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ABSTRACT – The objectives of the research are: (1) to identify whether One Stay/Three Stray Method (OSTS) is more effective than Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) to teach reading to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga; (2) to identify whether the students having high self–actualization have better reading skill than those having low self–actualization to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga; and (3) to identify whether there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' self–actualization to teach reading. The research methodology was the experimental research. The research was conducted at SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga from October to November 2012. The population of this research was eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga. The data analysis shows the following findings; (1) OSTS is more effective than GTM to teach reading to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga; (2) The students having high self–actualization have better reading skill than those having low one; and (3) There is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' self–actualization for teaching reading. It means that the effectiveness of the teaching methods depends on the degree of the students' self–actualization to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga.
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INTRODUCTION

Reading skill is learnt with various purposes. For instance: to find main ideas, word meaning, supporting details, explicit and implicit meanings, to improve students' grammar, punctuation, and to enrich their vocabulary. It can be started based upon the students’ levels of L2 learning process. The students can start reading from simple text to complicated one. Through reading various texts, not only will they elicit either information or systematic structures but also they will get amusement. Goodman in Schcolnik (2001: 12) distinguishes among five main types of one classification of reading purposes: (1) environmental reading (e.g., street signs, directions, etc.); (2) occupational reading (which is a major purpose for most people); (3) informational reading (in which written texts act as an extension of human memory); (4) recreational reading (to occupy leisure time); and (5) ritualistic reading (to fulfill a religious or cultural rite). As a matter of fact, the students are able to drag over themselves to gain the amusement through reading something making them fun for instance, reading
novels, magazines or comics which stimulate their feeling, images and thought, but they are not also able to read to carry away information for example to focus on symbols in some texts.

There is still another thing that should be considered. That is reading ability of senior high school students. It also plays an important role for them and English teachers to classify how far when students read passages or books, they obtain the messages or information or they can be categorized as readers who reach the level of the reading comprehension. To some degree, talking about the ability of reading has great relationship to the students’ fluent reading. Fluent reading is defined as the ability to read at an appropriate rate with adequate comprehension (Anderson, 2008: 3). The strategic reading is defined as the ability of a reader to use a wide variety of reading varieties to accomplish a purpose for reading. Then, he says that the reading materials, the readers, fluency, and strategy are defined as the act of reading (2008: 3).

Methods are also determiners in teaching learning process. Choosing the appropriate method will lead to the success of teaching. According to Qing-xue and Jin-fang (2007: 1), language teaching has a long, fascinating but rather tortuous history, in which a debate on teaching methods has evolved particularly over the last hundred years.

To some degree, the methods are exceedingly indispensable in teaching reading. Teaching without methods is the same as walking to somewhere without eyes. What should be considered and be paid attention is on the weaknesses and strengths of the methods in teaching reading. In conducting this research, the writer implemented One Stay/Three Stray Method to help students to seize the level of reading comprehension which is compared with Grammar-Translation Method.

Besides, psychological aspect will also affect students in learning reading i.e. self-actualization. Self-Actualization is that Maslow's use of the term "self-actualizing" is often thought of as having an inner focus i.e. differentiation of self, psychological integration or achieving some level of personal potential. The goal is to "better" the self. Self-actualization is "the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming" Maslow's message is that to achieve peak experience, people must move from self to other. Social justice, generativity, and transformative thinking and acting are all concepts that could be associated with this orientation. The fundamental idea is that people must move to a focus and concern for other people to achieve the highest level of human nature. People who move beyond self-actualization "are, without a single exception, involved in a cause outside of their skin: in something
outside of themselves, some calling or vocation” (Maslow, 1971: 42; Erik Erikson, 1987; Carl Rogers, 1961 and Goble, 1970) in (Burleson, 2005: 437).

By virtue of the above background of the study, the writer formulates the problems as follows:

1. Is one stay/three stray method more effective than the grammar-translation method to teach reading to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Lingga?

2. Do the students having high self-actualization have better reading skill than those who have low self-actualization to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Lingga?

3. Is there any interaction between the teaching methods and students’ self-actualization to teach reading?

By virtue of the above formulation of the problems, this research is primarily aimed at deciphering:

1. Whether one stay/three stray method is more effective than grammar-translation method to teach reading to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Lingga.

