Comparative Study on Teaching Reading Using Know, Want, Learnt (KWL) and Direct Instruction Method (DIM)

Gabriela Puspita Nagri, Ngadiso, Teguh Sarosa

English Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta

Email: gabrielapuspita@ymail.com

Abstract: The aims of this research are to find out: (1) whether there is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM; and (2) whether KWL method is more effective than DIM to teach reading. This experimental study used 22 students for the experimental group and 22 students for the control group. The data were collected by using reading test and then analyzed by using t-test formula. The computation of the data shows that the t-observation (t_o) is 1.988, which is higher than the t-table $_{(42,\ 0.05)}$: 1.960. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM. The mean of the group of students taught by using KWL method is 75.14, while the mean of the group of students taught by using DIM is 69.13. Therefore, it can be concluded that KWL method is more effective to teach reading than DIM for junior high school students.

***Keywords**: reading skill, Know Want Learnt method, Direct Instruction Method*

INTRODUCTION

English is important to be learnt because people use it in daily life communication. English is very important because it becomes a compulsory subject given to the students of Junior High School and Senior High School. English is also taught in Primary School and even Kindergarten although it is not compulsory. In Junior High School, English lesson is focused on the development of capability to communicate that covers four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. English lesson is divided into two skills, receptive and productive skills. Reading and listening are categorized into receptive skills, while writing and speaking are categorized into productive skills. From these four language skills, reading is an essential factor in the learning process.

In general, reading is a process of understanding, interpreting, and getting meaning of printed symbols in the text. Aebersold and Field (1997: 15) stated reading is what happens when people look at the text and assign meaning to the written symbols in that text. In relation to what Aebersold and Field say, Wallace (1992: 4) says that reading is interpreting which means reacting to a written text as a piece of communication. Reading is not only picking up information by translating every word of the text. More than that, reading is a process of understanding what readers have read. Reading comprehension is difficult moreover in foreign language. Readers or students sometimes face many problems in reading class. They often get difficulties on finding the topic sentence of the text, finding the explicit and implicit information of the text, explaining the reference of pronouns,

interpreting the meaning of words, and inferring the main idea. Those problems make students become frustrated, worried, even they become lazy.

The success of reading can be determined by many factors. One of those factors is the method of teaching reading that is used by the teacher. It is an important factor to solve the reading problems and reach the goal of teaching-learning activity. If the teacher uses the appropriate method of teaching reading, students may learn reading effectively because the appropriate method of reading is the key to build students' reading skill. They also will not be bored and lazy to read. Appropriate method of reading determines the success of reading.

Ogle (1986: 564) says that KWL is an instructional reading method that is used to guide students through a text. In using KWL method, students should use a chart that consists of three parts or columns (Know, Want and Learnt). Students have to fill the columns after reading the text given by the teacher. When students fill the columns, they need to use their background knowledge. Background knowledge is needed by students in order that they can get started by brainstorming any prior knowledge they may have on the topic which then helps them develop a curiosity on the subject and gets them interested in learning more about it. It will be quite difficult if there are students that do not have background knowledge. They will get difficulties in filling the column. KWL also helps students become better readers of expository text and helps teachers to be more interactive in their teaching.

Arends (1997: 64) says that Direct Instruction Method (DIM) is a method to teach that helps students learn basic skills and acquire information that can be taught in a step by step fashion. Direct instruction has the following characteristics: an academic focus, a teacher-centered focus, little student choice of activity, use of large groups rather than small groups for instruction, and use of factual questions and controlled practice in instruction. Academic focus is one of the highest priorities on the assignment and completion of academic tasks in the classroom. It does not build social relationship among the students. DIM demands strong teacher direction therefore it makes the students become passive in joining the learning process.

In teaching junior high school students, the teacher should have special methods to make students understand the text easily. Junior high school students are students who have lower thinking ability. Students will enjoy and not get bored in the teaching and learning process if the teacher uses the appropriate method. Considering the explanation above, the writer assumes that KWL method is better to be applied than DIM because by using KWL method, students can share knowledge to solve the problems in comprehending texts.

The objectives of the research are: (1) to investigate whether there is any significant difference in students' reading skills between the students taught using KWL method and the students taught using DIM; and (2) to investigate which group has better reading skill, the students taught using KWL method or the students taught using DIM.

