CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of two sections, namely the research finding and the discussion of the research. The finding of the research covers the description of the result of data collected through test and questionnaire that can be discussed in the section below.

4.1 Research Finding

4.1.1 Data Description of Research

The data was collected from students' pre-test and post-test at two classes; experimental class and control class, in which VIII A as the experimental class and VIII C as the control class. As the explanation in chapter III, the experiment class was taught achievement in reading by using Edutainment, and the control class was not. The result of the data can be described as the following:

4.1.2 Data of Experimental Class

As the explanation in chapter III,in which VIII A as the experimental class. The experimental class is the class that gets treatment by using Edutainment.

4.1.2.1 The students' score in pre-test

The writer gave some test to the students` as the pre-test to know the student`s reading comprehension. Every student got the question and answered it. After giving the pre-test to the students, the researcher found out the result of the students` reading comprehension based on the criteria for the students' achievement before giving treatment. The result was shown in the following table:

Table 4.1 Students' score in pre-test

NO	STUDENT	SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
1	Responden 1	73.4	GOOD
2	Responden 2	66.7	GOOD
3	Responden 3	60.0	POOR
4	Responden 4	73.4	GOOD
5	Responden 5	66.7	GOOD
6	Responden 6	60.0	FAIR
7	Responden 7	73.4	GOOD
8	Responden 8	46.7	POOR
9	Responden 9	73.4	GOOD
10	Responden 10	73.4	GOOD
11	Responden 11	60.0	FAIR
12	Responden 12	60.0	FAIR
13	Responden 13	73.4	GOOD
14	Responden 14	73.4	GOOD
15	Responden 15	73.4	GOOD
16	Responden 16	60.0	FAIR
17	Responden 17	73.4	GOOD
18	Responden 18	73.4	GOOD
19	Responden 19	66.7	GOOD
20	Responden 20	66.7	GOOD
21	Responden 21	60.0	FAIR
22	Responden 22	66.7	GOOD
23	Responden 23	73.4	GOOD
24	Responden 24	46.7	POOR
25	Responden 25	46.7	POOR
26	Responden 26	73.4	GOOD
27	Responden 27	73.4	GOOD
28	Responden 28	46.7	POOR
29	Responden 29	60.0	FAIR
30	Responden 30	73.4	GOOD
31	Responden 31	60.0	FAIR
∑		**2027.5**	
Average		**65.40**	

Based on the result of pre-test analysis in the table above, it showed that none of students got very poor and there are 5 students' got poor, there are 7 students got

fair, there are 19 students got good, and none of student got very good. However, the average score was 65.40. It described that the students' student reading comprehension was still poor before getting a treatment. Found on the table above about students' reading comprehension score in pre-test. We knew the frequency of the classification score by looking the following table:

Table 4.2 Students' classification score in pretest

No	Classification	Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very Good	80-100	0	0
2	Good	66-79	19	61.29
3	Fair	56-65	7	22.58
4	Poor	40-55	5	16.12
5	Very Poor	≤ 39	0	0
Total			**31**	**100%**

The table above described that none of student classified into very good, there were 19 students classified into good with rate percentage (61.29%), there were seven students classified into fair with rate percentage (22.58%), there were 5 students classified into poor with rate percentage (16.12%), and none of students classified into very poor.

4.1.2.2 Post-test

After the writer gave treatment by using Edutainment to the students, the writer gave post-test. The students were given the post-test to find out the student's reading comprehension and their progress, it was used to know the result treatment. The result was shown in the following table:

Table 4.3 Students' score in post-test

NO	STUDENT	SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
1	Responden 1	93.4	VERY GOOD
2	Responden 2	86.7	VERY GOOD
3	Responden 3	93.4	VERY GOOD
4	Responden 4	86.7	VERY GOOD

