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**ABSTRACT**

This research presents an experimental study between two methods, SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure in teaching reading comprehension. The objective of this research were to prove which method (SQ3R or PMORE) is effective to enhance the reading comprehension of the second grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar, to prove which method (SQ3R or PMORE) is effective to enhance the reading comprehension of the second grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar, and to know which method (SQ3R or PMORE) is suitable with introvert or extrovert students of the second grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar. This research employed experimental design which involved two experimental class. The experimental one class was taught by using SQ3R Method and the experimental two class was taught by using PMORE Procedure. The instrument of this research were reading test, questionnaire of interest, and questionnaire of personal style inventory. The population of this research was the second grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar. This research took 72 students as the sample. XI IPA2 as experimental one class and XI IPA1 as experimental two class. The result of this research showed that the students’ reading comprehension which was taught by using SQ3R Method is higher than the students which was taught by using PMORE Procedure. It proven by the mean score of the students in SQ3R Method class was 85.78 higher than the mean score of the students in PMORE Procedures class 80.17. The result of the students’ interest showed that SQ3R Method higher than PMORE Procedure. The result of the students’ personal style inventory showed that SQ3R Method more suitable used in extrovert students while PMORE Procedure more suitable use in introvert students. Therefore, H1 (alternative hypothesis) of this research which said SQ3R Method is more effective than and PMORE Procedure to enhance students’ reading comprehension achievement was accepted.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Reading is one of the most useful and necessary skills for daily life. People read variety of texts such as signs, timetables, directories, maps, letters, tables, application forms, stories, textbooks, instructional, leaflets and the like in order to get facts, exchange ideas, enjoy their leisure time, express feelings, etc. From a technical perspective, reading comprehension is a dynamic mental activity in which the reader interacts with the text to extract meaning (Farhadi, 2005).

It is widely acknowledged that reading is a vital skill for English language learners in today’s world. It enhances the development of overall proficiency and provides access to valuable information at work and in school. As Carrell (1989) puts, “for many students, reading is by far the most important of the four skills in second language, particularly in English as a second or foreign language. Since English in Indonesia is a foreign language, most students at any levels of education find it difficult to read English texts. Many research results indicated that the ability of Indonesian students to read English texts was very low.

Based on the observation, there was a problem in teaching reading of the second grade students of SMAN5 Makassar. It is evidence from the score of task in answering the questions based on the text. From 32 students who did the task, the mean score of the students from the test was 70. This score included in fairly classification. So, it can be said that the students reading comprehension is enough. According to the students, they could not answer the question because they did not comprehend the content of the text. Moreover, they did not have many vocabularies to understand the text and they were not interested neither in reading because they think reading is boring. In addition the level of language used in the reading text is included in intermediate level.

To solve this problem, the researcher intended to compare two methods in learning process to enhance the students’ comprehends. They are Survey, Question, Read, Recite and Review (SQ3R) Method and PMORE use Predict, Mark, Outline, Recite, and Evaluate (PMORE) Procedure. SQ3R, is one of the most remarkable and fertile strategies which consists of five steps (surveying, questioning, reading, reciting, and reviewing), is the most popular reading study system and techniques for approaching a reading text. An abbreviation was used to enable easier retention, as well as for allowing a quick and simple reference. SQ3R presents a detailed step-by step outline of what a reader should accomplish while reading. SQ3R is a meaningful reading method in which students practice different reading strategies (Huber, 2004). The SQ3R process is complex, and the knowledge constructed during this process is comprehensive and varied.

Predict, Mark, Outline, Recite, and Evaluate (PMORE) Procedure is a Procedure to understand and comprehend a text. This procedure is suitable to comprehend the text that have plot, such us narrative and recount text. This procedure consist of five steps. They are predict, mark, outline, recite and evaluate. There are some strengths of this procedure. First, in this procedure the students have time to predict the content of the text only with read the title of the text. Second, the students have opportunity to know the word that they don’t understand. Third, they have chance to share in pair and give their argument about the part of the story that interested them. Fourth, in other method usually in the evaluate step the researcher or the teacher provide some questions and then the students answer them, but in this method the researcher provide some statements and the students make some questions from those statements.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Previous Related Studies**

Al-Ghazo (2015) conducted a research to investigate the Effect of SQ3R and semantic mapping Strategies on reading comprehension learning among Jordanian University Students. The results of the study showed that semantic mapping and SQ3R strategies group performed better than the control group in the post test(comprehension test ) since the mean score obtained by experimental group (0.58) is higher than the mean score obtained by control group (0.50).

