CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

A. Profile of MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan

MTs. Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan is an Islamic Private Junior High School is located in Raguklampitan 12/03 Batealit Sub district, Jepara with accreditation B. Based on the school documentation, every year there is increasing the number of students. This school contains of 8 classes, 3 classes for each grade, except for grade IX has 2 classes. MTs. Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan has 240 Students and 22 teachers and official employees.

MTs. Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan uses KTSP curriculum in teaching learning process. However, in its implementation there are some improvisations on it, such as in developing the material and assessment.

MTs. Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan enthusiastically encourages the students in English learning. Many activities are conducted to support English learning, from intra curricular activities to extracurricular activities. Sometimes, this school invites native speaker to the school, to assist teaching learning process. Further, the native can motivate students to learn English language.
There are 19 teachers in MTs. Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan two of them are English teachers. Here is the profile of English teachers in MTs. Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan.

Table 4.1

The Profile of English Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Background of Education</th>
<th>Length of Time Teaching in Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan</th>
<th>Grade to Teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nur Hasan, S,Pd.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>S1 UNIVET Bangun Nusantoro, Sukoharjo, Solo</td>
<td>31 years</td>
<td>VIII, and IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nur Aliem, S,Pd.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>UMK Kudus</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographically MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan environment is strategic environment to support the implementation of the educational process. This school closes to the roadway. So, the children do not go to school in difficult transportation and rarely late. It is a distinct advantage that of MTs. Miftahul Huda in the roadway side.
B. Data Description

The purpose of this research was to measure *The Effectiveness of Crazy Professor Reading Game to Teach Reading at Eight Grade Students of MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan Batealit Jepara in Academic Year 2016/2017*. The result of the research and discussion of this chapter was the result of field research to gain the data of students’ cognitive aspect after conducting different learning process between experimental class and control class. The aim was to examine the truth of hypothesis of the research.

The researcher started activities from 3\(^{rd}\) September 2016 to 2\(^{nd}\) October 2016. Technique of collecting data in this research used observation, test and documentation. Observation is used to observe the students’ interest, involvement and activity during research. Before doing treatment, the students’ interest in reading a text is low. While doing treatment, students are given a CPR game to attract their interest in reading. They are very excited to involve them to implement step by step of this game. Instrument test was given in experimental class and control class as a tool to measure students’ cognitive ability. First, the researcher chose the sample of try-out class and gave try-out test. The researcher chose class IX A which consisted of 36 students as try-out class. Try-out was given to know whether items had been fulfilled the criteria of the aspect validity, reliability, degree of test difficulty and discriminating power of each item or not. The researcher gave 40
items of test in try-out test.

Second, the researcher got class VIII A which consists of 30 students as experimental class, and class VIII B which consists of 30 students as control class by using lottery. Before conducting the activities, the researcher determined lesson plan. Teaching learning in experimental class was conducted by teaching reading using CPR game, whereas in control class was conducted without using CPR game. The material was Descriptive text.

Third, before and after following the learning process the researcher gave the post test to the students. Then, the researcher scored the results of the test that had been given to the students. The test consists of 20 items of multiple choice.

C. Data Analysis

1. Analysis of Try-Out Instrument Test

Try-out test is carried out in try out class which consists of 40 items of multiple choices. The result of try-out test would be analyzed based on the validity, reliability, degree of test difficulty, and discriminating power, so that the items that had been prepared could be used as pre-test and post-test in experimental class and control class. The result of try-out analysis is as follow.

a. Validity of Instrument

Validity of instrument is used to know whether valid or invalid as an instrument test. Invalid instrument would be lost and not used, whereas valid instrument means could be final
evaluated in experimental class and control class. The result of this research was consulted to critical score for r-Product Moment or r table. Based on try-out instrument that have been conducted with the number of students of try-out class, N= 36, significance level 5%, \( r_{table} = 0.329 \). Each item was valid, if \( r_{count} > 0.329 \) (\( r_{count} \) higher than 0.329), in the contrary, if \( r_{count} < r_{table} \) the item test was invalid and must be deleted from the test. The result could be shown in table 4.1. The complete calculation could be seen in appendix 12.

