

## USING “KWHHL CHART” (KNOW-WANT-HEAD WORDS-HEART WORDS-LEARNED) TO TEACH READING OF DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

**Indah Rohmawati**

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Art, State University of Surabaya  
email: indahrohma01@gmail.com

**Dra. Kusumarasdyati, Ph.D.**

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Art, State University of Surabaya

### Abstrak

Suzan Szabo (2006) memperkenalkan modifikasi terbaru dari strategi KWL yaitu strategi KWHHL. KWHHL singkatan dari *Know* (apa yang siswa ketahui), *Want* (apa yang siswa ingin ketahui), *Head Words* (kata-kata sulit), *Heart words* (emosi dan perasaan siswa tentang teks), dan *Learnt* (apa yang telah siswa pelajari) yang ditampilkan dalam bentuk grafik. Szabo (2006) menyatakan bahwa strategy tersebut sukses dan bisa mengatasi keterbatasan strategi KWL. Dengan demikian, penelitian ini merupakan jenis penelitian kuantitatif eksperimental karena digunakan untuk menguji teori Szabo (2006). Selain itu, penelitian ini juga digunakan untuk mengetahui respon siswa terhadap penggunaan strategi table KWHHL dalam memahami bacaan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara nilai *posttest* kelompok eksperimental dan kontrol. Dapat dikatakan bahwa penerapan dengan menggunakan grafik KWHHL efektif untuk mengajarkan membaca pemahaman teks deskriptif. Selain itu, para siswa merasa senang dan minat dalam proses belajar mengajar ketika menerapkan strategi tabel KWHHL. Mereka setuju bahwa strategi ini dapat memudahkan mereka untuk memahami teks.

**Kata Kunci:** Tabel KWHHL, Teks Deskriptif, Pemahaman Membaca.

### Abstract

Suzan Szabo (2006) introduces the latest modification of KWL strategy that is KWHHL strategy. KWHHL stands for Know, Want, Head words, Heart words and Learnt which is showed in the form of chart. Szabo (2006) stated that it was a success and could overcome the limitation of KWL strategy. Thus, this research is classified as experimental quantitative research since it is used to test the theory of Szabo (2006). In addition, this study also used to know about students' response towards the use of KWHHL chart strategy in reading comprehension. The result showed that there is significant difference between the *posttest* scores of experimental and control group. It can be said that the treatment by using KWHHL chart was effective to teach reading comprehension of descriptive text. Moreover, the students feel enjoy and interest in teaching learning process while applying KWHHL chart strategy. They do agree that this strategy can ease them to comprehend a text.

**Keywords:** KWHHL Chart, Descriptive Text, Reading Comprehension.

### INTRODUCTION

Reading is important for life since it is the bridge of knowledge transformation. Reading is not only about enjoyment but also necessity; it is the basic tool of education. Cheek (1989:113) states reading is the key in learning about all aspect of life. Furthermore, Cooper (1988:32) claims that reading is a process of constructing or developing meaning from printed text, and it is primarily cognitive process. By reading, the readers can relax, interacting with the feelings and thoughts, obtain information, and improve the science knowledge. He also states that to comprehend the written words the reader must be able to understand what an author has to organize the ideas and information presented in the text and to relate the ideas and information from text to ideas

information stored in his or her mind. In addition, the ability of someone to comprehend a text is closely related to one's background knowledge. Coody (1972:12) states the interest and background knowledge would enable the students to comprehend at reasonable rate and keep him involved in the spite of synthetic difficulty.

Comprehending a text is not a simple matter since there are a lot of ideas and information packed onto a text and readers need to read it more than once to understand it. Utilizing reading strategies is necessary to improve students reading comprehension (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). Reading strategy is a series of steps of thinking conducted by the reader in order to improve his comprehension of the text; which will facilitate storage and usage of the knowledge or recalling it when desired, depending on his previous experience (O'Malley &

Chamot, 1990). In teaching language, Jansen (2002) states that the basic objective of teaching is to enhance the readers' awareness of the reading strategies and give them a chance to choose the most appropriate strategies in achieving their own teaching objectives. Many kinds of strategies are introduced to the students, one of them is KWL.

KWL is one of the strategies that endeavor to improve the reading comprehension in different ways. It activates the students' previous knowledge about the topic and helps them to monitor their comprehension of the text. Furthermore, the texts taught by using the KWL strategy are well remembered and recalled (Ogle, 1986). KWL stands for Know, Want, and Learn which is showed in the form of chart.