Based on the theories underlying the study dealing with using KWL and DIM in reading, the hypotheses proposed in this study are: (1) There is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM; and (2) The students taught by using KWL method have

better reading skill than those taught by using DIM.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, the writer used experimental method. According to Mason and Bramble (1997: 56), experimental studies involve comparing conditions under various settings of the treatment. Mason and Bramble also state that subjects might be divided into two groups, one to undergo a treatment condition, called the experimental group or treatment group, while the other to receive another treatment or control group. The experimental method is intended to investigate the effect of a treatment (X) for the variable (Y).

This research was conducted at the ninth grade of a senior high school in Surakarta. The population of the research is the ninth-grade students. The total populations are 256 students. The sample was taken from the population of ninth grade students coming for two classes. The total samples are 44 students, which consist of 22 students of IX D and 22 students of IX C. In this research, the writer used cluster random sampling. Cluster random sampling is the selection of groups, or clusters, of subjects rather than individuals (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000: 109). In the ninth grade of SMP Negeri 13 Surakarta, there are eight classes. The step of taking samples was based on the lottery. In the first lottery, the writer chose two classes as the sample from eight classes, and from that technique, the writer took class IX C and class IX D. Then, the writer did the second lottery to decide which class as the experimental group and which class as the control group. Based on the lottery, the IX D was the experimental group and the IX C was the control group, which then IX D was taught by using KWL, and IX C was taught by using DIM.

In this research, the writer used test for collecting the data and used t-test for analyzing the data. The writer gave the pre-test to know the baseline. After giving the pre-test, the writer gave treatments for both groups. After giving treatments for both groups, the writer gave the post-test to the students. In this research, the writer used report texts. The score of the students are compared using t-test formula to prove whether there is significant difference in reading skill between the two groups and to find which group has higher score.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data of the pre-test for the experimental group show that the highest score is 84, while the lowest score is 48, the mean is 67.86, the mode is 65.1, the median is 66.93 and the standard deviation is 10.02. The data of the pre-test for the control group show that the highest score is 84, while the lowest score is 44. The mean is 68.95, the mode is 71.5, the median is 69.78, and the standard deviation is 9.03.

Table 1. The Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Group Pre-test.

Class limits	Class boundaries	Midpoint	Tally	Frequency	Percentage
48 – 55	47.5 – 55.5	51.5	II	2	9.09
56 – 63	55.5 – 63.5	59.5	~~IIII~~ I	6	27.27
64 – 71	63.5 – 71.5	67.5	~~IIII~~ II	7	31.82
72 – 79	71.5 – 79.5	75.5	III	3	13.64
80 – 87	79.5 – 87.5	83.5	IIII	4	18.18
Total				**22**	**100**

Table 2 The Frequency Distribution of the Control Group Pre-test.

Class limits	Class boundaries	Midpoint	Tally	Frequency	Percentage
44 – 51	43.5 – 51.5	47.5	I	1	4.56
52 – 59	51.5 – 59.5	55.5	II	2	9.09
60 – 67	59.5 – 67.5	63.5	~~IIII~~ I	6	27.27
68 – 75	67.5 – 75.5	71.5	~~IIII~~ II	7	31.82
76 – 84	75.5 – 84.5	79.5	~~IIII~~ I	6	27.27
Total				**22**	100

The sample used in this research should come from the same level of population and have no significant difference in the reading skill. To prove that the two groups have no significant difference in reading comprehension achievement, the writer used the t-test. The result of t computation (t-test) of the pre-test shows that the t observation (t_o) is 0.26 while the t table (t_t) for degree of freedom 42 and the level of significance 0.05 is 1.960. It can be seen that the t observation (t_o) is lower than the t table (t_t), which means that there is no significant difference in the achievement of reading between the two classes. The homogeneity test used is Bartlet at the level of significance of 0.05 (α = 0.05). The result of homogeneity test of pre-test is that χ^2 = 0.092 is lower than χ_t^2 = 3.841 or $\chi_o^2 < \chi_t^2$. Because χ_o^2 is lower than χ_t^2, it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous.

The data of the post-test for the experimental group show that the highest score is 92, while the lowest score is 56. The mean is 75.14, the mode is 76.3, the median is 75.5, and the standard deviation is 11.44.

Table 3. The Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Group Post-test.