2. Whether the students having high self-actualization have better reading skill than those who have low self-actualization to the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Lingga.

3. Whether there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students’ self-actualization to teach reading.

**REVIEW OF RELATED TO LITERATURE**

According to Broughton, et al., (2003: 89-90), first it must be recognized that reading is a complex skill, that is to say that it involves a whole series of lesser skills. First of these is the ability to recognize stylized shapes which are figures on a ground, curves and lines and dots in patterned relationships. The second of the skills involved in the complex is the ability to correlate the black marks on the paper—the patterned shapes—with language. A third skill which is involved in the total skill of reading is essentially an intellectual skill; this is the ability to correlate the black marks on the paper by way of the formal elements of language, let us say the words as sound, with the meanings which those words symbolize.

Reading is about understanding written texts. It is a complex activity that involves both perception and thought. Reading consists of two related processes: word recognition and comprehension. Word recognition refers to the process of perceiving how written symbols correspond to one’s spoken language. Comprehension is the process of making sense of words, sentences and connected text, (Pang, et al., 2000: 6).

Anderson (2008: 2-3) gives his definition of reading that reading is a process of readers combining of information from a text and their own background knowledge to build meaning. Meaning does not rest in the reader nor
does it rest in the text. The reader's background knowledge integrates with the text to create the meaning. The goal of reading is comprehension. The primary aspect of reading skill addressed by this model was decoding, the ability to master the mechanics of reading—the phoneme-grapheme correspondences in our spelling system and how these are ordered in words (McGuinness, 2005: 153).

From the above experts’ perspectives of reading, it can at best be concluded that reading is a constructive visual activity process to derive meaning from a text through the readers’ perceptual skills, decoding skills, experiences, background knowledge, mind sets and reasoning abilities to decode, to recognize, to comprehend the written symbols to extract information. Reading is a mental or cognitive activity process of readers combining of information based upon their background knowledge to decode, to comprehend, and to interpret the written symbols, and to derive meanings from a text by using readers' perceptual skills, decoding skills, experiences, language backgrounds, mind sets and reasoning ability based upon readers' purposes.

Reading comprehension is the complex process of constructing meaning from a text through cognitive cooperation including word knowledge/conceptual knowledge and fluency (Jenkins, Larson, & Fleischer, 1983; Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985; Ruddell, Ruddell, and Singer, 1994; Guthrie, Wigfield, and Perencevich, 2004; and O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1987 in Klingner, Vaughn, and Boardman 2007). Reading comprehension entails three elements i.e. the reader, the text, and the activity, as the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language (Snow, 2002: 11). Comprehending is the active process of our thinking in which the meaning-making is still under construction after the act of reading, and comprehension depends on the problem-solving strategies that the reader uses to interpret what has been read (Dorn and Soffos, 2005: 7).

According to Pang, et al., (2000: 14), comprehension is the process of deriving meaning from connected text. It involves word knowledge (vocabulary) as well as thinking and reasoning. Therefore, comprehension is not a passive process, but an active one. The reader actively engages with the text to construct meaning. This active engagement includes making use of prior knowledge. It involves drawing inferences from the words and expressions that a writer uses to communicate information, ideas and viewpoints. In addition, Haris and Hodges (1995) quote from Ruddell, Ruddell, & Singer (1994) state that “Comprehension is a process in which the reader constructs meaning (in) interacting with
text through a combination of prior knowledge and previous experiences; information available in text; the stance taken in relationship to the text; and immediate, remembered or anticipated social interactions and communication.”

Comprehension is the end goal of reading, whether an individual reads for pleasure, to learn, or to locate information. Individuals construct meaning from text as they read, absorbing new information and comparing it to their pre-existing knowledge (Jacobson, 2007:1). Instead, reading comprehension requires the delicate interaction of several component processes that integrate information from the page that the student is reading with his or her background knowledge and experience, subject to a multitude of contextual constraints (Paris and Stahl, 2005:71).

Definition of reading comprehension contains the phrase interaction with texts. This refers mainly to cognitive strategies that are central to reading comprehension processes. In CORI, the cognitive strategies include: (a) activating background knowledge, (b) questioning, (c) searching for information, (d) summarizing, (e) organizing graphically, and (f) structuring stories. These cognitive strategies are the key forms of interacting with text that enable learners to build new knowledge (2002) in (Guthrie, Wigfield, and Perencevich, 2004:227). It is helpful to think about reading comprehension as comprising two sets of component parts: One set concerned with recognizing printed words and the other concerned with understanding the message that the print conveys (e.g., Hoover & Gough, 1990) in (Wagner, Schatschneider, and Phythian-Sence, 2009:179).