Many studies has been conducted about this topic, one of them was conducted by Al-Khateeb and Idrees (2010). Their study is intended to assess the impact of using KWL (Know-Want-Learned) strategy on the reading comprehension of religious concepts for grade ten female students in Ma'an city. In this study KWL strategy was found to have positive effect for the students, such as improving their achievement and upgrading their knowledge. In addition, Frustalia (2012) also conducted a research about Teaching Narrative Reading Comprehension for the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 33 Palembang by Using KWL. The result showed that teaching reading comprehension by using KWL had a significant effect on the students reading comprehension. It can be assumed that it is effective to teach reading comprehension by using KWL.

However, Szabo (2006) found several limitations to KWL. First, it does not encourage reflective thinking of students' background knowledge. Second, students can not develop questions during reading. Third, it does not encourage vocabulary growth. And finally, it does not encourage students to look for an emotional link or experiential link to the material being read.

In the implementation, there are several variations of KWL that has been emerged since its appearance. One of them is developed by Szabo (2006) called KWHHL, where the first H stands for Head means 'head words or unfamiliar words', and the second H stands for Heart words means 'emotional word and the event in reading text that triggered that emotion'.

Szabo (2006) personally conducted a research of the eighth-grade struggling readers for the School District. She taught reading using their content textbook in implementing KWHHL strategy, and the result indicates that the KWHHL was a success. The students showed an improvement not only in their test result but also in their oral and written language that they were

using both in class discussions and in their writing journals.

Moreover, Indonesian Curriculum stated that Senior High students should be able to develop their understanding about language and culture. It means they have to understand and create several types of short functional text and monolog as well as essay such as procedure, descriptive, recount, narrative, report, news item, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, spoof, explanation, discussion, review, public speaking (BSNP: 2006).

As the response of those issues, this study is used to find out the effectiveness of KWHHL strategy in teaching reading descriptive text, and to figure out the students' response towards the use of this strategy.

The KWHHL chart is shown in this following table. (Adopted from Szabo:2006)

Table 1. KWHHL chart

<b>K</b> What do you know?	<b>W</b> What do you want to know?	<b>H</b> Head Words	<b>H</b> Heart Words	<b>L</b> What have you learned?
Positive Ideas: 1. 2.	Before Reading 1. 2. 3.	Head Words 1. 2. 3.	Heart Words and Why 1. 2. 3.	New Information Learned 1. 2. 3.
Negative Ideas: 1. 2.	While Reading 1. 2. 3.		4. 5.	"Stayed the same" "Correct but added to" "Adjusted because flawed:"
Neutral Ideas: 1. 2. 3.				

First column is "K" column which stands for "What do you already Know" about what you will read. It is important for all readers to activate their prior knowledge (Miller, 2002). Teachers need to help students think about and reflect on prior knowledge in order to determine that prior knowledge is accurate or not. Teachers need to encourage students to determine if the knowledge they hold is positive or negative because this will encourage students to think more critically (Szabo, 2004). The "K" column is divided into three sections that labeled as "positive ideas" in the first section, "negative ideas" in the second section, and the third section labeled as "neutral ideas". This division is made in order to help the students determine and examine their beliefs about the information being read (Szabo, 2004).

Second column is labeled as "W" column for answering the question "What do I Want to find out?". The students can fill the column in interrogative form because it is important for students to develop their own questions so that they can be thoughtfully engaged while

they are reading (Lublinter, 2004). Therefore, the “W” column is divided in half – the top half labeled as “before reading,” which contained the questions that were developed by the students, and the bottom half is labeled “while reading.” In this column the students can record the questions developed during reading.

Third column is “H” for Head words, which focus on the vocabulary difficulties. When the students read, they may find words that they do not understand so they can write the sentence and underline the word. This column guided the students to record the words that are important or unknown to them. It also provided a way of differentiating and acknowledging that they all have different background knowledge and need to learn different words (Szabo, 2006).

Fourth column is called “H” column for Heart or emotional/experience words. It has been shown that each reader responds to the text in a very personal way, as each reader uses his/her own personal background experiences to construct meaning (Karolides, 1997). Therefore, this column can help students talk about and explore their own experiences and feelings, which would help them to understand the value they attached to the material being read (Rosenblatt, 1995). Thus, the second “H” column is provided for the students to write down their “heart or feeling” words. Students are instructed to find information in the text that evoked an emotion (happy, sad, scary, frustrated, etc). They summarize the event in the text and then tell what emotion it evoked and why it evoked that emotion. Furthermore, how the emotion that a text event evokes depends on how we personally experienced the event in our life (Szabo, 2006).