Class limits	Class boundaries	Midpoint	Tally	Frequency	Percentage
56 – 63	55.5 – 63.5	59.5	~~IIII~~	5	22.73
64 – 71	63.5 – 71.5	67.5	III	3	13.64
72 – 79	71.5 – 79.5	75.5	~~IIII~~ I	6	27.27
80 – 87	79.5 – 87.5	83.5	IIII	4	18.18
88 – 95	87.5 – 95.5	91.5	IIII	4	18.18
Total				**22**	100

The data of the post-test for the control group show that the highest score is 80, while the lowest score is 42. The mean is 69.13, the mode is 71.1, the median is 70.3, and the standard deviation is 8.36.

Table 4. The Frequency Distribution of the Control Group Post-test.

Class limits	Class boundaries	Midpoint	Tally	Frequency	Percentage
42 – 49	41.5 – 49.5	45.5	I	1	4.54
50 – 57	49.5 – 57.5	53.5	I	1	4.54
58 – 65	57.5 – 65.5	61.5	III	3	13.64
66 – 73	65.5 – 73.5	69.5	~~IIII IIII~~	10	45.46
74 – 81	73.5 – 81.5	77.5	~~IIII~~ II	7	31.82
Total				**22**	**100**

The post-test data of both experimental group and control group are in normal distribution. In the data of the experimental group, L_o is 0.1683. It is then consulted with L table for n = 22 at the level of significance of 0.05 (α = 0.05) = 0.1889. Because the value of L_o is lower than L table ($L_o < L_t$), it can be concluded that the data of the experimental group are in normal distribution. Meanwhile, the data of the control group show that L_o is 0.1327. It is consulted with the L table for n = 22 at the level of significance of 0.05 (α = 0.05) = 0.1889. Because the value of L_o is lower than L table ($L_o < L_t$), it can be concluded that the data of the control group are in normal distribution. The result of homogeneity test of post-test is that χ^2 = 0.756 is lower than χ^2_t = 3.841 or $\chi^2_o < {}^o\chi^2_t$. Because χ^2_o is lower than χ^2_t, it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous.

After finding out the result of the pre-requisite test, the writer then calculated the t-test to test the first hypothesis whether the first hypothesis is accepted or not. The data, which were analyzed in this research, are post-test scores of the two groups, the experimental group and the control group.

The null hypothesis (H_o) of the research is that there is no significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM. Statistically, the hypothesis can be formulated as H_o (Null Hypothesis): $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. The alternative hypothesis (H_a) of this research is that there is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM. Statistically, the hypothesis can be formulated as H_a (Alternative Hypothesis): $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$. If t_o (t-observation) is smaller than t_t (t_{table}) or $t_o < t_t$, H_o is accepted. On the contrary, if t_o (t-observation) is higher than t_t (t_{table}) or $t_o > t_t$, H_o is rejected.

The result of t computation shows that t- observation (t_o) is 1.988 while the t-table (t_t) for the degree of freedom of 42 and the level of significance = 0.05 is 1.960. So, t_o is higher than t_t. It means that H_o is rejected. It can be concluded that there is a significant difference in reading skill between students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM.

The second hypothesis of this research is that the group taught by using KWL method has a better reading skill than those taught by using DIM. In this case, to test the second hypothesis, the writer compared the post-test mean of the two groups. The mean of the scores of the experimental group is 75.14, while the mean of the scores of control group is 69.13. The mean score of the experimental group is higher than the mean score of the control group. It can be concluded that KWL method is more effective than DIM.

The result of the research shows that there is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$). KWL method is more effective than DIM $\left(\overline{X_1} > \overline{X_2}\right)$.

The use of KWL method is better because it allows the students to comprehend the text using their background knowledge. Background knowledge is important to make prediction in the comprehending text process. By using background knowledge, the idea of the text will be understood easily. The students can get started by brainstorming any prior knowledge they may have on the topic which helps them develop a curiosity on the subject and gets the students interested in learning more about it. It is stated by Ogle

(1986: 564) that KWL is a graphic organizer used to help students predict and connect new information with prior knowledge and students begin by brainstorming everything they know about a topic. Carr and Ogle (1987: 628) also state that KWL helps students become better readers of expository text and helps teachers to be more interactive in their teaching. KWL method also helps students to be active thinkers while they read, giving them specific things to look for and having them reflect on what they learned when they are finished reading. The process of reading through KWL method is very helpful for the students.

