours of teaching and learning English for eleventh grade is 2 hours (2 x 45 minutes) a week. It means the intensity of students in learning English is quite a bit, because students learn English in the classroom activities only once in a week. It is undeniable that sometimes students do not enjoy in joining English learning process especially in learning reading comprehension text. Therefore, teacher should consider the important of finding the right method and strategy to make the material easy to be accepted and understood by students.

According to Sabouri (2016) there are some effective strategies that can improve students' reading skill especially in comprehending text those are (1) activating and using background knowledge (2) generating (3) making inferences (4) predicting (5) summarizing (6) visualizing (7) comprehension monitoring.

From the various of reading comprehension strategies above, Ercetin (2010) found in his experimental research that activating and using background knowledge was one of the important factor that affect students' understand and use such text resources. Recht and Leslie (1988) confirm the important of background knowledge. Likewise, Osman and Ali (2002), they support the result of those two studies before. The result of their study said that topic familiarity and background knowledge are effective in reading test for students. In addition, Al-Jahwari (2015) said that many teachers realized prior knowledge can prepare students for reading.

Knowledge is one of the important factors that affect someone in understanding something. Moreover in the process of reading text, because reading is activity of gaining information. According to Mikulecky & Jeffries (2003), our brain looks for connection to our knowledge when our brain notices new information (p,15). The connection of our knowledge and the new information will become a part of long-term memory. Knowledge that readers' have is usually called as background knowledge or prior knowledge.

According to Fletcher (as cited in Woolley, 2011) in his book stated that background knowledge is one of a top-down focus that need to be considered in the process of making meaning or understanding text. The important of background knowledge also stated by Grabe and Stoller (2002) in their book that there are somethings that have to be activated in reading processes when someone read. Those are mentioned in the table below.

Table 1: Reading processes that are activated

Lower-level processes	Higher-level processes
- **Lexical access** - **Syntactic parsing** - **Semantic proposition formation** - **Working memory activation**	- Text model of comprehension - Situation model of reader interpretation - Background knowledge use and inferencing - Executive control processes

Ausubel (as cited in Hattan et al, 2015) stated that background knowledge is the existing knowledge structure that used to assimilate new information by connecting it with the new material in learning process. Therefore, from some studies above can be said that background knowledge is good to use as strategy in teaching and learning comprehension text.

There are many strategies in reading that using knowledge as the best factors in improving reading comprehension skill such as through answering questions, prediction, debate and discussion, field experience, semantic mapping, advance organizers, previewing, brainstorming, and KWL strategy. Fisher and Frey (2010) stated that KWL strategy is one of the most common reading strategies.

The definition of KWL strategy according to Ogle (as cited in Riswanto et al, 2014) stated that "KWL (Know, Want, Learned) strategy is one of teaching and learning strategies used mainly for information text. KWL strategy is a teaching and learning strategy using three-column organizer, those are *What I Know, What I Want to know, and What I Learned*.

According to Ogle (as cited in Strangman, Hall, & Meyer, 2004) stated that this learning strategy is begun with discussion session. Based on the diagram above, in the discussion session the teacher leads students to reflect their knowledge about a topic and brainstorming ideas and information of the topic. Next, the students fill the first two-column. The students fill the first column with statement they get after reflecting their knowledge about a topic. Whereas, they have to fill the second column with some questions about a topic they want to answer. The next session is reading session. Students read the text about a topic that has been told before. In this session, students are expected to find the information that can answer their questions in the second column. The answers of questions are written at the third column. Table 2 is the table of KWL strategy.