Curtis and Bercovitz (2004) in (Jacobson, 2007:3) state that the reading comprehension task consists of activating prior knowledge, making predictions, asking questions, answering questions, monitoring comprehension, adapting reading rate, rereading, using text aids, using context clues, recalling, identifying main ideas, identifying supporting details, relating reading to background knowledge, retelling, summarizing, comparing and contrasting, determining cause and effect, inferring, drawing conclusions, analyzing, evaluating, recognizing story structure, recognizing non-fiction text structure, and creating graphic organizer.

Based upon the above experts’ perspectives of reading comprehension definitions and micro and macro skills of reading, it can at best be summed up that reading comprehension is an active and complex process of constructing meaning from a text involving the interaction of cognitive and metacognitive strategies through a combination of readers prior knowledge, background knowledge, experience, and purpose to absorb new information. Therefore, through reading activity students are expected to be able
to determine the main idea, to find out explicit information, to find out implicit information, to find out meaning of words based upon the context, and to find out reference of pronouns.

In other case, concept of One Stay/Rest Stray Method according to Crawford, et al. (2005: 63-64) is that a cooperative learning activity is for sharing ideas within a classroom. This method is a very useful strategy for quickly sharing ideas within a large class. It has the advantage, shared by many cooperative learning techniques, of putting students in responsible roles in which they function as expert providers of information to others. One Stay/Three Stray can be fun for the students, because it gets them up and moving around, and exposes them to other faces. Students enjoy being interviewed, and they also enjoy telling their table mates what they learned when they visited the other groups. If the procedure is set up properly, students can learn to move around quickly to their new places.

Further, Jacobs, et al., (1996) in (Surjosuseno, 2011) confirm that using collaborative learning techniques will cause students to continue using good strategies of answering questions, making questions, and summarizing when the students read alone later on, after they graduate. “One Stays/Three stray” method is completely student-centered since the students may change the teacher's roles to suit their particular situation. Here, not only can the teacher/lecturer speak and explain in front of students, but also the students have opportunities to speak and explain in front of their friends.

By subsuming students in this method, not only will they have group work but also they will attain five major elements of the cooperative learning, especially in One Stay/Three Stray. Here are those elements which Kessler (1992); and Olsen and Kagan (1992) in (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 196) propose: (1) positive interdependence; (2) team formation; (3) accountability; (4) Social skills; and (5) Structures and Structuring.

On the other hand, Grammar-Translation Method is also better-known as Classical Method previously, focusing on grammatical rules, memorization of vocabulary and of various declensions and conjugations, translations of texts, and doing written exercises. The Grammar-Translation method itself gets its fame in the nineteenth century. This method is, moreover, stalwart among many competing models even though it does nothing to enhance students' speaking skill (Brown, 2001: 18-19).

In the Grammar-Translation Method, the students learn the parts of speech and syntax in detail. The sentences in English and the mother tongue are compared and contrasted side by side. In this method the mother tongue is used to teach English. This method is very famous in average teacher because it is
very easy for them to use this method (Patel and Jain, 2008). They continue that there are some characteristics of this method. They are: (1) the unit of teaching is word, not a sentence. It means vocabulary is taught in the form of isolated words; (2) it considers grammar as a soul of language; (3) grammatical rules of teaching of English are explained into mother tongue; (4) this method does not help in development of linguistic competence of learner; (5) English grammar is taught through rules, translation, definition and comparative study of mother tongue grammar; (6) grammar is taught deductively; (7) in the main function of language learning, communication is ignored; (8) reading and writing are the major focus; (9) words are taught through bilingual word-lists, dictionary study and memorization; (10) the English is taught in mother tongue with little use of target language; (11) the students’ native language is the medium of instruction; and (12) students are expected to attain high standards in translation.