5	Responden 5	73.4	GOOD
6	Responden 6	100.0	VERY GOOD
7	Responden 7	93.4	VERY GOOD
8	Responden 8	93.4	VERY GOOD
9	Responden 9	86.7	VERY GOOD
10	Responden 10	93.4	VERY GOOD
11	Responden 11	86.7	VERY GOOD
12	Responden 12	73.4	GOOD
13	Responden 13	86.7	VERY GOOD
14	Responden 14	86.7	VERY GOOD
15	Responden 15	86.7	VERY GOOD
16	Responden 16	73.4	GOOD
17	Responden 17	86.7	VERY GOOD
18	Responden 18	86.7	VERY GOOD
19	Responden 19	93.4	VERY GOOD
20	Responden 20	73.4	GOOD
21	Responden 21	86.7	VERY GOOD
22	Responden 22	93.4	VERY GOOD
23	Responden 23	80.0	VERY GOOD
24	Responden 24	73.4	GOOD
25	Responden 25	93.4	VERY GOOD
26	Responden 26	86.7	VERY GOOD
27	Responden 27	86.7	VERY GOOD
28	Responden 28	73.4	GOOD
29	Responden 29	86.7	VERY GOOD
30	Responden 30	93.4	VERY GOOD
31	Responden 31	73.4	GOOD
∑		**2661.5**	
Average		**85.85**	

Based on the result of the post-test analysis in the table above, it showed that there are 24 students got very good, there are 7 students got good, none of students got fair, and also none of students got poor category. However, the average score is 85.85.It described that the quality of the students' reading comprehension was good. There was improvement after getting treatment by using Edutainment. Found on the table above about students' intensive speaking score in post-test. We knew the frequency of the classification score by looking the following table:

Table 4.4 Students' Classification Score in posttest

No	Classification	Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very Good	80-100	24	77.41
2	Good	66-79	7	22.58
3	Fair	56-65	0	0
4	Poor	40-55	0	0
5	Very Poor	≤ 39	0	0
Total			**31**	**100%**

The table above described that 24 student classified into very good with rate percentage (77.41%), there were 7 students classified into good with rate percentage (22.58%), none of students classified into, and also none of students classified into poor. The following are the process of calculating to find out the mean score and standard deviation based on the calculating of student's score in the post-tes

Tabel 4.5 Students' score of Experimental Class

NO	STUDENT	PRETEST SCORE	POSTTEST SCORE	Gained Score
1	Responden 1	73.4	93.4	20
2	Responden 2	66.7	86.7	20
3	Responden 3	60.0	93.4	33.4
4	Responden 4	73.4	86.7	13.3
5	Responden 5	66.7	73.4	6.7
6	Responden 6	60.0	100.0	40
7	Responden 7	73.4	93.4	20
8	Responden 8	46.7	93.4	46.7
9	Responden 9	73.4	86.7	13.4
10	Responden 10	73.4	93.4	20
11	Responden 11	60.0	86.7	26.7
12	Responden 12	60.0	73.4	13.4
13	Responden 13	73.4	86.0	13.4
14	Responden 14	73.4	86.7	13.4
15	Responden 15	73.4	86.7	13.4
16	Responden 16	60.0	73.4	13.4
17	Responden 17	73.4	86.7	13.4
18	Responden 18	73.4	86.7	13.4
19	Responden 19	66.7	96.4	26.7
20	Responden 20	66.7	73.4	6.7

21	Responden 21	60.0	86.7	26.7
22	Responden 22	66.7	93.4	26.7
23	Responden 23	73.4	80.0	6.7
24	Responden 24	46.7	73.4	26.7
25	Responden 25	46.7	93.4	46.7
26	Responden 26	73.4	86.7	13.4
27	Responden 27	73.4	86.7	13.4
28	Responden 28	46.7	73.4	26.7
29	Responden 29	60.0	86.7	26.7
30	Responden 30	73.4	93.4	20
31	Responden 31	60.0	73.4	13.4
∑ = 31		**2027.5**	**2621.6**	**634.4**
Mean Score		**65.40**	**84.56**	**20.46**
Max Score		**73.4**	**100**	**46.7**
Min Score		**46.7**	**73.4**	**6.7**

The table above showed that the students got improvement by gaining score before and after treatment. It proved that the students got improvement in their Reading comprehension by using Edutainment. The improvement could be measured by presenting the minimum and maximum score of pre-test and post-test. The minimum score of pre-test was 46.7 and the maximum was 73.4, beside that the minimum score of post-test was 73.4 and the maximum score of post-test was 100. The mean of pre-test was 65.40 and the mean of post-test was 84.56. Before treatment the students got poor category but after doing treatment by edutainment the students got good cetegory, it means that there was improvement with students' reading comprehension.