There are some previous studies wich applied this strategy. Fengjuan (2010) said that KWL strategy becomes a very effective strategy to achieve goal in all-round development in learning language skills. Dieu (2016) supported that study. He found in his study that KWL strategy encourages students' academic success because they can more connect their knowledge to class and topics or subjects matter. In addition, Karang (2014) had applied KWL (Know-What-Learn) strategy to activate students' knowledge. She found that the KWL strategy improved the students' ability in reading comprehension and increased students' learning motivation, interest, and attitude in their reading. It is supported by Sinambela, Manik, and Pangaribuan (2015) in their research. They found that students' who were taught with KWL strategy achieved higher score than those who were taught without KWL strategy. In addition, the students' were taught with KWL strategy were more active in learning activities. Riswanto, Risnawati, and Lismayanti (2014) also agreed with the results of that research, they also added that students who were taught with KWL strategy were more enthusiastic, active and enjoy in reading activities. The results of those researches showed that the implementation of KWL strategy was effective in teaching reading comprehension. Thus, KWL strategy was effective strategy of teaching reading. This was supported by the statement

by The National School Improvement Network's bulletin (2002) in the paper about effective learning stated.

"The effective learning involves outcomes such as more connected knowledge, wider range of strategies, greater complexity of understanding, enhanced action appropriate to goals and context, increased engagement and self-direction, more reflecting approach, more positive emotions and affiliation to learning, more developed vision of future self as a learner, greater facility in learning with others, and more sense of participation in a knowledge community."

In other researches, Hamdan (2014) conducted a research about KWL strategy in two different schools (public and private school). He found that although private school that became the control group adopts an international curriculum where English is used as instruction in learning process, the students from public school who were taught with KWL –Plus strategy achieved a higher performance in reading than the students in control group. Therefore from the previous studies which have been mentioned above it can be concluded that KWL strategy is the good ways to improve students' reading comprehension.

Table 2 KWL instructional scheme

K (What I Know)	W (What I Want to Know)	L (What I Learnt)
Students are brainstorming everything they know about the topic of study. The students list what have they got when they are brainstorming.	Students tell what they want to know about the topic.	After students finished their reading, they list what they have learned about the topic. They can see K column to connect what have they known and what have they learned. Then, they can also check the W column to see which questions were answered and which were left unanswered.

Reading is one of the important language skills in learning English. Two mainly language skills in the national examination of English subject are listening and reading. The reading section has more questions than the listening section. In addition, report text is the kind of text which commonly became the questions in the national examination.

Report text is the kind of text which presents information about something in general. It is as a result of systematic observation and analysis. Sometimes, students are difficult in understanding report text because the language used in this kind of text is not always in the elementary level. Thus, students should have good ability in comprehending text. Therefore, teaching reading is not only providing the text and then asking students to translate word by word, but also asking students to understand the content of the text.

Based on the background above, the writer is interested to conduct an experimental study entitled "Improving Students' Reading Comprehension of Report Text with KWL Strategy (A Quasi-experimental Study at the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Negeri 1 Bae Kudus).

The research questions of the study were formulated in the following:

1. How is the implementation of KWL strategy in improving students' reading comprehension of report text at the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Bae Kudus in the academic year 2018/2019?

2. Is there any significant achievement difference of students taught with and without KWL strategy in reading comprehension of report text?

METHODS

The writer used quantitative research with description in this study. Based on Creswell (2014), quantitative research was an approach for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables.

This was experimental research which has purpose to know the effectiveness of the method or technique that the teacher used in teaching and learning process. In this study, the writer used quasi-experimental research design in the type of nonequivalent (pre-test and post-test) control-group design to analyze the data.

The population of this study was the eleventh grade students in Mathematic and Natural Science of SMA 1 Bae Kudus in the academic year 2018/2019. There were 7 classes. Each class consisted of 36 students. Therefore, the total number of the students was 252 students. While in this study the writer choose two groups of class randomly to be the subject of the study. One was as an experimental class (XI MIPA 6). The other one was as a control class (XI MIPA 5). Therefore, the total subjects of this study were 72 students.

The instruments of this study were lesson plans, observation list, and reading comprehension test. The lesson plans used to observe the implementation of KWL strategy in learning reading comprehension text. The writer used multiple-choice reading comprehension test to check the effectiveness of KWL strategy and to measure the significant achievement difference between experimental and control group. The observation list has been prepared to be the teacher orientation in observing the classroom learning process using KWL strategy. Meanwhile, the observation was used to find out the progress of students' characters during the learning process. The content of the observation list uses guideline which is made by me based on Permendikbud 104 (2014). It will be analyzed using Likert Scales as scaling technique.