Finally, the last column is the “L” column for “What did I learn?”. It is important to recognize student’s own learning growth so that each student needed to be effective both at summarizing and evaluating the material and at confirming his or her own knowledge as a result of the reading. Therefore, Szabo (2006) divided this column in half. At the top of the column, they are for reflecting and summarizing text by writing 3-5 things that they had learned while reading. At the bottom of the column, they are asked to write, “stayed the same,” “correct but added to,” or “adjusted because flawed.” These phrases are used to determine the prior knowledge that they had written down in the “K” column before they began their reading. Next, if the prior knowledge is flawed, they have to discuss how this knowledge changed.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This research was classified as quantitative, especially experimental research because it had purpose

to determine the effect of “KWHHL Chart” technique towards students’ reading comprehension of descriptive text. According to Ary et al. (2010) experimental research is a study of the effect of the systematic manipulation of one variable on another variable. The manipulated variable is called the independent variable or the experimental group. While the observed and measured variable is called the dependent variable or control group. In this research both experimental group and control group got pre-test. The post-test was given to both groups after the experimental group got the treatment. Besides, this research was considered as quantitative research. Quantitative method was used because the data which are used in analysis are in the form of numbers.

### **Subject of the Research**

The population of this research was the tenth graders of SMAN 3 Sidoarjo. From this population, the two sample classes were chosen randomly. The researcher used cluster random sampling to determine the sample. X - 6 and X - 7 have been chosen as the samples among 8 classes. X-6 was drawn as the experimental group and X-7 as the control group.

### **Research Instruments**

The instruments of this study were tests and questionnaire. The first instrument was test. This research used pre-test and post-test. The number of the questions in the test was 25 questions which in the form of multiple choices and short answer format. The tests were about the information of the text. In designing a test, there were some criteria which were used as a consideration. A good test should be valid, reliable, and have an appropriate level of difficulty and discriminatory power. Thus, the test has been checked based on the test validity, reliability, level of difficulty, and item discrimination. The result showed that it was appropriate test.

Second, questionnaire was used to know the students’ response towards this strategy. The questionnaire used in this research was rating-scale questionnaire. Rating-scale questionnaires built in a degree of sensitivity and differentiation of response while still generating numbers. The questionnaire consisted of six scales in order to avoid mid-point. The questionnaire was given to the experimental group after getting posttest.

### **Data Collection Technique**

This study used two instruments, test and questionnaire. Therefore, there were two steps in collecting the data. The first is data collection technique

for the test. The design used to collect the data in this research was a ‘true’ experimental design: the pretest-post-test control group design. The procedures of collecting data were: (1) Class X-6 and X-7 were given a pretest which had same questions. The students' pre-test score was used to see the starting point. (2) Class X-6 as the experimental group was taught about how to use “KWHHL Chart” technique and how to implement it in a reading passage, but class X-7 as the control group did not. (3) Class X-6 as the experimental group was taught the use of “KWHHL chart” technique in three meetings. (4) After the treatment, the two groups were given post-test which has the same level of difficulty of the pretest. Post-test will be compared with pre-test to see the effect of “KWHHL Chart” strategy to improve the students’ reading comprehension of descriptive text.

The second data collection technique is for the questionnaire. It was given after the posttest to the class X-6 as the experimental group. The students were instructed to complete the questionnaire based on their true feelings. They had to circle one of the scales whether they agree or not. The questionnaire was about five categories, they were: (1) students’ opinion of the teacher’s performance which was asked in question number, (2) general interest of the students, (3) relationship with the topic, (4) relationship with reading, and (5) students’ enthusiastic in reading.

**Data Analysis Technique**

The data of the test was analyzed using t-test, which was proposed by Best (Hermina, 2000). The t-test was used to calculate and analyze the data not only to test “KWHHL Chart” technique is more effective or not but also to test whether students' reading comprehension of descriptive text increase or not through “KWHHL Chart” technique. The formula of t-test is:

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{s\bar{x}_D}$$

The steps of computing the t-test were: (1) Compute the Mean of Differences, (2) Compute the Standard Deviation of the Differences, (3) Compute Standard Error of the Mean for the Differences, (4) Compute Correlated t-test (Albert E. Bartz: 1976).

In the other hand, in analyzing the data using questionnaire, the researcher used manual way. Therefore, the questionnaire used in this research was rating-scale questionnaire which consisted of six scales. The researcher could infer that those respondents who circled 1, 2, or 3 were in some measure of disagreement, whilst those respondents who circled 4, 5, or 6 were in some measure of agreement (Cohen et al., 2000). This

was the way to interpret the students’ feelings and opinions.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Result**

This study was conducted to find out whether the KWHHL Chart strategy was effective to teach reading comprehension of descriptive text or not. The subject of the study were two classes, they were X-6 as the experimental group and X-7 as the control group. They were 36 students in each group. When the researcher conducted the experiment, 5 students were absent. They were two students from the experimental group who did not attend the post-test, and three students from the control group who did not attend the pre-test and treatment. These five students were not included in the data computation. Therefore, there were 34 students in experimental group and 33 students in control group as the sample.