Komang, *et.al*(2013) report in his research to investigate whether or not there is a different effect between PQRST and SQ3R strategies based on the text types upon the eighth grade students’ reading competency. The result shows that, first, there is a significance difference between the students who were taught by PQRST strategy than those who were taught by SQ3R strategy. Second there is no interactional effect of teaching reading strategies (PQRST and SQ3R) and text types (narrative and recount) on students’ reading competency.

Nurteteng (2014) reported in her research with the title using PMORE Procedure to improve the reading comprehension of the first grade students of SMAN 1 Maiwa. The researcher found that the reading comprehension increased significantly after using this procedure in teaching and learning process. The use of the method not only improve the reading comprehension of the students but also speaking skill and vocabulary skill.

**Some Pertinent Ideas**

**SQ3R Method**

SQ3R, is one of the most remarkable and fertile strategies which consists of five steps (surveying, questioning, reading, reciting, and reviewing), is the most popular reading study system and techniques for approaching a reading text. Brown (2000, p.315) stated that this strategy consists of the following five steps:

*"Survey: skim the text for an overview of min ideas.*
*Questioning: the reader asks questions about what he or she wishes to* *get out of the text.*
*Read: read the text while looking for answers to the previously formulated* *questions.*
*Recite: reprocess the salient points of the text through oral*.
*Review: assess the importance of what one has just read and incorporate it* *into long term association."*

An abbreviation was used to enable easier retention, as well as for allowing a quick and simple reference. SQ3R presents a detailed step-by step outline of what a reader should accomplish while reading. SQ3R is a meaningful reading method in which students practice different reading strategies (Huber, 2004). The SQ3R process is complex, and the knowledge constructed during this process is comprehensive and varied. Novice and intermediate learners must expend more cognitive and behavioral effort in operating and managing the process and knowledge before they become experienced and superior. Their effort may impede reading comprehension when learners are unfamiliar with this method. Then their motivation may become lower for using and practicing this strategy (Artis, 2008).

**PMORE Procedure**

Predict, Mark, Outline, Recite, and Evaluate (PMORE) Procedure is a Procedure to understand and comprehend a text. This procedure is suitable to comprehend the text that have plot, such us narrative and recount text. This procedure also consist of five step. First, predict step. In this step, the students predict the content of the text as generally after they read the title and look the picture of the text carefully. Second, mark step. In this step, the students circled the word that they do not understand. It can be unfamiliar word or new word. Then, the students find out the meaning of the circled word in pairs. After that, they make sentence from each circled word. Third, outline step. In this step, the students make an outline of the text based on the generic structure of the text. They are orientation, events and re-orientation. Then, they check off their prediction before with the true content of the text they have read. Fourth, recite step. In this step, the students read again the text to enhance their understanding about the text. Then, they choose one part of the text that interested them and give the reason why this part is interesting. After that they share their works in pairs. The last step is evaluate. In this step, the researcher provides some statement from the text that the students have read. Then, they make possible question of these statements.

**Reading Comprehension**

Research studies on reading comprehension have revealed that reading is a complex cognitive activity that is crucial for adequate functioning and for obtaining information in current society and requires an integration of memory and meaning construction (Alfassi, 2004). Souvignier, *et.al* (2006) define reading comprehension as the reader’s ability to read and remember, reproduce, learn from, and find deeper meaning in text for later use. According to Burn (1984:150), reading comprehension consists of four categories.

They are literal reading, interpretative reading, applied reading and creative reading. Abbott, *et.al* (1981) categorized reading strategies into several kinds. They are effective reading, survey reading, skimming reading, and scanning, intensive reading. In teaching reading comprehension, the teacher should be aware of levels of comprehension, so that they have some criteria by which to judge the materials they use in the classroom, and also the levels of comprehension use by the students at any particular time. Reading comprehension refers to the ability to understand information presented in written form. Fairbairn, *et.al*(1996:14) divides the level of comprehension into three categories. They are literal comprehension, interpretative comprehension and extrapolative comprehension.