**Table 4.2**

The Result of Computation of Validity Item Try-Out Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>( r_{table} )</th>
<th>Number of item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4,5,7,8,10,11,13,15,16,17,19,21,24,25,28,29,32,33,35,36,38,39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,6,9,12,14,18,20,22,23,26,27,30,31,34,37,40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, valid instrument has chance to be used as pre-test and post test. Invalid instrument not used as pre-test and post-test.
a. Reliability of Instrument

Reliability test is used to know the consistency level of answer to the instrument. A good instrument has consistent answer whenever it be presented. The result of computation coefficient reliability of 40 items acquired $r_{ij} = 0.857$ and $r_{table} = 0.329$. Because $r_{ij} = 0.857 > r_{table} = 0.329$, it could be concluded that the item was reliable and could be trusted to be used as a data collection tool. The calculation of instrument reliability could be seen in appendix 13.

b. Degree of Test Difficulty

Analysis degree of test difficulty is used to know the degree of test difficulty whether the test has criteria difficult, medium, or easy.

The computation of degree of test difficulty could be seen in the table 4.2 and the complete calculation could be seen in appendix 14.

**Table 4.3**

The Result of Computation of Degree of Test Difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>9, 14, 20, 37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1,3,6,10,11,12 ,15,17,18,19,2 1,22,25,27,29,32,34,35,36,3 8,40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>2,4,5,7,8,13,1 6,23,24,26,28,30,31,33,39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the criteria above, the researcher decides to use easy and medium criteria as instrument of pre-test and post-test.

c. Discriminating Power

Based on the result of discriminating power of item as shown in the table 4.3. The complete calculation could be seen in appendix 15.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>3, 9, 14, 18, 20, 21, 31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2, 23, 26, 30, 34, 37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 33, 39, 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7, 19, 28, 29, 32, 35, 36, 38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the researcher uses each number that has satisfactory and good criteria to be instrument of pre-test and post-test score.

Based on the analysis of validity, reliability, difficulty level and discriminating power, only 20 items were used as instrument to make the scoring easy. They were number 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 38.
2. **Data Analysis of Research Finding**

Before conducting the research, the researcher prepares the lesson plan for experimental and control class two meetings for each class. At the first meeting, the researcher doing pre-test for experimental and control class. The students both two classes were not interested and lazy to answer the pre-test. Some of them answer the question without read the text first. In other word, they are doing the pre-test haphazardly. The researcher gave the treatment in experimental class by using CPR game and control class without CPR game. The same post-test was given by the researcher, 20 items of multiple choice with four options selection.

Based on the data of pre requisite test, the researcher used pre-test students in MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan used as preliminary basic to conduct research. In this case the initial ability of the class that would be examined as a research object to be known whether same or not. Therefore, researcher took the pre-test students in class VIII as score of initial data.

Based on the calculation of normality test for $\chi^2_{\text{count}}$ class VIII A = 5.3732 while $\chi^2_{\text{table}} = 11.07$ for $\chi^2_{\text{count}} < \chi^2_{\text{table}}$. So, the class VIII A was normal distribution. For class VIII B $\chi^2_{\text{count}} = 6.2131$ while $\chi^2_{\text{table}} = 11.07$ for $\chi^2_{\text{count}} < \chi^2_{\text{table}}$, it meant that class VIII B also normally distributed. In homogeneity test data was obtained $F_{\text{count}} = 1.264$, $F_{1/2a (nb-1):(nk-1)} = 1.86$. Because $F_{\text{count}} < F_{1/2a (nb-1):(nk-1)}$, it meant that both class VIII A and class VIII B were
homogeneous. In other words, the condition of students’ ability both two classes before being given treatment were same, namely normal and homogeneous. Therefore, these were two classes could be used as experimental class and control class.

