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ABSTRACT

Priyanto, Andreas. 2016. *The Effect of KWL strategy and Translation technique on the Reading Achievement of the 11th Grade Students*. S-1 Thesis, English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya.

Advisor: Dra. Agnes Santi Widiati M.Pd.

**Keywords:** KWL, Translation technique, reading achievement.

English is one of the most widely spoken languages in the world. It has four main skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Reading is considered as one of the critical skills and a major pillar of teaching and learning process. At any level, reading is the key to successful and productive learning. It allows students to get the information and absorb knowledge as much as possible. Reading also helps students build more vocabulary and be more comfortable with written English. Students nowadays do not really like to read, which caused them not able to comprehend readings well. They will probably be on the road to academic failure, because reading is the source of all information. Thus, it is necessary for teachers to teach reading with various reading strategies and methods so that the students can overcome the obstacles and read well.

This quasi experimental pre-test, post-test non-equivalent control group study investigated if KWL strategy could help students achieve better reading achievement, specifically in analytical exposition. This study was conducted in a senior high school in Surabaya. Two techniques, KWL strategy and Translation technique were applied to different classes in order to find out whether the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students taught using KWL strategy and those taught using Translation of Literary Passage should be accepted or not.

The result of the study showed that both techniques significantly improved the students’ reading achievement. Then, the writer analysed the gain score means from both group using T-test: two samples assuming unequal variances. The data analysis showed that the t-obtained was greater than t-table (5.931 > 2.007). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and this indicated that KWL showed better result than Translation technique.