The most relevant principles of this method can be summarized as follows (based on Richards and Rodgers 1986): (1) it emphasizes the study and translation of the written language, as it is considered superior to spoken language; (2) successful learners are those who translate each language into the other, though they cannot communicate orally; (3) reading and writing are the main language skills; (4) Teachers play an authoritarian role in the classroom and the predominant interaction is between teacher-student; (5) Students must learn grammatical rules overtly and deduce their applications to exercises; (6) Students have to know verb conjugations and other grammatical paradigms; (7) The basic unit of teaching is the sentence; (8) The student’s native language is the medium of instruction and used as well to compare with the language studied.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The method used in conducting this research was an experimental method. Experiment is the most powerful quantitative research method for establishing cause and effect relationships between two or more variables (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2003: 365). The essential feature of experimental research is that investigators deliberately control and manipulate the conditions which determine the events in which they are interested introduce an intervention and measure the difference that it makes (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2007: 276).

In parallel with this research, related to the effectiveness of teaching methods used as the independent variables and the self-actualization as the attribute variable, and reading comprehension as the dependent variable for the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Lingga, this research design used was a simple
factorial design. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007: 281) state that factorial designs also have to take account of the interaction of the independent variables. The teaching methods used in this research were One Stay/Three Stray and the Grammar–Translation Methods. These two different methods were clung to two groups of students. One Stay/Three Stray group of students functioned as an experimental group whereas the other one functioned as a control one.

This study was conducted at the eleventh graders of *SMA Negeri 01 Lingga* in the academic year of 2012/2013. Then, the research was conducted from October to November 2012.

In conducting this research, the target population of this research was all of the eleventh graders of *SMA Negeri 01 Lingga* in the academic year 2012/2013. The eleventh graders of *SMA Negeri 01 Lingga* are intentionally divided into five classes; those are IPA-1, IPA-2, IPS-1, IPS-2, and IPS-3 consisting of 139 students, on the average 28 students for each class.

The writer took only 56 students (28 students from IPS-3 and 28 students from IPS-1) or two classes from all of the population as the sample in conducting this research. In dividing each of the classes into the group of high and low self–actualization, the writer classified 14 students having high self–actualization and 14 students having low self–actualization. Finally, the writer used lottery to determine which class became the experimental and control classes. From the lottery result, IPS-3 became the experimental class, whereas IPS-1 became the control class.

The sampling technique used in conducting this research was cluster random sampling technique. Then, among the five classes, the writer determined to take only two classes (IPS-3 and IPS-1) randomly as the sample in conducting the research, consisting of 56 students. In this case, 28 students were taken from class IPS-3 and 28 students from class IPS-1. Then, the writer used lottery to determine which class became the experiment and control classes. The amount of this sample was considered being representative enough to use as the subject in conducting this research.

Besides, in collecting the data, the writer used instruments i.e. test and questionnaire. A test was used to test students’ skill in reading by determining their best choice from four options which were available (A, B, C, and D) in each reading test item, whereas questionnaire was used to measure students’ self–actualization. The score from 4 to 1 was for positive statements, whereas negative statement scores were 1 to 4.

The method used in analyzing the data of this study was descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of
students’ scores in reading skill, whereas inferential analysis to know normality and homogeneity tests.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test

Table 1. Summary of Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>No of Sample</th>
<th>(L)</th>
<th>(L t)</th>
<th>(α)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_i</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.1186</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_j</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.1305</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_i</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.0865</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_j</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.1423</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_i B_i</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1197</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_i B_j</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1564</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_j B_i</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1709</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_j B_j</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1095</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above data, it can be concluded that the data obtained are in normal distribution.

Homogeneity Test

Table 2. Summary of Homogeneity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X_i</th>
<th>X_j</th>
<th>X_k</th>
<th>X_l</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78750</td>
<td>51607</td>
<td>51607</td>
<td>62311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>612.86</td>
<td>492.9</td>
<td>684.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>612.86</td>
<td>492.9</td>
<td>684.9</td>
<td>2468.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td>37.91</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the above computation result, it shows that the $\chi^2$ (0.44) is lower than $\chi^2$ at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$ (4.00). $H_0$ is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data obtained are homogenous.