One reading comprehension test would be given in the first week as a pre-test. And the other would be given as the post-test after the both groups getting treatments. The reading comprehension test consisted of reading passage with the length of the text was about 250 words. The test consisted of 20 multiple-choice comprehension questions.

The data collection of this study was obtained from the eleventh grade students of SMA N 1 Bae Kudus. The data of the study was quantitative data. There were some processes that have to be done by the writer to make sure that the instrument was good, those were try out, validity, reliability, item difficulty, discriminating power, pretest, treatment and posttest.

The data from reading comprehension test then can be analyzed to find if there is any significant achievement difference between experimental and control group by using *Independent Sample Test* in SPSS 22.0 program. In addition, the *Paired-Sample T-test* is also used to analyze if there is any improvement from pre-test to post-test in both group or not.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Implementation of KWL Strategy

This quasi-experimental study implemented KWL *(Known-Want-Learn)* strategy in learning reading comprehension. The purpose was to prove its effectiveness in improving reading comprehension of report text of the eleventh graders of SMA N 1 Bae Kudus in the academic year of 2018/2019. The experimental study was conducted in class XI MIPA 6 as the experimental group and class XI MIPA 5 as the control group.

The experimental group was given treatments by using KWL strategy in learning reading comprehension, while the control group was given treatments by brainstorming strategy. Both experimental and control groups got three meetings for the treatments. The material of report text which given to both groups was same. In addition, the students of both groups learned the same topic of report text.

Both experimental and control groups got the first treatment after carrying out the pre-test. They learned the same material of report text with the different strategies. The first treatment was conducted on Monday, 11th February 2019 both in the experimental and control group. According to the schedule, I came to class XI MIPA 5 as the control group and then after that I came to class XI MIPA 6 as the experimental group.

In the first treatment, I gave the students of both groups know about the purpose of the material which would be learned. After that, I explained the classroom activities in that day briefly. In the experimental group I also explained about KWL strategy as the strategy which would be implemented during the learning process. The classroom activities during treatment were presented in Appendix 19.

The students of the experimental group were enthusiast when I explained about KWL strategy, because that was the first time KWL strategy in their classroom learning process. They learned the definition, generic structure, and the language feature of report text. In the treatment, students of both groups made small groups consisted of 6 students. Then, they tried to comprehend the report text and answer the following questions with their group. The topic of report text which was discussed in both groups was same. The experimental group answered the questions following the text and comprehended the text using KWL strategy, while the control group answered the questions and comprehended the text by brainstorming and translating the text into Indonesian.

The second meeting, both groups still learned a text of report with the new topic. The students of experimental group made a small group consisted of six students. They make a discussion with their group by using KWL strategy to answer and comprehend the text. In the other side, the control group also made a small group consisted of six students. Each group discussed the text by brainstorming strategy. In the end of the learning activities, both the students experimental and control groups made a summary about the information they had learned from the text.

In the second treatment, the differences between experimental and control groups could be seen from the participation of the students of both groups and their summary of the text. The students' participation of experimental group was higher than the students' participation of the control group. Almost all the students of the experimental group were more interested to follow the learning activities in KWL strategy. While, there were only a few students of the control group who actively participate during learning activities. In the other hand, the summary of the students in experimental group were more complete than the summary of the control group. In addition they could present the information that they got clearly.

The third meeting, both groups still practiced to comprehend the report text with the new topic. Both experimental and control groups discussed the text in a small group which consisted of six students. In addition, they also answered the quizzes related to the text they had discussed by

playing number had together. In the end of the learning activities the students of both groups also told about the information they had learned from the text.