4.1.3Data of Control Class

As the explanation in chapter III,in which VIII C as the control class.The control class is the class that doesnt gets treatment by Edutainment. Control class just got direct intruction.

4.1.3.1Pretest

The writer gave some questions to the students` as the pre-test to know the student`sreading comprehension. Every student got the question and answered it. After giving the pre-test to the students, the researcher found out the result of the students` reading comprehension based on the criteria before giving treatment. The result was shown in the following table:

Table 4.6 Students' Pretest Score based on students' achievement

NO	STUDENT	SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
1	Responden 1	66.7	GOOD
2	Responden 2	60.0	FAIR
3	Responden 3	66.7	GOOD
4	Responden 4	60.0	FAIR
5	Responden 5	60.0	FAIR
6	Responden 6	60.0	FAIR
7	Responden 7	73.4	GOOD
8	Responden 8	73.4	GOOD
9	Responden 9	60.0	FAIR
10	Responden 10	73.4	GOOD
11	Responden 11	66.7	GOOD
12	Responden 12	60.0	FAIR
13	Responden 13	73.4	GOOD
14	Responden 14	66.7	GOOD
15	Responden 15	60.0	FAIR
16	Responden 16	73.4	GOOD
17	Responden 17	60.0	FAIR
18	Responden 18	53.4	FAIR
19	Responden 19	60.0	FAIR
20	Responden 20	46.7	POOR
21	Responden 21	73.4	GOOD
22	Responden 22	60.0	FAIR
23	Responden 23	53.4	POOR
24	Responden 24	53.4	POOR
25	Responden 25	73.4	GOOD
26	Responden 26	46.7	POOR
27	Responden 27	66.4	GOOD

28	Responden 28	73.4	GOOD
29	Responden 29	46.7	POOR
30	Responden 30	66.7	GOOD
31	Responden 31	66.7	GOOD
∑		**1827.4**	
Average		**58.94**	

Based on the result of the post-test analysis in the table above, it showed that none of students got very good, there are 15 students got good, there are 11 students got fair, and there are 5 students got poor category. However, the average score was 58.94. It described that the students' student reading comprehension was still poor before getting a treatment. Found on the table above about students' reading comprehension score in pre-test. We knew the frequency of the classification score by looking the following table:

Table 4.7 Students' Classification Score in pretest

No	Classification	Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very Good	80-100	0	0
2	Good	66-79	15	48.38
3	Fair	56-65	11	35.48
4	Poor	40-55	5	16.12
5	Very Poor	≤ 39	0	0
Total			**31**	**100%**

The table above described that none of student classified into very good, there were 15 students classified into good with rate percentage (48.38%), there were 11 students classified into fair with rate percentage (35.48%), there were 5 students classified into poor with rate percentage (16.12%), and none of students classified into very poor.

4.1.3.2 Posttest

After the writer gave treatment without using Edutainment to the students, the writer gave post-test. The students were given the post-test to find out the achievement and their progress. The result was shown in the following table:

Table 4.8 Students' Posttest Score based on students' achievement

NO	STUDENT	SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
1	Responden 1	73.4	FAIR
2	Responden 2	73.4	GOOD
3	Responden 3	73.4	GOOD
4	Responden 4	73.4	GOOD
5	Responden 5	73.4	FAIR
6	Responden 6	86.7	VERY GOOD
7	Responden 7	86.7	VERY GOOD
8	Responden 8	80.0	VERY GOOD
9	Responden 9	73.4	GOOD
10	Responden 10	86.7	VERY GOOD
11	Responden 11	66.7	GOOD
12	Responden 12	73.4	GOOD
13	Responden 13	80.0	VERY GOOD
14	Responden 14	80.0	VERY GOOD
15	Responden 15	73.4	GOOD
16	Responden 16	80.0	VERY GOOD
17	Responden 17	73.4	GOOD
18	Responden 18	66.7	GOOD
19	Responden 19	66.7	GOOD
20	Responden 20	60.0	FAIR
21	Responden 21	86.7	VERY GOOD
22	Responden 22	86.7	VERY GOOD
23	Responden 23	66.7	GOOD
24	Responden 24	66.7	GOOD
25	Responden 25	80.0	VERY GOOD
26	Responden 26	73.4	GOOD
27	Responden 27	80.0	VERY GOOD
28	Responden 28	80.0	VERY GOOD
29	Responden 29	60.0	FAIR
30	Responden 30	73.4	GOOD
31	Responden 31	73.4	GOOD

∑	**2327.8**
Average	**75**

Based on the result of the post-test analysis in the table above, it showed that there were 8 students got very good, there were 19 students got good, there were 4 students got fair, and none of students got poor category. However, the average score is 75.It described that the quality of the students' reading comprehension was good. There was improvement after getting treatment without Edutainment. We knew the frequency of the classification score by looking the following table:

Table 4.9 Students' Classification Score in posttest

No	Classification	Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very Good	80-100	8	25.80
2	Good	66-79	19	58
3	Fair	56-65	4	16.12
4	Poor	40-55	0	0
5	Very Poor	≤ 39	0	0
Total			**31**	**100%**

The table above described that there were 8 student classified into very good with percentage (25.80%), there were 19 students classified into good with rate percentage (58%), there were 4 students classified into fair with rate percentage (16.12%), and none of students classified into poor and very poor score.

Table 4.10 students' score of Control Class

NO	STUDENT	PRETEST SCORE	POSTEST SCORE	Gained Score
1	Responden 1	66.7	73.4	6.7
2	Responden 2	60.0	73.4	13.4
3	Responden 3	66.7	73.4	6.7
4	Responden 4	60.0	73.4	13.4
5	Responden 5	60.0	73.4	6.7
6	Responden 6	60.0	86.7	26.7
7	Responden 7	73.4	86.7	13.7
8	Responden 8	73.4	80.0	6.6
9	Responden 9	60.0	73.4	13.4
10	Responden 10	73.4	86.7	13.7

11	Responden 11	66.7	73.4	6.7
12	Responden 12	60.0	73.4	13.4
13	Responden 13	73.4	80.0	13.7
14	Responden 14	66.7	80.0	13.3
15	Responden 15	60.0	73.4	13.4
16	Responden 16	73.4	80.0	13.7
17	Responden 17	60.0	73.4	13.4
18	Responden 18	53..4	66.7	13.3
19	Responden 19	60.0	66.7	6.7
20	Responden 20	46.7	60.0	13.3
21	Responden 21	73.4	86.7	13.7
22	Responden 22	73.4	86.7	13.7
23	Responden 23	53.4	66.7	13.4
24	Responden 24	53.4	66.7	13.4
25	Responden 25	73.4	80.0	13.7
26	Responden 26	46.7	73.4	26.7
27	Responden 27	66.7	80.0	20
28	Responden 28	73.4	80.0	13.7
29	Responden 29	46.7	60.0	13.3
30	Responden 30	66.7	73.4	6.7
31	Responden 31	66.7	73.4	6.7
∑ = 31		**1827.4**	**2327.8**	**396.9**
Mean Score		**58.94**	**75**	**12.80**
Max Score		**73.4**	**86.7**	**26.7**
Min Score		**46.7**	**60.0**	**6.7**

The table above showed that the students got improvement by gaining score before and after treatment. It proved that the students got improvement in their Reading comprehension without using Edutainment. The improvement could be measured by presenting the minimum and maximum score of pre-test and post-test. The minimum score of pre-test was 46.7 and the maximum was 73.4, beside that the minimum score of post-test was 60.0 and the maximum score of post-test was 86.7. The mean of pre-test was 58.94 and the mean of post-test was 75. Before treatment the students got poor category but after doing treatment by just doing direct intruction the students got good cetegory, it means that there was improvement with students' reading comprehension.