The data were collected from students’ pre-test and post-test scores. The pretest of the experimental group was given before the treatment, while the posttest was given after treatment. In the other hand, the pretest of the control group was given before giving the material, while the posttest was given after teaching the material without applying the treatment. Thus, there were two scores of pretest and posttest.

The results of both tests were analyzed by using t-test formula. It was necessary to calculate the pretest first before calculating the posttest in order to know whether the experimental group and the control group were equal or not. Based on the data below, the t-value of the pretest scores of experimental and the control group was 1.4 and the t-table was 2.000. The t-value was lower than the t-table. It meant that the difference of the pretest score between the experimental group and the control group was not significant. In the other words, the reading comprehension of both group were equal.

Table 2. The Result of t-test

Groups	N	Mean		df	t-value		t.05
		Pre-test	Post-test		Pretest	Posttest	
Experimental	3 4	56.4	73.7	65	1.4 (not significant)	4.2 (significant)	2.000
Control	3 3	59.6	67				

From the table above, the score of t-test value was 4.2 with 65 degree of freedom (df) and the t table was 2.000. It could be seen that the t value was higher than t table. It meant that there was significant difference between the posttest scores of experimental and control group. Thus, the treatment by using KWHHL chart gives a significant influence to the students’ score.

In the other hand, questionnaire was administered to find out the students responses towards the use of KWHHL chart. The questionnaire was only given to the experimental group after posttest. The questions asked were about 5 categories. They were: students' opinion of the teacher's performance which was asked in question number 1, general interest of the students which was asked in question number 2, relationship with the topic in question number 3, 4, and 5, relationship with reading lesson in question number 6 and 7, and students' enthusiastic in question number 8.

The students were free to express their opinion by answering the questions in the questionnaire without any intimidation and pressure. There were eight questions in the questionnaire which consisted of six scales. The scales 1 to 3 was counted as disagree while the scales 4 to 6 was counted as agree.

Table 3. The Percentage of the Students' Response

Question Number	Number of students		Percentage (%)	
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree
1	3	31	8.8	91.2
2	9	25	26.5	73.5
3	4	30	11.4	88.6
4	3	31	8.8	91.2
5	1	33	2.9	97.1
6	6	28	17.6	82.4
7	3	31	8.8	91.2
8	8	26	23.5	76.5

Based on the table, the students showed positive response towards the use of this strategy. For general interest of the students category which was shown in question number 2, 73.5% of whole students were interested in the technique. The students thought that the KWHHL chart technique was useful for them. However, 26.5% of whole students had different opinion. They thought that this technique was not useful for them.

While for relationship with reading lesson category which was divided into two in question number 5 and 6. It was about the relationship with the reading lesson. There were 82.4% of whole students who thought that this technique can ease them to understand the text. Moreover, it also increased their vocabulary. Thirty students or 91.2% of whole students agree that their vocabulary increased after learning using KWHHL chart. However, 13.2% of whole students felt that there was no difference after learning using KWHHL chart.

The last category was about the students' enthusiastic in reading a text. After learning about this technique, 76.5% of whole students intended to read passages. They were not afraid anymore in long passage. In contrary, 23.5% of whole students still did not have any intention in reading long passages.

## Discussions

The result of this study showed that the use of KWHHL Chart strategy was effective to teach reading comprehension of descriptive text since there was a significant difference between experimental group and control group. The experimental group showed some improvement in their posttest after getting the treatment. Therefore, it could be said that this technique was successful. This result was in line with Szabo (2006) who stated that the KWHHL was a success, which the students showed an improvement in their test result.

This also proved another statement from Szabo (2006) that students' vocabulary increased, as they appeared to be more comfortable using their difficult words both oral and written. The result of this study showed the improvement of the students' vocabulary through the posttest result. Most of them answered correctly the vocabulary questions in their posttest. The students chose different words, so they learnt a variety of words in context and were able to help each other with the word meanings. As they chose the words they wanted to learn, they became engaged in reading, which in turn increased their comprehension of the text (Juel & Deffes, 2004).