The second meeting the researcher explains the material about Descriptive text and gives the text entitled Welcome to Sydney. After giving the reading text, the researcher conducts the activity by using CPR game in experimental class. The researcher explains CPR game and its roles. To conduct the CPR game, the researcher focuses on Dramatic Reading, Question and Answer, Silent Reading, and The Crazy Professor session. At the first time, some students are shine to express themselves. Different activity in control class the students were asked to read the text without using CPR game. In this meeting, both of two classes focus on the material and reading text.

The third meeting both of two classes were given Descriptive text entitled Borobudur Temple Compounds. In experimental class the reading text asked to read the text using CPR game. Some students have self confident to read the text using appropriate gesture. Whereas in control class asked to read the text without using CPR game. After finish to read the text the students are asked to answer some questions based on the text that have been read.

The fourth meeting, the researcher doing the post-test both of experimental and control class. The students of experimental
class using CPR game to read and to understand the text. Whereas, in control class without using CPR to read and to understand the text.

Post-test was conducted after doing the treatment in experimental class and lecturing in control class. In this case, post-test was used to know the students’ learning achievement, is there any different score before and after doing treatment both of two classes.

a. Pre Requisite Test

Analysis of pre requisite test is an analysis of initial data was obtained by researcher as a pre requirement that the object would be examined was statistically valid. So, it could be used as the object of the research. The data used for the analysis of pre requisite test of this research is pre-test score. The list of pre-test score can be found in appendix 16.

Based on these data, to analyze initial data the researcher conducted three statistical tests, those were normality test, homogeneity test and test of average.

1) Normality Test

Test of normality is used to find out whether the data of experimental class and control class that have been collected came from normal distribution or not. The result of calculation of Chi-square ($\chi^2_{\text{count}}$) was compared with table of Chi-square ($\chi^2_{\text{table}}$) by using $\alpha = 5\%$ of significance. If $\chi^2_{\text{count}} < \chi^2_{\text{table}}$, it meant that the data
spread of research result distributed normally. Normality test of pre-test of experimental class and control class could be seen in the table 4.4 and the table 4.5

**Table 4.5**

The Normality Pre-Test of Experimental Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>Ei</th>
<th>Oi</th>
<th>(Oi-Ei)²</th>
<th>Ei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.00 - 29.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>0.4321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00 - 39.00</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>2.4228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00 - 49.00</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>6.8654</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00 - 59.00</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>9.8592</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.00 - 69.00</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>7.1832</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00 - 79.00</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>2.6527</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.50 X²</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>5.3732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.4 the normality of pre test score in experimental class (VIII A) with significance level $\alpha = 5\%$ with $dk = 6-1 = 5$, obtained $\chi^2_{\text{count}} = 5.3732$ and $\chi^2_{\text{table}}$
= 11.07. Because \( \chi^2_{\text{count}} < \chi^2_{\text{table}} \), it could be concluded that the data was normally distributed. The complete calculation can be seen in appendix 17.

The normality of pre test score in control group (VIII B) as shown in table 4.5 with significance level \( \alpha = 5\% \) with \( \text{dk} = 6-1 = 5 \), obtained \( \chi^2_{\text{count}} = 6.2131 \) and \( \chi^2_{\text{table}} = 11.07 \). Because \( \chi^2_{\text{count}} < \chi^2_{\text{table}} \), it could be concluded that the data was normally distributed. The complete calculation could be seen in appendix 18.

2) Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test data is used to determine whether the data had the same variant (homogeneous) or not. Test average of two variants of data was done by dividing the largest variant with the smallest variant.

Both two classes had the same variant when using \( \alpha = 5\% \) obtained \( F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}} \), it meant the two classes could be said homogeneous.