4.1.3.3 Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, a t-test was used to make it easier to test thehypotheses. The formula of the t-test is as follows:

$$t_0 = \frac{x_1 - x_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

Before analyzing the data by using the t-test formula, there are several stepsthat should be done as follows:

Table 4.11 The Comparison Score between Students in Experimental Class (X) and Control Class (Y)

No	X	Y	X = x – Mx	Y = Y – My	X^2	Y^2
1	20	6.7	-0.46	-6.1	0.21	37.21
2	20	13.4	-0.46	0.6	0.21	0.36
3	33.4	6.7	12.94	-6.1	167.96	37.21
4	13.3	13.4	-7.16	0.6	51.26	0.36
5	6.7	6.7	-13.76	-6.1	189.33	37.21
6	40	26.7	19.54	13.9	381.81	193.21
7	20	13.7	-0.46	-6.1	0.21	37.21
8	46.7	6.6	26.24	-6.2	109.11	38.44
9	13.4	13.4	-7	-6.1	49	37.21
10	20	13.7	-0.46	0.9	0.21	0.81
11	26.7	6.7	6.24	-6.1	38.93	37.21
12	13.4	13.7	-7	0.9	49	0.81
13	13.4	13.7	-7	0.9	49	0.81
14	13.4	13.3	-7	0.5	49	0.25
15	13.4	13.4	-7	0.6	49	0.36
16	13.4	13.7	-7	-6.1	49	37.21
17	13.4	13.4	-7	0.6	49	0.36
18	13.4	13.3	-7	0.5	49	0.25

19	26.7	6.7	6.24	-6.1	38.93	37.21
20	6.7	13.3	-13.76	0.5	189.33	0.25
21	26.7	13.7	6.24	0.9	38.93	0.81
22	26.7	13.7	6.24	0.9	38.93	0.81
23	6.7	13.4	-13.76	-6.1	189.33	37.21
24	26.7	13.4	6.24	-6.1	38.93	37.21
25	46.7	13.7	26.24	0.9	109.11	0.81
26	13.4	26.7	-7	13.9	49	193.21
27	13.4	20	-7	7.2	49	51.84
28	26.7	13.7	6.24	0.9	38.93	0.81
29	26.7	13.3	6.24	0.5	38.93	0.25
30	20	6.7	-0.46	-6.1	0.21	37.21
31	13.4	6.7	-7	-6.1	49	37.21
∑ = **21**	**634.4**	**396.9**	**0.9**	**-33.7**	**2199.8**	**931.33**
Mean Score	**20.46**	**12.80**				

(Data Source: the worksheet of the calculating on pre-test and post-test)

Base on the table above The table above showed that the students got improvement by comparison score before and after treatment. It proved that the students got improvement in their Reading comprehension by using Edutainment. The mean scores in Experimental Class (X) was 20.46 and the mean score of control class as the class that the students got improvement in their Reading comprehension without Edutainment was 12.80.

In the other to see the student's score, the following is t-test was statically applied:

Determining mean of gained score of experimental class:

$$\bar{x} = \left(\frac{\sum x}{Nx}\right)$$
$$\bar{x} = \left(\frac{634.4}{31}\right)$$
$$\bar{x} = 20.46$$

Determining mean of gained score of control class:

$$\bar{x} = \left(\frac{\sum y}{Ny}\right)$$
$$\bar{x} = \left(\frac{396.9}{31}\right)$$
$$\bar{x} = 12.80$$

Determining deviation of experimental class:

$$SS = \sum \mathrm{x}^2 - \frac{(\sum \mathrm{x})^2}{N}$$
$$SS = 2199.8 - \frac{(634.4)^2}{31}$$
$$SS = 2199.8 - \frac{402463.36}{31}$$
$$SS = 2199.8 - 12982.68$$
$$SS = -10782.88$$