To support the explanation of the treatments, I also collected the data using observation list which I have made based on the criterion of Permendikbud 104 (2014). The students attitudes during the learning process which observed are the students are enthusiast when the teacher explains about KWL strategy, the students are not afraid to share their ideas or opinions to their friends, the students do not bother or even judge their friends false or true, Each student has at least one question about what they want to know related to the topic being discussed, the students are enthusiast to share what they want to know about the topic to their friends, the students keep on reading the text to understand the content of the text and to answer the questions they have made, the students learn something from the text after they had read the passage, the students are not afraid in telling their comprehension of the text, the other students keep on listening when their friends are telling their comprehension of the text being studied, and the students are motivated and interested in reading text from other sources.

The observation used likert scale to analyze the data. So, it used some number to give the value. Those numbers are 4 which means very high, 3 means high, 2 means low, and 1 means very low. Based on finding of the observation and the meaning of numbers above, the number of ideal scores (criteria) for all items is 4 x 10 = 40. The number of scores obtained from observation is 37. Therefore, based on the data, the level of students participation in the learning process using KWL strategy is (37 : 40) x 100% = 92,5 % than expected (100%).

After the treatments, both groups carried out the post-test to know if there was any difference achievement of the students after getting the treatments.

The result of the study showed that the implementation of KWL (Known-Want-Learned) strategy is effective in teaching reading comprehension of report text.

The Difference of Students' Achievement
Result of Pre-test
The pre-test was given to the experimental and control group. The results of the experimental group showed that the average pre-test score was 74.58. While, the average pre-test score of the control group was 72.77. The *Independent Sample Test* in SPSS 22.0 program was used to analyze the data.

According to the analysis, the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.470. It was higher than 0.050. It could be said that both the experimental and control group had the equal level of ability. Therefore, Ho was accepted, in short, the students' reading comprehension level of both groups was equal.
Result of Post-test
The post-test was given after the students of both groups getting the treatments. The average post-test score of the experimental group was 90.97. While, the average post-test score of the control group was 87.77. The average of both groups had a higher increase than the pre-test.

The analysis showed that the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.076. Ho was accepted because the significant value was higher than 0.050. It could be concluded that there was no significant achievement difference between the experimental and control group in post-test.
The difference of pre-test and post-test between experimental and control group
The analysis of pre-test and post-test between two groups was done to know whether there was improvement after getting the treatments or not by using The *Paired-Sample T-test.*

The analysis of *Paired-Sample T-test* of the experimental group showed that the pre-test mean was 74.58, while the post-test mean was 90.97. In the other side, the analysis of the control group showed that the pre-test mean was 72.77, while the post-test mean was 87.77. The average value of the experimental group had a higher increase than the control group. In addition, *Paired-Sample T-test* of the experimental group showed that the significance value, *Sig. (2-tailed)* was 0.000. It was

lower than 0.05. While, the analysis also showed that the significance value, *Sig. (2-tailed)* was 0.000. It was higher than 0.05 (*Sig.(2-tailed)* < 0.05). It meant that both the experimental and control group had improved their score after getting the treatments. Therefore, Ha was accepted, in short, there was significant achievement difference between pre-test and post-test for both groups.

Discussion

This study was to elaborate whether the implementation of KWL strategy was effective to improve students' reading comprehension report text or not and to know the significant achievement difference between the students who were taught using KWL strategy and those who were taught using brainstorming strategy. After holding three times of reading comprehension text treatments in the experimental and control group, I found the differences between the students of those groups. The students of experimental group who taught using KWL strategy were more active than the students of control group. The activities of KWL strategy made the students enjoy the learning process. Students' participation, motivation and interest in reading learning process increased. Therefore, the atmosphere of the classroom became more fun.