**Interest**

When people talk about interest, they will think about our positive response or attitude to something we like, enjoy and appreciate which make us having a desire to do. To clearly what actually interest means some theorist will define it. According to Good (1959), interest is a subject-object attitude, concerned with condition involving a perception or idea in attention and a combination of intellectual and feeling curiosity condition by experience. Interest is feeling of desire to know or to learn about something has a positive attitude towards something he/she really likes and enjoys. When talking about interest, we will think about positive response or attitude to something we like, enjoy, and appreciate which make us having desire to do. Therefore, Hornby (2002) defines interest as : 1) Condition or wanting to know or learn about something or somebody; (2) Quality that arouses concern or curiosity, that holds one’s attention; and (3) Something with which one concern oneself.

**Personality Inventory**

Hartmant (1995, cited in Donclark, 2000) believes that when learners take part actively in learning process, their feeling of authority will increase and they intend to orient their own personal development themselves. Chapman (2006) asserts that personality awareness means how to communicate with others to get information and how to solve problems and manage oneself successfully when conflicting with others. There are types of personality inventory. They are introvert, extrovert, intuitive, sensing, judging, thinking, feeling, and perceiving.

**METHOD**

**Design and Samples**

This research applied experimental method. In this experimental design, it required at least two experimental classes, namely experimental one class and experimental two class. The sample of experimental one class consisted of 36 students and experimental two class consisted of 36 students. They were the second grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar. Both of two groups were given the same pretest and posttest. They were also received the same reading material of the narrative text. The difference here, the experimental one class was taught using SQ3R Method while the experimental two class was taught using PMORE Procedure.

**Instrument and Procedure**

Two kinds of instruments- reading test and questionnaire were applied in this research. The reading test administered in pretest and posttest. Pretest was conducted before the treatment to know the prior knowledge of students to assess their competence in reading comprehension while post-test was held at the end of the treatment to know the improvement of the students’ reading comprehension after giving the treatment. Both of experimental one group and experimental two group were given the same topic of the test. The tests consisted of multiple choice as much as 30 items. The material of the test is recount text.

The treatment was conducted for six meetings in both of group. In experimental one group was taught using SQ3R Method and experimental two group was taught using PMORE Procedure. There are six titles of recount text used in the treatment. In the first until six meetings, the students’ activities was same but the different is the title of the text that used in learning process.

The questionnaire was administered to find out the students’ interest in learning English by using PMORE Procedure and SQ3R Method. The questionnaire consist of 20 items. The students also was administered questionnaire about students’ personal style inventory as much as 8 items. This questionnaire was adapted from R. Craig Hogan and David W. Champagne personal style inventory worksheet.

**Data Analysis**

To examine the effectiveness of SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure on students’ reading comprehension and the students personality (introvert and extrovert) students toward those methods, two major statistical procedures were applied: (1) descriptive statistics, including the frequency, descriptive static which calculated the mean and standard deviation; (2) Inferential analysis, including independent test and paired test. Meanwhile, to analyze the students’ interest toward SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure, Likert Scale was used.

**RESULT AND DISUSSION**

**The Students’ Improvement in Reading Comprehension by Using SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure**

*The students’ score of pre-test and post-test in reading comprehension for SQ3R Method class and PMORE Procedure class*

The table 1 is the statistically summary of the students’ pretest and post-test in reading comprehension for SQ3R Method class (E1) and PMORE Procedure class (E2). The statistical summary depicted in table 1 below shows that the total number of subjects is 36 students. The score achieved by the students tend to get increased from pretest to post-test.

*Table 1*

*The statistical summary of the students’ Pretest and Post-test in Reading Comprehension for Experimental One Class and Experimental Two Class*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Pretest | Posttest |
| E1 | E2 | E1 | E2 |
| N | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| Mean | 70.25 | 68.06 | 85.78 | 80.17 |
| Std. Deviation | 8.388 | 7.826 | 4.389 | 6.640 |

The data in table 1 shows that the comparison of pretest and posttest in reading comprehension achievement on experimental one class shows that there was a significant difference. It was proved by the statistical summary that the mean score of pretest was categorized as ‘fairly good’ while the mean score of posttest was categorized as ‘very good’. It means that overall it indicated that there was a significant difference on experimental one class test result in pretest and post-test.