From the calculation:

\[
S_1^2 = 138.76437 \\
S_2^2 = 109.7989
\]

It could be calculated:

\[
F_{\text{count}} = \frac{138.7644}{109.7989} = 1.264
\]
The result of the calculation of homogeneity test on the sample above obtained $F_{\text{count}} = 1.264$, with opportunities $\frac{1}{2} \alpha$, significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$, $d_k$ numerator = 30-1 = 29 and $df$ denominator = 30-1 = 29, with $F(0,025) (29,29,) = 1.86$, it could be seen that $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$, it meant that the data had homogeneous variant. The data of homogeneity test as shown in table 9.

**Table 4.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>$F_{\text{count}}$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{table}}$</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VIII A</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VIII B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete computation could be seen in appendix 19.

3) Test of average

The test of two averages is used to determine whether experimental class and control class had an identical average or similar in pre-test or not. This study found that the average of experimental class = 54.83 and average of control class = 56.16. From the test of average obtained $t = -0.463$ with the significance level 5% and $d_k = 58$ obtained $t_{\text{table}} = 2.00$. Thus - $t_{\text{table}} < t_{\text{count}} < t_{\text{table}}$ which meant that the average of learning outcomes between experimental class and control class were relatively the same. The complete computation could be seen in appendix 20.
b. Analysis Phase End

The analysis was based on the post-test score was given to students both experimental class and control class. The result of post-test score could be seen in appendix 23.

The final analysis, the researcher used ANOVA. The researcher gave comparison between students’ reading achievement score of pre-test in experimental class and control class and the students’ reading achievement score of post-test of experimental class and control class. It was done to prove the truth of hypothesis. The researcher used two ways ANOVA to analyze the data. From the average score of pre-test and post-test both experimental class and control class, the result was gained as the table 4.8.

**Table 4.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (Factor B)</th>
<th>Test (Factor A)</th>
<th>Total Factor B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>N₁₁=30, M₁₁=54.833, s₁₁=11.780</td>
<td>N₂₁=30, M₂₁=77.167, s₂₁=8.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>N₁₂=30, M₁₂=56.167, s₁₂=10.478</td>
<td>N₂₂=30, M₂₂=73.167, s₂₂=8.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Factor A</td>
<td>N₁.=60, M₁.=55.500, s₁.=11.074</td>
<td>N₂.=60, M₂.=75.167, s₂.=8.634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the result above, it could be explained that:

1) Total Respondents (N) is 60 with details:
   a) Experimental class = 30
   b) Control class = 30

2) Total mean scores of pre-test for both two classes are 55.5
   a) Experimental class = 54.833
   b) Control class = 56.167

3) Total deviations standard of pre-test for both two classes are 11.074
   a) Experimental class = 11.780
   b) Control class = 10.478

4) Total mean scores of post-test for both two classes are 75.167
   a) Experimental class = 77.167
   b) Control class = 73.167

5) Total deviations standard of post-test for both two classes are 8.634
   a) Experimental class = 8.060
   b) Control class = 8.855

6) Total respondents of pre-test and post-test are 120
   a) Experimental class = 60
   b) Control class = 60

7) Total mean scores of pre-test and post-test are 65.333
   a) Experimental class = 66.000
   b) Control class = 64.667
8) Total deviation standards of pre-test and post-test are 13.974

a) Experimental class = 15.065
b) Control class = 12.884

After getting the description of variable students’ reading achievement, the next step was variant analysis using W-state application. Table below is the result of variant analysis.

**Table 4.9**

**The Summary of Variance Analysis Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance Source</th>
<th>Total of Square (JK)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (DF/DK)</th>
<th>Average of Square (RK)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F-Critis at 5% level</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test (A)</td>
<td>11603.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11603.333</td>
<td>118.415</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (B)</td>
<td>53.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.333</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>Not Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A*B)</td>
<td>213.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213.333</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>Not Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dalam</strong></td>
<td>11366.667</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>97.989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23236.667</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the variant analysis above, it could be concluded that:

1) Total of square (JK) from test (A) is 11603.333, group is 53.333, interaction (A*B) is 213.333, **dalam** is 11366.667, and total is 23236.667

2) Degree of Freedom (DK) from test (A) is 1, group (B) is 1, interaction (A*B) 1, **dalam** is 116, and total is 119.