The results of the implementation of KWL strategy in teaching reading and learning process in experimental group showed that students were more active. Their participation, motivation, and interest in reading learning process increased. It was similar with several previous studies. Dieu (2016) supported this study. He found in his study that KWL strategy encourages students' academic success because they can more connect their knowledge to class and topics or subjects matter. In addition, Karang (2014) had applied KWL (Know-What-Learn) strategy to activate students' knowledge. She found that the KWL strategy improved the students' ability in reading comprehension and increased students' learning motivation, interest, and attitude in their reading. It is supported by Sinambela, Manik, and Pangaribuan (2015) in their research. They found that the students' who were taught with KWL strategy were more active in learning activities. Riswanto, Risnawati, and Lismayanti (2014) also agreed with the results of that research, they also added that students who were taught using KWL strategy were more enthusiastic, active and enjoy in reading activities. Moreover, it was supported by the result of observation showed that students' participation was very high during the learning process. The study conducted by Cholifah (2015) supported this result.

In the learning process of the experimental group which implemented KWL strategy, the goals of reading learning stated by Appleget & Appleget (as cited in Kaya 2014) were reached. The teacher had explained the material and guided the students to follow the activities of learning process well.

According to Ogle (as cited in Strangman, Hall, & Meyer, 2004) there were three sessions in implementing KWL strategy in reading learning process, those were reflecting, brainstorming, and reading. The students' interest had growth since the process of reflecting and brainstorming students' knowledge about the topic that was being discussed. In this session, the report text was not given to the students yet. Therefore, when the teacher guided them to reflecting their knowledge about the topic of report text such as 'Giraffe', they discussed it with their small group. Then, they participated in filling out the first column. The students alternately represented the group mentioning what they have known about the topic with great enthusiasm. Moreover, in the second session they began to enjoy the learning process. The teacher guided the students to make questions related to the topic being discussed. The students' curiosity arises in this session. They could share knowledge about the topic with members of their group. It was one of the effective learning outcomes stated in the National School Improvement Network's bulletin (2002), namely participation in a knowledge community. In the last session, the teacher gave the report text to each group. The students were eager to read and understand the text to prove their knowledge and look for answers to the questions

they had made. Not all questions that they had made had answers in the text. This case made students looked for answers from other sources such as reading books and articles from the internet. It also related to the second goals of effective reading teacher stated by Appleget & Appleget (as cited in Kaya 2014) namely to foster a love of reading. Therefore, it was showed that the implementation of KWL strategy was effective in reading learning process.

In addition, I also conducted the pre-test and post-test to prove how effective is the KWL strategy in improving students' reading comprehension of report text statistically. The result of the data analysis showed that the students' reading comprehension of report text has improved significantly. The pre-test results of the experimental group showed that the mean score was 74.58. While, the pre-test mean score of the control group was 72.77. In addition, the T-test analysis by using *Independent Sample T-test* in SPSS 22.0 program was done to know the significant achievement difference. According to the analysis, the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.470. It was higher than 0.050. It could be said that both the experimental and control group had the equal level of ability.

The post-test was given after the students of both groups getting the treatments. The post-test mean score of the experimental group was 90.97. While, the post-test mean score of the control group was 87.77. The post-test mean score of both groups had a higher increase than the pre-test. In addition, the analysis of *Independent Sample T-Test* found that the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.076. It could be concluded that there was no significant achievement difference between the experimental and control group in post-test. The result was same with the previous study conducted by Hana, Warsono, and Faridi (2015). The absence of significant achievement difference can be caused by several things, such as situation and time ineffectiveness. The students of experimental group worked on the post-test together with the socialization for the eleventh graders, therefore their focus might not be entirely on the post-test.

The analysis of *Paired-Sample T-test* which used to know whether both the experimental and control group improved their score after getting the treatments or not found that the significant value of the experimental group, *Sig. (2-tailed)* was 0.000. It was lower than 0.05. While, the analysis of the control group also showed that the significance value, *Sig. (2-tailed)* was 0.000. It was lower than 0.05 (*Sig.(2-tailed)* < 0.05). It meant that there was a significant achievement difference between pre-test and post-test for both groups. In short, both the experimental and control group had improved their score after getting the treatments.

In the correlation of the mean score, the experimental group showed that the pre-test mean was 74.58, while the post-test mean was 90.97. In the other side, the analysis of the control group showed that the pre-test mean was 72.77, while the post-test mean was 87.77. Although both groups improve their mean score after getting treatments, but the mean score of the experimental group was higher than the control group. It meant that KWL strategy was better in improving students' reading comprehension to report text.