The experimental two class shows the difference but it is not so significant. By the statistical summary, the mean score of pretest was categorized as ‘fairly good’ while the mean score of post-test was categorized as ‘good’. Overall, the students reading comprehension in experimental two class on posttest were higher than post-test although they were not really significant.

*The percentage of the students’ performance of pretest and posttest in SQ3R Method class and PMORE Procedure class*

*Table 2*

*The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students’ Scores of Pretest and Post-test in Experimental One class and Experimental Two Class*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | SQ3R Method/E1 | PMORE Procedure/ E2 |
| Pretest | Posttest | Pretest | Posttest |
| F | P (%) | F | P (%) | F | P (%) | F | P (%) |
| Excellent | 96-100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Good | 86-95 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 25 |
| Good | 78-85 | 11 | 31 | 14 | 39 | 5 | 14 | 22 | 61 |
| Fairly Good | 66-75 | 17 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 4 | 11 |
| Fair | 56-65 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 31 | 1 | 3 |
| Poor | 36-55 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 0-36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 36 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 36 | 100 |

The comparison between experimental one class and experimental two class in the pretest result showed that there was no significant difference of both groups in reading comprehension. It was proved by the result pre-test in both groups that most of students (17 0r 47%) in experimental one class achieve ‘fairly good’ category almost same in experimental two class where it was attained by 18 or 50 % students.

The post-test score in experimental one class and experimental two class, however showed that there was significant difference in the post-test result of both groups. Most of students of experimental one class namely 22 students or 61% achieved very good category; while in the control group, most of the students (22 or 61%) were categorized as ‘good’.

*Pair-test*

In the tables below, the researchers presents the difference of the students’ writing ability before treatment and after treatment (pretest and post-test) in experimental one class and experimental two class. This paired sample test used to find out whether there was an improvement of the students’ condition before and after being taught by using SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure. The results were shown by the paired T-test of dependent T-test as follows:

*Pair-test for SQ3R Method Class (E1)*

*Table 3*

*The Pair Sample Statistic of Experimental One Class*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
| Pre-test | 70.25 | 36 | 8.388 |
| Post-test | 85.78 | 36 | 4.389 |

Referring to table 3, the mean score of the pre-test was 70.25 while the mean score of post-test was 85.78. The mean score of post-test was higher (15.53) than pre-test. It indicated that the use of SQ3R Method significantly improves the students’ reading comprehension of recount text.

In the line with the previous table, the following table also used to see the difference of pre-test and post-test in the experimental one class.

*Table 4*

*The Pair Sample Test of Experimental One Class*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pretest and Posttest | 15.528 | 4.232 | .705 | 22.013 | 35 | .000 |

Referring to table 4 the mean score of the pre-test was 70.25 while the mean score of post-test was 85.78. The mean score of post-test was higher (15.528) than the pre-test. Therefore, the date on the table shows that the sig. 2 tailed or probability value of pretest and post-test was .000., it was lower than alpha α 0.05 which indicated there is significant different between the score of pre-test and post-test. It means that the reading comprehension of experimental one class students after treatment was effective at 5% significance level which indicated statistically improved. Thus, there is a significant different between pretest and posttest for SQ3R method class.

*Pair-test for PMORE Procedure Class (E2)*

*Table 5*

*The Pair Sample Statistic of Experimental Two Class*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
| Pre-test | 68.06 | 36 | 7.826 |
| Post-test | 80.17 | 36 | 6.640 |

Referring to table 5, the mean score of the pre-test was 68.06 while the mean score of post-test was 80.17. The mean score of post-test was higher (12.11) than pre-test. It indicated that the use of PMORE Procedure significantly improves the students’ reading comprehension of recount text.

In the line with the previous table, the following table also used to see the difference of pre-test and post-test in the experimental one class.