Determining deviation of control class:

$$SS = \sum \mathrm{y}^2 - \frac{(\sum \mathrm{y})^2}{N}$$
$$SS = 931.33 - \frac{(396.9)^2}{31}$$
$$SS = 931.33 - \frac{157529.61}{31}$$
$$SS = 931.33 - 5081.6$$
$$SS = -4150.27$$

Determining value of hypotheses testing by using t-test formula:

$$t_o = \frac{x_1 - x_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$
$$t_o = \frac{20.46 - 12.80}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{-10782.88 + -(4150.27)}{31 + 31 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{31} + \frac{1}{31}\right)}}$$
$$t_o = \frac{-7.66}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{-6632.61}{60}\right)\left(\frac{1}{31} + \frac{1}{31}\right)}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{-7.66}{\sqrt{(-110.54)\,.\,(0.06)}}$$
$$t_o = \frac{-7.66}{\sqrt{-6.63}}$$
$$t_o = \frac{-7.66}{-2.57} = 2.98$$

Determining degrees of freedom:

$$df = N_X + N_y - 2$$
$$df = 31 + 31 - 2$$
$$df = 60$$

After obtaining the degrees of freedom, looking at t-table (tt) at the degree of freedom 60 in significant degrees of 0.05 (5%), the t-table (tt) is 1.67.Based on data analysis, if t_o (*t-observation*) is higher than t_t (*t-table*), (2.98> 1.67), the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It should be concluded thatthe implementation of Edutainment is able to improve the eighth grade students' reading comprehensionat MTs N 2 Sidrap.

4.1.4 Students'reading comprehension

The pre-test aimed to know extent students'reading comprehension. The students' reading comprehension was poor before the treatment because it viewed from the mean score of experimental class in pre-test was 56.17,it could be seen that student's reading comprehension was in poor category. Based on the table of the students' score in pre-test, the most of students got low score than the students got high score. It could also be seen from the classification students' score. It showed there were some students got fair and poor so the researcher concluded the students' reading comprehension at MTsN 2 Sidrap was still poor.

4.1.5 The Improvment Student Reading Comprehension by Using Edutainment

The post-test aimed to know how was the improvement students reading comprehension after using edutainment. After using edutainment, the students' reading comprehension had increased. Based on the result of mean score in post-test

had increased from the mean score was 56.17 became the mean score was 88.43. It had shown that student's reading comprehension had changed from poor category became good category.

4.1.6 The Improvment between Edutainment with Student Reading Comprehension

The pre-test and the post-test gave to know the improvement between Edutainment with students'reding comprehension. Measuring the students' reading compreghension before and after being taught by using edutainment could be seen at students' score in pretest and posttest. It could be said that the implementation of edutainment could be effective to increase students' reading comprehension if the students' score of posttest was higher than the students' score pretest. By looking at the research finding, found that the mean score of pretest was 56.17 and the mean score of posttest was 88.43.

From that finding, it could be interpreted that students'reading comprehension before being taught by edutainment was lower if it compared with the students' reading comprehension after being taught by using edutainment. It implicated that using edutainment could be effective to increase students'reading comprehension. It means that there was the improvement between edutainment with students'reading comprehension.

Furthermore, to make a conclusion about the effectiveness of edutainmnet to increase students' reading comprehension at MTsN 2 SIDRAP, it could be done by analyzing the data using t_o and compared it with the t-table. The result of the data analyzes showed that t_o (2.92) > t_t (1.67). It means that the edutainment is effective to increase students'reading comprehension at MTsN 2 Sidrap.

4.2 Discussion

This section provides the discussion about the finding that showed in previous section. The discussion of this research provides insight about the implementation of edutainment to increase students' reading comprehension.