Finally, the research findings revealed that the alternative hypothesis (H1) which stated that "KWL strategy is effective to improve students reading comprehension of report text" was accepted and the null hypothesis (H2) was rejected. however, the second alternative hypothesis (H3) which stated that "There is a significant difference of the students' achievement between those who taught with and without KWL strategy" was rejected and the null hypothesis (H4) was accepted, because the result of *Independent-Sample Test* of post-test was higher than 0.05.

CONCLUSION

The objectives of this study were to measure the effectiveness of the implementation of KWL strategy to improve students' reading comprehension of report text of the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 1 Bae Kudus in the academic year of 2018/2019, and to know significant achievement

difference of the students who were taught using KWL strategy and those who were taught using brainstorming strategy.

According to the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the implementation of KWL strategy was effective in teaching reading comprehension of report text. The observation showed that students who were taught using KWL strategy were more active and participative during the learning process. Almost all the students of experimental group participate in every steps of learning activities. They had more motivation to read the text after the teacher guided them to reflecting their knowledge and brainstorming what they had already known and what they wanted to know. In addition, they also could recall the information they got from the text more complete than the control group.

The data analysis showed that the result of pre-test and post-test mean scores of the experimental group increased (from 74.58 to 90.97), than the control group (from 72.77 to 87.77). It could be concluded that the experimental group had a higher increase than the control group.

In addition, the pre-test and post-test mean scores of both groups also analyzed by using *Paired-Sample T-test* to know if there was improvement after getting the treatments. The result of *Paired-Sample T-test* showed that the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* of experimental group was 0.000, then the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* of the control group was 0.000. Those significances were less than $\alpha = 5\%$ (0.05). It could be concluded that there was improvement from pre-test and post-test of both groups.

However, according to the analysis of *Independent Sample Test* of both groups, there was no significant achievement difference in post-test between the experimental and control group. The *Independent Sample Tets* of post-test experimental and control group showed that the significant value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.76. It was higher than $\alpha = 5\%$ (0.05). Therefore, H3 was rejected, while H4 was accepted. The absence of significant achievement difference can be caused by several things, such as situation and time ineffectiveness.

Finally, I concluded that prior knowledge is important in reading comprehension text, and the implementation of KWL strategy in eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 1 Bae Kudus is effective for teaching reading comprehension of report text. Moreover, it gives a good effect to improve students' reading comprehension of report text.

REFFERENCES

Al-Jahwari, Y. (2014). Prior Knowledge in EFL Reading Comprehension: Omani Teachers' Perspective & Classroom Strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature ISSN 2200-3592 (Print), ISSN 2200-3452 (Online). Vol. 4 No. 1; January 2015* doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.1p.169

Anderson. (1997). *Text Type in English 2.* Australia. Macmillan Education Australia PTY LTD.

Building and Activating Background Knowledge. Online at https://www.google.co.id/search?source=hp&ei=LbsZW96NLMX2vgTjtKlI&q=Building+ and+Activating+Background+Knowledge&oq=Building+and+Activating+Background+Kn owledge&gs_l=psyab.3..0j0i22i30k1.1949.1949.0.3280.3.2.0.0.0.0.121.121.0j1.2.0....0...1c.1.6 4.psyab..1.2.261.6..35i39k1.143.E27gMvFrIWU [accessed 08/06/18]

Cholifah, F. (2015). *Improving Students' Reading Comprehension through KWL (Know, Want, Learned) Strategy: A Classroom Action Research at Eight Grade Students of SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Jember.* Unpublished Thesis. Muhammadiyah University of Jember.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* London: Sage Publisher.

Dieu, T. T. T. (2016). Trying K-W-L Strategy on Teaching Reading Comprehension to Passive Students in Vietnam. *In International Journal of Language and Linguistics 2015; 3(6):* 481-492 doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20150306.33.