*Table 6*

*The Pair Sample Test of Experimental Two Class*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pretest and Posttest | 12.111 | 3.178 | .503 | 22.863 | 35 | .000 |

Referring to table 4 the mean score of the pre-test was 68.06 while the mean score of post-test was 80.17. The mean score of post-test was higher (12.111) than the pre-test. Therefore, the date on the table shows that the sig. 2 tailed or probability value of pretest and post-test was .000., it was lower than alpha α 0.05 which indicated there is significant different between the score of pre-test and post-test. It means that the reading comprehension of experimental one class students after treatment was effective at 5% significance level which indicated statistically improved. Thus, there is a significant different between pretest and posttest for PMORE Procedure class.

*Test of Significance (T-Test)*

The hypotheses were tested by using inferential statistic. In this case, the researcher used t-test (testing of significance) for independent sample test. It was intended to know the significance difference between thr result of the students’ mean scores in the pretest and the posttest in the experimental one class and experimental two class. The result of t-test was calculated by using SPSS version 20.00. After using the statistics, the researcher found the probability value of t-test as presented in the following table.

*Table 7*

*Test of Significance (t-test) for SQ3R Method Class (E1) and PMORE Procedure Class (E2) in Pretest and Posttest*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene’s Test of Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig | t | df | Sig.2 (tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Pretest Equal variances assumed | ,176 | ,676 | 1,148 | 70 | ,255 | 2,194 | 1,912 | 1,619 | 6,008 |
| Posttets Equal variances not assumed | ,698 | ,406 | 4,230 | 70 | ,000 | 5,611 | 1,327 | 2,965 | 8,257 |

Based on the result of data analysis as summarized in table 7 in the pretest of the experimental one class and experimental two class, the researcher found that the probability value or *P-value* (0,255) was higher than the level of significance α (0.05) or 0.225 > 0.05. It means that H0 was accepted and H1 was rejected in pretest. In other word, the students’ ability or level are same before giving the treatment. Whereas, the data in posttest of the experimental one class and experimental two class shows that probability value (*P value)* was smaller than α (0.000 < 0.05). It means that H1 was accepted and H0 was rejected in posttest. In other words, there was a significant difference of the students’ score between the use of SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure of both groups after receiving treatment.

**The Analysis Data of the Students’ Interest**

The questionnaire was distributed to the students of experimental one clas and experimental two class after giving treatment in the aim to find out whether the students are interested in learning recount text by using SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure.

Based on the data analysis of the questionnaire items which referred to the data of the interest of the students on the percentage analysis, the researchers found that none of the students who states negative statement to the use of SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure. The frequency and percentage of the students’ questionnaire are shown in table 8 as follows:

*Table 8*

*The Rate of Frequency and Percentage of Students’ Interest*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Interval | Categories | SQ3R Method Class (E1) | PMORE Procedure Class (E2) |
| Frequency | Percentage (%) | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
| 12345 | 85-10068-8452-6836-5120-35 | Very highHighModerateLowVery low | 1419 3  0 0 | 38.9 52.88.3 0 0 | 41018 3 0 | 11.1 %27.7 %50 % 8.3 % 0 |
| Total | 36 | 100 |  |  |

Referred to the analysis of questionnaire in table 6 that the most of students in SQ3R Method class , in this case, 19 or 52.8% were in positive statements on interval 68-84 which indicated as ‘high interested’. Whereas in PMORE Procedure class, in this case 18 or 50% on interval 52-68 which indicated as ‘moderate interested’. Thus, it can be concluded that the use of SQ3R Method is more interesting to the students in learning reading comprehension especially recount text.

**Students Personality Inventory toward SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure**

In this research, the researcher identified the student’s personality inventory whether to introvert students’ or extrovert students’ tend to SQ3R Method or PMORE Procedure. The researcher distributed questionnaire both of group to know whether SQ3R method and PMORE Procedure suitable with introvert or extrovert students. The table below explained about the result of the students’ personality.

*The Students’ Personality Inventory in SQ3R Method Class (E1)*

The findings presented deals with the students’ personal inventory in SQ3R Method class. It can be seen in the following table:

*Table 9*

 *The Student’s Personality Inventory Frequency*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group | SQ3R Method Group (E1) |
| Personal Inventory | Introvert | Extrovert |
| F | P (%) | F | P (%) |
| 13 | 36 | 23 | 64 |

The table 9 shows that the students in SQ3R Method class, there are 13 students (36%) classified in introvert student and the rest of them as much as 23 students (64%) classified in extrovert students. It indicated that the students in SQ3R Method class (E1) more extrovert students.