3) Average of square (RK) from test (A) is 11603.333, group is 53.333, interaction (A*B) is 213.333, **dalam** is 97.989.
4) From the variant analysis result, it could be concluded that factor A was significance, factor B was not significance, and interaction between factor A and B was not significance in level 5%, so the calculating can not be continued with analysis interaction AB.

D. Grand Analysis

During the implementation of CPR game the students of experimental class were very excited doing this game. It is because they fell free to express the word they read. It is possible one students to another have different gesture which they are created by themselves. The implementation of this game can not be conducted optimally. It is caused by some factors. Some of them, the students are still confused to create the gesture and they are shy to express some words through their gesture. Beside that the important facilities are not available in experimental class, such as projector. The projector of this class was broken and it has not repaired yet. So, it gives a little affect of students’ understanding to do step by step of CPR game.

Before analyzing the data of the research result, the researcher gives some criteria related to the students score in pre-test and post-test both two classes, experimental class and control class.
The criteria can be drawn as follow.

81-100 (very good)
61-80  (good)
41-60  (medium)
21-40  (sufficient)
0 -20  (poor)

Table 4.10
The Lowest and Highest Score of Pre-Test of Experimental Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test for Experimental Class</th>
<th>The Lowest Score</th>
<th>The Highest Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.11
The Lowest and Highest Score of Post-Test of Experimental Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Test for Experimental Class</th>
<th>The Lowest Score</th>
<th>The Highest Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.12
The Lowest and Highest Score of Pre-Test of Control Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test for Control Class</th>
<th>The Highest Score</th>
<th>The Lowest Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13
The Lowest and Highest Score of Post-Test of Control Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Test for Control Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lowest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test for Control Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of pre-test in experimental class shows that the lowest score is 20 and the highest score is 75. The first score can be rated poorly and the second score include good criterion. The average of pre-test score is 54.83, it is includes medium criterion.

The lowest score of post-test in experimental class is 65, it includes good criterion and the highest score is 90, it belongs to very good criterion. The average of post-test score is 77.16, it is includes good criterion.

The students’ score of pre-test in control class shows that the lowest score is 25 and the highest score is 70. Based on the criteria that have been formulated above, the lowest score include sufficient criterion and the highest score include good criterion. The average of pre-test score is 56.16, it is includes medium criterion.
The students’ score of post-test in control class, the lowest score is 55 and the highest score is 85. The first score includes medium and the second score is very good. The average of post-test score is 73.16, it is includes good criterion.

The following is the table of pre-test post-test control group design. Research design can be drawn as follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R (Experiment)</th>
<th>O₁</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>O₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R(Control)</td>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After conducting pre-test and post-test, the researcher got the data of students’ average in experimental class and control class as shown on table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R (Experiment)</th>
<th>54.83</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>77.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R(Control)</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increasing of average score of pre-test and post-test score in experimental class and the increasing of average score of pre-test and post-test score in control class can be shown in the table below.
The Average Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test both Experimental Class and Control Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average score of Experimental and Control Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>56,16</td>
<td>73,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>54,83</td>
<td>77,16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before conducting CPR game in experimental class, the students reading achievement is low. They are not interested and be lazy to read the English text. Some of them read the text shortly, without trying to understand the content of the text itself. They do not use their sense utterly.

After conducting the treatment by using CPR game, the students feel enjoy to read and understand the text. This game encourages the students to motivate themselves and their partner. Most of the students use their gesture optimally, to make them and their partner easy to understand the text. In pairs, both of students help each other to master what content they are being read. It is shown in the step of Question and Answer session. In this turn, the first student ask to their partner and their partner
answer it, and on the contrary. The students are motivated to read the text more. So that, they get a good understanding in both material and text. It can be proven by improving students’ reading achievement after being taught by using CPR game.

The students’ condition of control class before the experimental class being taught by using CPR game is the same as the students’ condition of experimental class. Some students were noisy, they also did not pay attention. Moreover they were chatting each other.