Hypotheses Testing

Table 3. Mean Scores of Multifactor Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A_i</th>
<th>A_j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B_i</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_j</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above table, it can be concluded that:

1. Because $F_{\text{between columns}}$ (5.062) is higher than $F_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$ (4.00), $H_0$ is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that the teaching methods for teaching reading are different significantly from one another. The mean of the first column is 68, whereas the mean of the second column is 64 or $c_1(68) > c_2(64)$. It means that the mean of the first column is higher than the mean of the second one. It can be summed up that OSTS is more effective to teach reading than GTM.

2. Because $F_{\text{row}}$ between rows (5.062) is higher than $F_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$ (4.00), $H_0$ is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that the students having high and those having low self–actualization are significantly different in their reading skill. The mean of the first row is 68, whereas the mean of the second row is 64.

Table 4. The Summary of a 2x2 Multifactor of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F_o$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{t}}(.05)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between columns</td>
<td>240.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240.3</td>
<td>5.062</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between rows</td>
<td>240.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240.3</td>
<td>5.062</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns by rows</td>
<td>1440.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1920.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>640.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>2468.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4389.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above table, it can be concluded that:

1. Because $F_o$ between columns (5.062) is higher than $F_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$ (4.00), $H_0$ is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that the teaching methods for teaching reading are different significantly from one another. The mean of the first column is 68, whereas the mean of the second column is 64 or $c_1(68) > c_2(64)$. It means that the mean of the first column is higher than the mean of the second one. It can be summed up that OSTS is more effective to teach reading than GTM.

2. Because $F_{\text{row}}$ between rows (5.062) is higher than $F_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$ (4.00), $H_0$ is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that the students having high and those having low self–actualization are significantly different in their reading skill. The mean of the first row is 68, whereas the mean of the second row is 64.
It means that the mean of the first row is higher than the mean of the second one. It can be summed up that the students having high self-actualization have better reading skill than those having low one.

3. Because $F_{interaction}$ (30.339) is higher than $F_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.00), $H_0$ is rejected and there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students’ self-actualization for teaching reading. Thus, it can be summed up that the effectiveness of the teaching methods depends on the degree of the students’ self-actualization.

Table 5. The Summary of Tukey Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Group</th>
<th>q_o</th>
<th>q_t</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1 - A_2$</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$A_1 = A_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1 - B_2$</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$B_1 = B_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1 B_1$</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$A_1 B_1 = A_2 B_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2 B_1$</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$A_1 B_1 = A_1 B_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Because $q_o$ between columns (3.18) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.89), implementing OSTS method is significantly different from GTM to teach reading. Because the mean of $A_1$ (68) is higher than $A_2$ (64), it can be concluded that OSTS method is more effective than GTM to teach reading.

2) Because $q_o$ between rows (3.18) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.89), it can be concluded that the students who have high and those who have low self-actualization are significantly different in their reading skill. Because the mean of $B_1$ (68) is higher than $B_2$ (64), it can be concluded that the students who have high self-actualization have better reading skill than those who have low one.

3) Because $q_o$ between cells $A_1 B_1$ and $A_2 B_1$ (7.76) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.03), implementing OSTS method is significantly different from GTM to teach reading to the students who have high self-actualization. Because the mean of $A_1 B_1$ (75) is higher than $A_2 B_1$ (61), it can be concluded that OSTS method is more effective than GTM to teach reading to the students having high self-actualization.

4) Because $q_o$ between cells $A_1 B_2$ and $A_2 B_2$ (3.26) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.03), implementing GTM is significantly different from OSTS method to teach reading to the students who have low self-actualization. Because the mean of $A_1 B_2$ (61) is lower than $A_2 B_2$ (67), it can be concluded that implementing GTM is more effective than OSTS to teach reading to the students who have low self-actualization.

By virtue of the findings of part 3 and part 4 of the Tukey Test, it is known that OSTS method is more effective than GTM for teaching reading to the students having high self-actualization and GTM is
more effective than OSTS method for teaching reading to the students who have low self-actualization. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an interaction between the teaching methods and the students' self-actualization in teaching reading. In addition, the effectiveness of the method depends on the degree of the students' self-actualization.