4.2.1 Data Interpretation

Based on data analysis, if t_o (*t-observation*) is higher than t_t (*t-table*),(2.98> 1.67), the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It should be concluded that the implementation of Edutainmet is able to improve the eighth grade student'a reading comprehension at MTs N 2 Sidrap.But, both control class and experimental class get improvement in each posttest. Furthermore, the students in the experimental class achieve higher score in their post-test than the score of students in control class.

4.2.2 The Result of the Text

The theory of edutainment in chapter II, according to Colace (*Work in Progress: Bayesian Networks for Edutainment*), explained that edutainment is a derived word that states a mixture of entertainment and education or marriage of education with entertainment[1]. In this case Edutaintment is a learning process designed so that the content of education and entertainmentcan combined harmoniously to create learning that is alot of fun. According to Marcel Danesi (*Conceptual errors in second language learning*) in 'Dictionary of Media and Communications' has been "[blend of education and entertainment] any media product or text that both educates and entertain" and infotainment is referred as

[1]Colace, F., De Santo, M. &Pietrosanto, A. *Work in Progress: Bayesian Networks for Edutainment,36th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, DOI:10.1109/FIE, 2006

"[blend of information and entertainment] television or other media form of entertainment based on presenting factual information in an engaging way,". By studying on their own, discussing, discovering and living out their own important concepts contained in the material discussed, It is hoped that it can improve student understanding and foster self-confidence, as well as their social skills, in addition to improving student learning outcomes themselves.[2]

The essence of Edutainment is to allow students to work together in small groups, first to advance their understanding of themselves and the world, and then to provide them with the opportunity to share that new understanding with their friends. Students contribute to their team, and team contributes to the class. They are cooperating within their teams so they can better cooperate with the other teams to reach a class goal. The strategy is simple and flexible. We may choose any number of ways to apply the approach in a given classroom. Nevertheless, the inclusion of ten elements or steps increases the probability of success.For this research, the writer focuses on students' achievement in reading of Edutainment as learning proce. The research uses the students' achievement in reading, if in learning outcomes (posttest) of experimental class is higher than control class.

The data was found that the mean score of the pretest score of the experimental class is 65.40. The mean score of the pretest score of the control class is 58.94. The mean score of the posttest score of the experimental class is 85.85 and the mean score of the posttest score of the control class is 75. It can be seen that the students' learning outcomes of experimental class is higher than the students'

[2]Colace, F., De Santo, M. &Pietrosanto, A. *Work in Progress: Bayesian Networks for Edutainment,36th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, DOI:10.1109/FIE, 2006

learning outcomes of the control class. So based on the theory, the implementation of Edutainment able to increase the eighth grade studentt's reading comprehension at MTs N 2 Sidrap.

4.2.2 The Implementation of Edutainment to Increase Students' Reading comprehension.

In the treatment process, the writer took sixth meetings include posttest and pretest in teaching Edutainment to improve the students' reading comprehension at the experimental class VIII A and took second meetings include pre-test and post-test in the control class.

The first meeting was located in the class of VIII A and VIII C MTsN 2 Sidrap,before the writer gave treatment that was conducted on Wednesday December11th, the students were given the pre-test to measure their reading comprehension .After the writer opened the meeting, the researcher invited the students for invoking to the God with a Muslim way in praying then she gave some test to the students` as the pre-test to know the students' reading comprehension. Every student got the question and answered it, some members were good in answering all the questions but several of them unfortunately were still confused in answering. The researcher continued to all the members until the last name after getting all the data, the writer closed the class by greeting to the students. After getting all the data, the writer closing the class by greeting to the students.

The second meeting was located in the class of VIII A MTsN 2 Sidrap on Friday December13th, 2019. This meeting was a first treatment after giving the pre-test. In the morning, the writer started the class by greeting and checked the students attendance. Before the students knew the techniques, the reseacher explained the

material to the students about “Narrative Text”. Next, the reseacher gave the students learning process of Edutainment. The writer informed the students about Edutainment, the writer let them know about the Edutainment by explanation as follows : the definition, the purpose, and the way of using Edutainment. Next, the writer explained the definition, the structure, and the characteristic of recount text. After that, the writer distributed the text to the each student and she encouraged active participation in the process by inviting students to assume the writer by asking question and directing the discussion of the text. The first paragraph, the writer as a leader, and the next paragraph every student have a chance to be a leader to discuss about the text until the last paragraph. Teaching learning runs slowly, so will continued to the next meeting. In final activity, the writer confirmation about the understanding about Edutainment, inform the students about the next meetings plan to do, and closed the class.