The students’ condition of control class after the experimental class being taught by using CPR game is same as the students’ condition of control class before the experimental class being taught by using CPR game. Some students read the text without understand the meaning of the word. In other side, they have a good understanding about the material after conducting teaching learning material.

E. Discussion of the Research Findings

This research conducted to know the effectiveness of CPR game as a learning method to teach reading. This game was chosen based on the condition of students in the researched school. The students are difficult to understand English text, it make them not interested and be lazy to read the text. Moreover, some of them are noisy and chatting each other while teaching learning process.
Learning outcome can be influenced by some factors such as environment, instrumental, physiology, and psychology. It can be drawn as follow.

1. Environment

   Related to this factor, natural condition and social condition affect the object of the research.
   a. Natural condition

       While doing research, MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan is being built musholla in the school. Sometimes the students can not focus in teaching learning process.
   b. Social condition

       The social condition in MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan is good, because the location is close to MI, Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan, MA Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan, village hall, and mosque. The relationships among those institutions are good. They support each others. As an example, the school organizes the Isro’ Mi’roj which held in the mosque.

2. Instrumental
   a. Curriculum

       MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan uses KTSP in teaching learning process.
b. Infrastructure

Infrastructure at MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan is good enough, but it still needs some facilities to support teaching learning process in classroom. In this case, there are some projector can not used, such as in experimental class. The projector is broken, it has not repaired yet.

c. Teacher

There are two English teachers in MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan, Mr. Hasan and Mr. Aliem. Mr. Hasan starts to teaches English in this school from 1985 until now, whereas Mr. Aliem from July 2016.

3. Physiology

Students’ condition of MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan physically and mentally is good. There is no disability student in this school.

4. Psychology

Students’ interest is not good enough, because while teaching English some students give up at the first time. Their mind set about English is difficult subject. Actually they have a good talent in mastering English, but because some factors the have not reach it. So this talent needs to be developed.

From the factors above, there are some factors that affect the students’ learning outcome in MTs Miftahul Huda Raguklampitan, so that the research cannot be conducted
optimally. Some factors are natural condition, infrastructure, and psychology.

Based on the discussion about some factors above, psychologically the students have a good talent in mastering English, but they do not have enough effort to conquer English subject. One way is through reading a text. There are many methods to teach reading, it may use game, song, or another method. In this case, to develop students’ reading skill the researcher uses a game as learning method to teach reading. Many games of reading, one of them is CPR game. This game can attract students’ interest to read the text.

From the analysis of pre-test and post-test score both in experimental class and control class, it can conclude that there are some increasing in students’ reading achievement after giving treatment in experimental class and students’ reading achievement after lecturing in control class. It can be proven based on the data was gained that the mean score of pre-test in experimental class = 54.83 and the mean score of pre-test in control class = 56.16, the mean score of post-test in experimental class = 77.16 and the mean score of control class = 73.16. The range of average scores between pre-test and post-test in experimental class is 23 point. Whereas the range of average scores both pre-test and post-test in control class is 17 point.
In other side, based on the average score in pre-test and post-test both experimental class and control class by using ANOVA the result is there is no significant difference in students’ reading achievement score between experimental class and control class. It is caused by some factors and limitations during the research. Some of them, there is limited time conducting the research, so it makes some students still confused conducting the CPR game. The treatment was done two times. The students are still in adaptation process, so they do not really understand the steps of CPR game.

F. Limitation of the Research

The researcher realizes that this research had not been done optimally. There were constraints and obstacles faced during the research process. Some limitations of this research are as follow.

1. This research was limited at MTs Miftahul Huda Ragulampitan, Batealit, Jepara in the academic year 2016/2017. When the same research is conducted in other school, it is still possible that different result will be gained.

2. Relative short time of research makes this research could not be done maximum. The researcher did the research in such a short time, however this research run well.

Considering all of those limitations, there is a need to do more researches about teaching reading through CPR game. The researcher hopes that there will be more optimal result.