*Table 10*

 *Students’ Mean Score between Introvert and Extrovert Students in Pretest and Posttest*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Pretest | Posttest |
| Mean Score | Standard Deviation | Mean Score | Standard Deviation |
| Introvert Students | 70.23 | 7.305 | 80.92 | 2.565 |
| Extrovert Students | 68.62 | 10.909 | 88.52 | 2.294 |

The table 10 shows that the student’s mean score between introvert and extrovert students. The mean score of introvert students in pretest was 70.23 with standard deviation 7.305. While, the mean score of extrovert students posttest was 68.62 with standard deviation 10.909. Different in post test, the mean score of extrovert students was 88.52 with standard deviation 2.294 higher than the mean score of introvert students was 80.92 with standard deviation 2.565.

*Table 11*

 *The t-test of the Students’ Mean Score between Extrovert and Introvert Students in Pretest and Posttest*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | t-value | df | Probability Value |
| Pretest | 0.593 | 34 | 0.557 |
| Posttest | 9.152 | 34 | 0.000 |

The table 11 shows that in pretest the *t-value* was 0.593 with degree of freedom 34 and *P value* 0.557. From the degree of freedom we can be know the *t-table* of this research was 1.691. Based on the data, the *t-value* (0.593) *< t-table* (1.691) and *P value* (0.557) > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is no significant different between the mean score of the introvert and extrovert students in pretest because P *value* (0.557) higher than 0.05. While in posttest, the *t-value* was -9.152 with degree of freedom 34 and *P value* 0.000. Based on the data, the *t-value* (9.152) *> t-table* (1.691) and *P value* (0.000) < 0.05. It can be concluded that there is a significant different between the mean score of the introvert and extrovert students in posttest. In other word, there SQ3R method suitable use the extrovert students. The difference mean score of the students between pretest and posttest will be seen in the graphic below.

*Figure 1. The Students’ Mean Score between Extrovert and Introvert Students in SQ3R Method Class (E1)*

*The Students’ Personality Inventory in PMORE Procedure Class (E2)*

The findings presented here deal with the students’ personal inventory in PMORE Procedure class. It can be seen in the following table:

*Table 12.*

 *The Students’ Personality Inventory Frequency*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group | PMORE Procedure Group (E2) |
| Personal Inventory | Introvert | Extrovert |
| F | P (%) | F | P (%) |
| 27 | 75 | 9 | 25 |

The table 12 shows that the students’ personality inventory frequency in PMORE Procedure class (E2), there are 27 students (75%) classified in introvert student and the rest of them as much as 9 students (25%) classified in extrovert students. It indicated that the students in PMORE Procedure class (E2) more introvert students.

*Table 13*

*The Students’ Mean Score between Introvert and Extrovert Students in Pretest and Posttest*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Pretest | Posttest |
| Mean Score | Standard Deviation | Mean Score | Standard Deviation |
| Introvert Students | 69.36 | 7.285 | 82.67 | 0.925 |
| Extrovert Students | 66.22 | 9.135 | 72.67 | 1.929 |

The table 13 shows that the student’s mean score between introvert and extrovert students. The mean score of introvert students in pretest was 69.36 with standard deviation 7.285. While, the mean score of extrovert students posttest was 66.22 with standard deviation 9.135. Contrary in post test, the mean score of introvert students was 82.67 with standard deviation 0.925 higher than the mean score of extrovert students was 72.67 with standard deviation 1.929.

*Table 14*

*The t-test of the Students’ Mean Score between Extrovert and Introvert Students in Pretest and Posttest*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | t-value | df | Probability Value |
| Pretest | 1.036 | 34 | 0.308 |
| Posttest | 5.142 | 34 | 0.000 |

The table 14 above shows that in pretest, the *t-value* was 1.036 with degree of freedom 34 and *P value* 0.308. Based on the data, the *t-value* (1.036) *< t-table* (1.691) and *P value* (0.308) > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is no significant different between the mean score of the introvert and extrovert students in pretest because P *value* (0.557) higher than 0.05.While in posttest, the *t-value* was -9.152 with degree of freedom 34 and *P value* 0.000. Based on the data, the *t-value* (5.142) *> t-table* (1.691) and *P value* (0.000) < 0.05. It can be concluded that there is a significant different between the mean score of the introvert and extrovert students. In other word, there PMORE Procedure suitable use to the introvert students. The difference mean score of the students between pretest and posttest will be seen in the graphic below.