The use of DIM is less effective because in DIM processing, the teacher centrality strongly occurs. It makes the students become passive in joining the learning process, and sometimes it makes the students get bored. It is stated by Ronsenshine in Peterson (1979: 1) that direct instruction has the following characteristics: an academic focus; a teacher-centered focus; little student choice of activity; use of large groups rather than small groups for instruction; and use of factual questions and controlled practice in instruction. A teacher-centered focus means the teacher becomes the decision maker along the learning process. The teacher is engaged in many planning decisions, such as deciding what she/he wants to teach, when she/he wishes to teach and how she/he will go about the reading process. Therefore, DIM does not promote achievement in creativity and students' thinking, and sometimes it makes the students bored.

Considering the junior high school students as the students with lower thinking ability, it will be more interesting for them to brainstorm and share their background knowledge then discuss together than just do the teacher directions and become passive learners. Therefore, KWL method is better because in KWL method processing, the students can share their background knowledge and by using background knowledge, the idea of the text is understood easily. KWL method also helps the students to be active thinkers before they read, while they read, and after they read. KWL method can be an effective method in reading.

The explanation above conforms with the result of this research that there is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM, and KWL method is more effective than DIM to teach reading for junior high school students.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result of the research, the findings are: (1) there is a significant difference in reading skill between students taught by using KWL method and those taught by using DIM; and (2) KWL method is more effective to be applied in reading than DIM for junior high school students.

The result of the research shows that KWL method can give better achievement in reading than DIM. It means that KWL method is appropriate to be applied in teaching reading for junior high school students. The selection of KWL method is reasonable because by using KWL method the students can comprehend the text using their background knowledge to make prediction. Learning reading through KWL method helps the students develop a curiosity on the subject and gets the students interested in learning more about it. KWL method also helps the students to be active thinkers before they read, while they read, and after they read.

In teaching reading to junior high school students, it is better for the teacher to teach the students by using KWL method as an alternative way by considering the steps namely before reading, while reading, and after reading.

Before reading, the students brainstorm ideas and discuss what they know about the topic to activate background knowledge. After brainstorming and discussing, they list what they know about the topic in the K column. Then, they list some questions what they want to know about the topic in the W column. These activities allow them to brainstorm their background knowledge and to be more active to share what they know about the topic.

While reading, the students list new information as they read in L column. As they read and encounter new information, additional questions can be added in W column. These questions encourage them to continue reading for a purpose and help them to comprehend the text.

After reading, the students discuss what they have learned, the answers of the questions. They may ask questions after reading. It allows them to reflect on their reading and to relate it to their own experiences. It also allows the teacher to see how well the students understand what they have read and whether they have grasped the main ideas.

Related to the result of the study that there is a significant difference in reading skill between the students taught using KWL method and those taught using DIM and that the students taught using KWL method have better reading skill, the writer would like to give suggestions to the English teacher, the students, and other researchers.

To the English teacher, since the result of this research shows that KWL method is better than DIM, it is recommended for teacher to use KWL method as an alternative way in teaching reading.

To the students, they should use their background knowledge in the teaching learning process through KWL method; before reading, while reading, and after reading, and do more practices in the class. The students have to improve their comprehension of reading with various activities such as encountering new information, discussing what the students know and what the students want to know about the topic, and thinking critically in using their background knowledge because reading is important for their academic success.

To other researchers, the writer is aware that her research is not the end of the problem being studied. The result of the study merely confirms the hypothesis; it does not prove that something is absolutely true all the time. The writer hopes that other researchers will make such an improvement by using this topic of research with different subjects of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aebersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (1997). *From Reader to Reading Teacher*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Arends, Richard. I. (1997). *Classroom Instruction and Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blachowicz, Camille., & Ogle, Donna. (2008). *Reading Comprehension Strategies for Independent Learners*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Carr, E., & Ogle, Donna. (1987). K-W-L Plus: a strategy for comprehension and summarization. *Journal of*

Reading, *30* (7), 626-631. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (4th ed).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mason, E. J., & Bramble, W. J. (1997). *Research in Education and the Behavioral Sciences.* Chicago: Times Mirror Higher Education Group, Inc.

Ogle, D.M. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher*, *39* (6), 564-570. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.