The first "K" or "Know" column which was useful for activating the students' prior knowledge (Miller, 2002) was proved. Students could write out their prior knowledge related to the topic in order to determine whether their prior knowledge was accurate or not. Furthermore, the students could determine and distinguish their opinion into positive and negative ideas as well as have further discussion about the negative ideas. It supported Szabo's (2004) statement that determining the knowledge into positive or negative ideas would encourage students to think more critically.

Second column was "W" column for "Want". The students formed some questions about what they wanted to know about the topic and finally they could answer it after reading the text. They read the text carefully and thoroughly. So it supported Lubriner's (2004) statement. He stated that developing their own questions can make them thoughtfully engaged while they are reading.

Then the third column was "H" for Head words, which focused on the unfamiliar vocabulary. The result about this column showed that the students' vocabulary knowledge was increased since their scores were also increased. The students answered the vocabulary questions correctly in their posttest and got the other questions well. It meant that they could comprehend the text easily after solving the unfamiliar words. So, it supported Gunning's (2006) statement that vocabulary knowledge increases reading comprehension.

In contrary, the result of the fourth column which was called “H” column for Heart words was opposed Rosenblatt’s (1995) opinion. He stated that this column would help the students to understand the value they attached to the material being read by exploring their experiences. The students wrote their experiences and their emotion but they went too far. Most of their experiences and emotion were not closely related to the topic.

For the last column was the “L” column for “Learn”. The result was in line with Szabo’s (2006) statement. She stated that this column was effective for both summarizing and evaluating the material and confirming their knowledge as a result of the reading. It was proved by the significant difference in their posttest score.

Moreover, based on the result of the questionnaire, most of the students also felt enjoy and interest in teaching learning process. They did not felt pressure and participate actively. This situation was needed in teaching reading as Coady (1972:12) states the interest would enable the students to comprehend at reasonable rate. The students should be interested in the reading material in order to help them comprehend it easily. That was why choosing the right topic was also important.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusions

Based on the result and discussion, there are two conclusions that can be drawn. The first conclusion is there is an improvement in students’ achievement who were taught using KWHHL chart. It was shown by statistically computation between the posttest of experimental group and control group which had significant difference. The score of the t-test value (4.18) was higher than the t-table (2.000). It meant that there was a significant difference between the posttest scores of experimental and control group. Thus, the treatment by using KWHHL chart was effective to teach reading comprehension of descriptive text to the tenth graders.

The second conclusion is there is positive response towards the use of KWHHL chart in reading comprehension. This can be seen from the result of the questionnaire. The students were enthusiastic and participated actively during the teaching learning process that used KWHHL chart. Most of them were interested in the use of this chart. They also felt easy to comprehend the text using this KWHHL chart. It could be seen from the students’ posttest score which were better than pretest.

### Suggestions

Based on the result, it is expected for the English teacher who wants to use KWHHL chart in teaching reading comprehension to be more active and understand what KWHHL is about completely, especially for each column. Thus, the teacher can teach the use of this chart maximally. Besides, the teacher should choose reading material and the vocabulary content based on the students’ level. Furthermore, the material should base on the students’ interest so that they can understand the material easily and enjoy the learning process.

It is also recommended for the next researchers, to find out the use of KWHHL chart to address the other genres beside descriptive. Moreover, it is hoped that the other researchers can find out other technique in teaching descriptive text which are more effective and interesting.

## DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Inroduction to Research in Education (8<sup>th</sup> Ed)*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Cheek, E. (1989). *Reading for success in elementary schools*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education (5<sup>th</sup> Ed)*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cooper, M. (1988). Conference report: 11th world congress in reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 4, 32.
- Frustalia, Tri. (2012). Teaching Narrative Reading Comprehension for the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 33 Palembang by Using KWL. *A thesis of English Education Study Program Student*, Sriwijaya University.
- Gunning, T. (2004). *Creating literacy: Instruction for all students in grades 4 to 8*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Jansen, E. (2002). " Brain – Based learning : A reality check ". *Educational Leadership*, pp 76 – 80.
- Karolides, N.(1997). *Reader response in elementary classrooms: Quest and discovery*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1970). *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Lublinter, S. (2004). Help for struggling upper-grade elementary readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 57, 430-438.

O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning Strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Ogle, D. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *The Reading Teacher*, 39, 564-570.

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

Rosenblatt, L. (1995). *Literature as exploration*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Standar Isi untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan. Jakarta:2006.

Szabo, S. (2004). The KWL: A tool to help teacher candidates connect theory and practice. *Oklahoma Association of Teacher Educators*, 8, 62-74.

Szabo, Susan. (2006). KWHHL: A student-driven evolution of the KWL. *American Secondary Education* 34 (3).