*Figure 2 Graphic of the Students’ Mean Score between Extrovert and Introvert Students in PMORE Procedures Class (E2)*

Based on the findings above, the comparison of the students’ improvement in experimental one class and experimental two class can be proven by analysing the post-test result. The result shows that the mean score of the students’ post-test in both of the groups is increased after giving the treatment. It can be seen through the mean score of the students’ pre-test which was 70.25 (fairly good classification) becomes 85.78 (very good classification) in the post-test for the experimental one class, while the students’ pre-test for experimental two class was 68.06 (fairly good classification) becomes 80.17 (fairly good classification) in the post-test.

There were several factors influencing the result of SQ3R Method higher than PMORE Procedure. Firstly, in this method provided the steps that easier in using and understood by the teacher. It is same like Brown (2000) said that SQ3R presents a detailed step-by step outline of what a reader should accomplish while reading. Second, the students’ interest in reading comprehension is improved. The result of the students interest is higher than the student’s interest which taught by PMORE Procedure. It also supported the findings of Artis (2008) research which said that SQ3R causes students to change their negative thoughts on reading textbooks. Third, the use of survey step. It allow the students to be more creative construct the information in their mind, their prior knowledge to comprehend the text. This findings also supported by the previous findings which stated that SQ3R method helps the students to construct the information in their mind, and make it meaningful (Sihaloho, *et.al,* 2010).

Referring to previous explanation above, the comparison of the students’ improvement in experimental one class and experimental two class that focus on students’ extrovert or introvert. In SQ3R Method Class, the result shows that the mean score of the extrovert students’ higher than the mean score of the introvert students in post-test. It can be seen through the mean score of the extrovert students’ which was 88.52 (very good classification) higher than the mean score of introvert students was 80.92 (good classification). In other word, SQ3R Method is suitable to use for extrovert students.Contrary in PMORE Class the result the result shows that the mean score of the introvert students’ higher than the mean score of the extrovert students in post-test. It can be seen through the mean score of the introvert students’ which was 82.67 (good classification) higher than the mean score of extrovert students was 72.67 (fairly good classification). In other word, PMORE Procedure is suitable with introvert students.

There are some factors which influenced the result about the students’ personality inventory. First, the students which is taught using PMORE Procedure more be introvert students. Due to, the step of this procedure more suitable with the introvert students’ style. It also supported by the previous theory which stated that introverts person are more concerned with the inner world of the mind and they enjoy thinking, exploring their thoughts and feelings (Champan , 2005). Second, the students which is taught using SQ3R Method more be extrovert students. Due to, the step of this method more suitable with the introvert students’ style. It supported by the previous theory which stated that extrovert person are interested in what is happening around them and are mostly open and often talkative. Extroverts compare their own opinions with the opinions of others (Champan, 2005).

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

Finally, the researcher concluded that SQ3R Method is more effective than and PMORE Procedure to enhance students’ reading comprehension achievement of the second grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar.It’s proved by the mean score of the students in SQ3R method class (E1) was 85.78 higher than the mean score of the students in PMORE Procedure class was 80.71. In another side, the questioners consist of 20 items which is whether the methods are not interesting and helpful for the students got higher scores compared to the others. The researcher found that all of the students’ activities from all of the indicators of interest were reached which could be seen on the students’ involvement, feeling pleasure, attraction, and attention in using SQ3R Method. The last findings is the SQ3R Method suitable with extrovert students while PMORE Procedure suitable with introvert students.

Based on the conclusion above the researchers gives suggestions as follows: (1) English teacher of SMAN 5 Makassar should collaborate SQ3R Method and PMORE Procedure to fullfill the students need based on their personal inventory as teaching method in learning English. The teaching learning process should enhance students’ interest and reading achievement. (2) For the next researchers are suggested to explore more on not only SQ3R Method but also PMORE Procedure in engaging the students’ interest and helping enhance the students’ learning achievement in learning English.
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