DISCUSSION
By virtue of the above data analysis, here are some conclusions.

a. OSTS method is more effective than GTM. OSTS method is a cooperative learning activity for sharing ideas within a classroom. It can be applied even in a large class. Students are positioned as expert providers of information to the other students. The students staying share their discussion result to visiting groups. The students straying to other groups learn what other groups have seized so far. Besides, OSTS is not only about learning together with other friends but also about having positive interdependence, having team formation, having accountability, having social skills, and having structures and structuring. Members of the team rotate to another table while Team Member One stays to explain product to visiting team. The other straying members visit to the other groups. After team members return, they discuss the differences among the products they have seen and use the information to improve their own (Heartland Area Education Agency 11, 2006: 17). Further, Jacobs, et al., (1996) in (Surjosuseno, 2011) state that “One Stays/the Rest Stray” method is completely student-centered since the students may change the teacher's roles to suit their particular situation. Here, not only can the teacher/lecturer speak and explain in front of students, but also the students have opportunities to speak and explain in front of their friends.

On the other hand, Grammar-Translation Method is also better-known as Classical Method. It is focused on the grammatical rules, memorization of vocabulary, translations of texts, and working on written exercises. In the main activity of GTM, the students were instructed to read a passage from the foreign language literature. Then, each student was called upon to read a few lines from the given passage and to translate them into their mother tongue with the help of a teacher if he/she found it difficult to translate some difficult words. The discussion only between the teacher and the students. Al-Nafisah and Ismail (2010) and Larsen-Freeman (2000: 15–16) state steps of teaching reading comprehension by using grammar-translation method: (1) reading passage from the foreign language
literature; (2) translating a few lines from the passage; (3) discussion between teacher and students; (4) writing down answers to the comprehension questions at the end of the passage; and (5) asking students one by one to read the question and their answer to that question.

b. The students having high self-actualization have better reading skill than those having low one. The students having high self-actualization referred to individual’s desire to become the best that they are able to—that is to develop all the abilities and talents that they possess to their fullest potential. The students having high self-actualization are strongly characterized with awareness, spontaneity, the capability of free choice among the ego-states, uncensored and authentic feelings, and high knowledge to improve, recognize, and realize oneself, especially in reading skill. In this case, what they want to be, they must be. Heylighen (1992) describes three competences related to the high self-actualization people. The first competence is about material competence. This competence is the need for solving problem. The second one is cognitive competence tending to have high knowledge, intelligence, and creativity. The last one is about subjective awareness or subjective competence, meaning the capability to find and to motivate to do the necessary search for the resources to solve the problem.

On contrary, the students having low self-actualization run aground with their low potential. They do not have sense of sensitivity of responding or of discovering their abilities and talents in learning reading. They do not have awareness, spontaneity, intimacy, and high level of knowledge. They tend to be dragged over with their weaknesses. They do not regard a problem faced as a challenge but they are prone to steer clear of it. Moreover, they do not have desire to become, and to achieve anything which s/he is capable of becoming. The best that they can do is taking the reality as it is. According to Bíró (2009: 31) students having low self-actualization are individuals who: (a) are not aware of his or her unfulfilled needs, and is able to fulfill them, thus proceeding toward self-actualization; (b) may not improve his or her awareness, spontaneity and intimacy skills, if s/he finds it necessary for the realization of his or her potential; (c) may not recognize his or her false goals and intentions, thus may get closer to the experience of flow; and (d) may not realize his or her being alienated, and can cope with it with the help of love.

Based upon above elaboration of high and low self-actualizing students, it can be concluded that the students
c. The interaction between teaching methods and students’ self-actualization can be seen one by one. Firstly, OSTS always demands active students to play his/her role in his/her group. The way that the activity is done is by rotating members of a team to other tables. It means that there are three members of a group who will pay a visit to other group. They are classified as *strayers*. Strayers will, then, collect as much information as they can to take it back and to share it to their own group what they have already learnt from other teams. In other case, one member staying in his/her origin group will receive and explain product to visiting teams. Crawford, et al., (2005: 63-64) states that one stay/three stray is a cooperative learning activity for sharing ideas quickly within a large class. It puts students in responsible roles in which they function as expert providers of information to others. Besides, one stay/three stray can be fun for the students, because it gets them up and move around, and exposes them to other faces. Students enjoy being interviewed, and they also enjoy telling their table mates what they learned when they visited the other groups.