The third meeting was located in the class of VIII A MTsN 2 Sidrap, conducted on Wednesday December 18th, 2019. This meeting was a second treatment after giving the pre-test. In the morning, the writer started the class by greeting and checked the students attendance. Before the students knew the techniques, the reseacher explained the material to the students about “Narrative Text”. Next, the reseacher gave the students learning process of Edutainment. Next, the writer devided the students into group consist of 4-5 students. After the researcher devided into some groups the researcher gave text about “thing”. In exploration stage, all students to do group work to discussing about the text. In explanation stage, the reseacher invited one by one to come forward explain the text, every students explain different text like: the text about holiday, the past, a trip, so on. In elaboration stage, the researcher

pointed some student to answered question like “what is the purpose of the text?” and the student answered is “the purpose is tell past even” and the other student just answered “tell a past”. In explanation stage, the researcher pointed some students to telling what their have been explain like “the purpose of the text is tell a past and inform the readers about events of the day. After that, the writer gave exercise.In final activity, the writer confirmation about the teaching learning process, inform the students about the next meeting plan to do, and closed the class.

The fourth meeting was located in the class of VIII A MTsN 2 Sidrap, conducted on Friday December 20th, 2019. In the Morning, In the morning, the writer started the class by greeting and checked the students attendance. Before the students knew the techniques, the reseacher explained the material to the students about “Narrative Text”. In engagement stage, the reseacher gave question about the topic of yasterday. For example,what the topic of text yasterday? and all students said “Holiday”. Next, the reseacher gave the students learning process of Edutainment. The reseacher gave text about the topic “My First Trip to Pari Island”. After the researcher devided into some groups. In this stage, all students to do group work to discussing about the text. In explanation stage, the reseacher invited one by one to come forward explain the text, every students explain different text. In the next stage, the researcher pointed some student to answered question like “what the content basically talks about?” and the student answered is “The Writer’s Trip to Pari Island”. The last, the researcher closed the class.

The fifth meeting was located in the class of VIII A MTsN 2 Sidrap, conducted on Wednesday January 8th, 2020. In the morning, This meeting was a second treatment after giving the pre-test. In the morning, the writer started the class

by greeting and checked the students attendance. Before the students knew the techniques, the reseacher explained the material to the students about “Narrative Text”. Next, the reseacher gave the students learning process of Edutainment. In stage, all students to do group work to discussing about the text (Cultural Visit to Bandung with UI Creates). In explanation stage, the reseacher invited one by one to come forward ex plain the text , every students explain different text like: the text talk aboutthe writers trip, the writer impression IU Create, the writer experience, so on. In the next stage, the researcher pointed some student to answered question like “where did the writer vocation?” and the student answered is “In Bandung”. After that, the writer gave exercise.In final activity, the researcher confirmation about the teaching learning process, inform the students about the meetings plan to do, and closed the class.

The last meeting was located in the class of VIII A and VIII C MTsN 2 Sidrap, after the writer gave treatment to the students, the writer gave post-test on Wednesday January 10th, 2020, the students were given the post-test to find out the achievement and their progress, it was used to know the result treatment; it was also used to know wether there is an improvement or not. After the writer opened the meeting, she gave some test to the students` as the post-test to know the student`s achievement in reading. Every student got the question and answered it. students were given the post-test to measure their ability in reading. After the researcher opened the meeting, the writer continued to inform them that all the members would be coming forward and everyone would be getting some questions that should be answered. In post-test time, some members were good in answering all the questions but a little of them unfortunately were still low in answered.