Ercetin, G. (2010). Effects of Topic Interest and Prior Knowledge on Text Recall and Annotation Use in Reading a Hypermedia Text in the L2. *In European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning. ReCALL 22(2): 228–246. 2010 r* doi:10.1017/S0958344010000091

Fengjuan, Z. (2010). The Integration of the Know-Want-Learn (KWL) Strategy into English Language Teaching of Non-English Majors. *In Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly) Vol. 33 No. 4 Aug, 2010.*

Grabe, W., & Stroller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Reading.* London: Pearson Education.

Hattan, C. et al. (2015). Prior Knowledge Activation in Design and in Practice. *In Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice 2015, Vol. 64, 478-497.*

Hamdan, M. H. (2014). KWL-Plus Effectiveness on Improving Reading Comprehension of Tenth Graders of Jordanian Male Students. *In Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 4, No. 11, pp. 2278-2288, November 2014.*

Hana, A. M., Warsono., & Faridi, A. (2015). The Effectiveness of GIST (Generating Interactions between Schemata and Text) and KWL (Know, Want, and Learned) Strategies to Improve Reading Achievement of Male and Female Students. *In English Education Journal EEJ 5 (2) (2015)*

Harrys & Valette. (2003). *Principle Language Testing.* New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Karang, A.A.A P. (2014). *Improving Reading Comprehension Through KWL Strategy at The Eight Grade Students of SMP N 1 Amlapura in academic year 2013/2014.* Unpublished thesis, Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar.

Kaya, M. (2014). The Qualities of Effective Literacy Teachers: The Dynamics of Effective Teachers' Beliefs, Their Practices and Students' Responses. *In Journal of Education and Human Development 2014, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 41-57* DOI: 10.15640/jehd.v3n3a4 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v3n3a4

Mickulecky, B. S., & Jeffries, L. (2003). *More Reading Power: Reading for Pleasure, Comprehension Skills, Thinking Skills, Reading Faster Second Edition.* New Yourk: Pearson Education.

Osman, A., & Ali, M. (2002). *The Effect of Background Knowledge, Interest and Topic Familiarity on Reading.* Author Confirmed-Publication Date: 2005 (pyb 8.06.07)

Recht, D. R., & Leslie, L. (1988). Effect of Prior Knowledge on Good and Poor Readers' Memory of Text. *In Journal of Educational Psychology 1988, Vol. 80, No. 1, 16-20.*

Riswanto, Risnawati, & Lismayanti, D. (2014). The Effect of Using KWL (Know, Want, Learned) Strategy on EFL Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement. *In International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4, No. 7 (1); may 2014.*

Sabouri, N. B. (2016). How Can Students Improve Their Reading Comprehension Skill?. *In Journal of Studies in Education ISSN 2062-6952 2016, Vol. 6, No. 2.*

Simanjuntak, E. G. (1988). *Developing Reading Skills for ELF Students.* Jakarta: Proyek Pengembangan Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan.

Sinambela, E., Manik, S., & Pangaribuan, R. E. (2015). Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement by Using K-W-L Strategy. *In English Linguistics Research Vol. 4, N0. 3; 2015.*

Spratt, Pulverness, & Williams. (2005). *The TKT Teaching Knowledge Test Course.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strangman, N., Hal, T., & Meyer, A. (2004). *Background Knowledge Intruction and the Implication for UDL Implementation.* Wakafield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum. (Links updated 2009). Retrieved from http://aem.cast.org/about/publications/2004/ncac-background-knowledge-udl.html

Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D).* Bandung: Alfabeta.

The National Association of Secondary School Principal's bulletin. (2010, December). *Building and Activating Background Knowledge.* Principal Leadership: 1904 Association dr., reston, VA 20191-1537.

The National School Improvement Network's bulletin. (2002). *Effective Learning.* Institute of Education University of London. London: Author.

Woolley, G. (2011). Reading Comprehension: Assisting Children with Learning Difficulties. DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1174-7_2, © Springer Science +Business Media B.V. 2011