**Besides**, high self-actualization is about how students are able to utilize their potential, talents, and even limitations to become the best what they want to be. What they want to attain is always the best in their lives by expanding the consciousness to reach everything what they are capable of becoming. The concept of high self-actualization is in general creative personality factor pervading behaviors which consist of awareness, spontaneity, intimacy, and knowledge. The students will never fail to have desire to become what they want to be in the process of learning. Goble (1970) quotes Papert’s vision that one of self-actualizations enables learners to become more and more what they are, understand what they desire to become, and achieve everything they are capable of becoming. Therefore, OSTS method is more effective than GTM for the students who have high self-actualization. Therefore, OSTS method is more effective than GTM for the students who have high self-actualization.

GTM also involves the mother tongue in the teaching learning process. The successful learners are categorized for those who are able to translate source language into the target language well. GTM lets a teacher to call some students upon to translate a few lines from a text. The teacher also helps them to translate...
them if they find some difficult words. Furthermore, the teacher offers an opportunity to ask some questions. After that, the students answer some questions. This method is also categorized as teacher-centered, because the discussion is only between the teacher and the students. Stern (1983: 453) states that the Grammar–Translation Method focuses on the teaching of the foreign language grammar through the presentation of rules together with some exceptions and lists of vocabulary translated into the mother tongue. Translation is considered its most important classroom activity. The main procedure of an ordinary lesson follows this plan: a presentation of a grammatical rule, followed by a list of vocabulary and, finally, translation exercises from selected texts.

Students having low self–actualization are those who get stuck with their potentials, talents, and even weaknesses in learning. They tend to be lack of awareness to receive pure and deep impressions, of spontaneity, of capability, of intimacy to express uncensored and authentic feelings, and of knowledge. When they are faced with some problems, they will not be able to overcome them. They will let them as they are or they can even exacerbate them. They will never be capable of becoming what they want to be, because they receive something as it is. Bíró (2009: 17) describes that non–self-actualizing individuals are: (1) rejecting of impulses; (2) dependent on the environment; (3) interpersonal relationships based on interest; (4) demanding love (based on demands); (5) self-centeredness; and (6) instrumental change. Thus, One Stay/Three Stray Method is supposed to be suitable method for the students having high self–actualization. Therefore, by virtue of its nature, GTM is more appropriate to be used for the students having low self–actualization.

Based upon the above explanation between methods (OSTS and GTM) and high and low self–actualizing students, it can be summed up that OSTS is more effective to teach reading for students having high self–actualization. On the other hand, the GTM is more effective to teach reading for students having low self–actualization. Therefore, there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ self–actualization in teaching reading.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

By virtue of the data descriptions analysis, the researcher expounds the findings as follows:

1. OSTS Method is more effective than Grammar–Translation Method to teach
reading for the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga.

2. The students having high self-actualization have better reading skill than those having low self-actualization for the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 01 Daik Lingga.

3. There is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' self-actualization in teaching reading. OSTS method offers something different in teaching reading and it is more effective when it is implemented in the class than GTM. Students' direct activeness and involvement in running the activities from the beginning to the last activities are strongly required. In OSTS, the students discuss the text until they comprehend it. Then, they must answer some questions. After that, one student staying functions as an expert provider of information to the other visiting teams in his/her home group. Besides, the other three students straying function to collect as much information as they can from the other groups. Then, they have to return to their own group and discuss what they have already learnt from the other teams. OSTS method also sprouts up the sense of the students’ positive interdependence, team formation, accountability, social skills, and structures and structuring.

For the last, related to this research, the researcher wants to suggest for the teacher, for the students, and for other researchers as follows:

1. For the Teacher
   a. The teacher is suggested to implement OSTS method to teach reading in order that the students' reading skill is better.
   b. What the teacher must consider is that the students' low and high self-actualization is another factor which can also influence the students' reading skill.

2. For the Students
   a. The students must fully be involved in joining the reading subject in the class and must develop all potentials which they have properly.
   b. The students who still have low skill in reading have to be more active and diligent and are able to learn together with the students obtaining higher or highest scores in reading.

3. For other researchers
   a. The other researchers who are willing to conduct the same method as their research are able to use the result of this research as a supporting data or material to conduct their research in more detail.
   b. The other researchers are also able to outfit the limitations of the result of this research to be more complete so that the result of their
research is able to offer something different and new for other readers.

REFERENCES


Snow, Catherine. 2002. Reading for Understanding: Toward a Research and Development Program in Reading Comprehension. Santa Monica: RAND’s Publications.

