E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 98-116
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

Listen–Read–Discuss and Critical Reading Development in a Vocational English Classroom

Dilla Pradina[1], M. Asrul Hasby[2], K. Dedy Sandiarsa S.[3]

[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
e-mail: dillaapradinaa@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji penerapan strategi Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris kejuruan serta perkembangan hasil yang berkaitan dengan membaca kritis. Penelitian tindakan kelas dua siklus melibatkan 35 siswa kelas XI TPTU SMKN 3 Mataram melalui tahap perencanaan, tindakan, observasi, dan refleksi. Data yang didokumentasikan terdiri atas angket tertutup berbasis skala Likert dan lembar observasi kelas. Penelitian sumber melaporkan peningkatan nilai rata-rata dari 49,93 pada siklus I menjadi 69,29 pada siklus II setelah perbaikan materi dan pelaksanaan pembelajaran. Karena nilai tersebut berasal dari instrumen angket, artikel ini menafsirkannya sebagai perkembangan respons siswa terkait proses membaca kritis, bukan sebagai skor tes objektif kemampuan membaca kritis. Pembahasan diperdalam melalui penelitian dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika tentang LRD, critical reading, reading comprehension, critical thinking, ECOLA, G-BDRTA, dan bahan ajar berbasis tugas. Hasil menunjukkan perkembangan kelas yang positif dan menegaskan pentingnya hubungan antara penjelasan awal, pembacaan individual, diskusi berbasis bukti, serta asesmen yang selaras dengan konstruk. Guru disarankan mempertahankan LRD tetapi menambahkan tugas individual yang meminta siswa mengidentifikasi klaim, memilih bukti tekstual, dan memberikan alasan pada teks baru.
Kata kunci: Listen–Read–Discuss; critical reading; vocational English; classroom action research; reading assessment

Abstract

This study examined the implementation of Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) in a vocational English classroom and the development of outcomes related to critical reading. The two-cycle classroom

action research involved 35 Grade XI TPTU students at SMKN 3 Mataram through planning, action, observation, and reflection. Documented evidence consisted of closed-ended Likert-scale questionnaires and classroom observation sheets. The source study reports an increase in the mean score from 49.93 in Cycle I to 69.29 in Cycle II after revisions to materials and classroom implementation. Because these values were generated by a questionnaire, the present article interprets them as development in learners' reported critical-reading-related responses rather than as an objective critical-reading performance test. The discussion is strengthened through research by English Education lecturers at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika on LRD, critical reading, reading comprehension, critical thinking, ECOLA, G-BDRTA, and task-based reading materials. The findings indicate a favorable classroom trajectory and highlight the need to connect teacher input, individual reading, evidence-based discussion, and construct-aligned assessment. Teachers are encouraged to retain LRD while adding individual tasks requiring learners to identify claims, select textual evidence, and justify judgments on unfamiliar texts.
Keywords: Listen–Read–Discuss; critical reading; vocational English; classroom action research; reading assessment

LATAR BELAKANG

Reading in an EFL classroom involves more than recognizing vocabulary and locating explicitly stated information. Learners must integrate linguistic cues, background knowledge, sentence relationships, and the overall purpose of a text. Critical reading adds another layer because readers must examine claims, identify relevant evidence, notice assumptions, compare interpretations, and decide whether a conclusion is warranted. Literal comprehension and critical evaluation are therefore related but not interchangeable. A learner can accurately report what a text says without yet being able to evaluate how convincingly the text supports its message (Grabe & Stoller, 2014; Facione, 2015).

This distinction has direct implications for instruction and assessment. If the learning goal is critical reading, classroom questions need to elicit more than recall, and the assessment should require some observable form of reasoning. Learners might identify a claim, locate supporting evidence, explain an inference, compare two interpretations, or justify why one conclusion is stronger than another. Self-report

evidence can still be useful because it describes how learners perceive their reading practices or participation, but it should not be treated as equivalent to independently demonstrated critical-reading performance (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

The Listen–Read–Discuss sequence offers a practical structure for organizing such work. In the listening stage, the teacher can introduce the topic, activate background knowledge, and establish a question. The reading stage gives learners direct access to the written evidence, while the discussion stage allows interpretations to be compared and reconsidered. The sequence is educationally powerful when the stages complement one another rather than duplicate the same explanation. If the listening stage supplies all conclusions in advance, the reading and discussion stages may become confirmation rather than inquiry.

Local research from English Education lecturers at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika (UNDIKMA) provides an especially relevant context for this issue. Terasne et al. (2018) investigated the same LRD strategy in reading comprehension and reported progressive improvement across pre-test and two post-tests. Their study used reading tests and observation, which is important for the present article because it shows how LRD can be evaluated through direct performance evidence. The current study, by contrast, reports questionnaire-based cycle means, so the two studies should be compared at the level of instructional process rather than treated as if their numerical outcomes measured the same construct.

Other UNDIKMA work shows that critical reading can be supported through structured reading routines. Terasne and Sugianto (2019) examined PQ4R in relation to critical thinking and reading comprehension, while Imran et al. (2020) investigated Think–Talk–Write for reading comprehension viewed from critical-thinking skills. Hanan et al. (2020) applied genre-based directed reading thinking activities and found that reading strategy effects should be interpreted together with learners' critical-thinking characteristics. These studies collectively emphasize active prediction, discussion, reflection, and evidence use rather than passive reception of a text.

The design of critical-reading materials is equally important. Imran and Hidayatullah (2020) found that English Education students expressed clear needs for critical-reading goals and showed a preference for cooperative learning in the development of critical-reading syllabus and materials. More recently, Hanan et al. (2024) developed task-based reading materials at UNDIKMA that explicitly required learners to evaluate arguments, compare perspectives, synthesize information, question assumptions, and draw reasoned conclusions. Such findings support the view that critical reading develops when the materials themselves make analytical operations visible.

Research by Haerazi and colleagues further highlights the relationship between reading strategy, learner support, and higher-order thinking. Haerazi and Irawan (2020) reported positive effects of the ECOLA technique on reading comprehension while also examining motivation and self-efficacy. Haerazi et al. (2021) investigated culture-based instructional materials designed to improve reading and writing in relation to critical thinking. Haerazi et al. (2019) likewise showed that contextual teaching can improve reading comprehension while engaging learner motivation. These studies suggest that reading outcomes depend on the interaction of task structure, materials, and learner engagement rather than on a strategy label alone.

The local literature also identifies persistent barriers to reading development. Firman et al. (2021) documented difficulties involving limited reading practice, vocabulary, reading strategies, grammar, and phonemic awareness among secondary learners. Firman and Hasby (2020), working in a vocational-school context, reported improvement in reading comprehension through Information Search, while Hasby and Iswara (2019) examined reading comprehension together with learner motivation. These studies are particularly relevant to the present vocational setting because they show that access to a text and willingness to engage with it may need to be supported before learners can sustain more demanding analytical reading.

The source study at SMKN 3 Mataram was motivated by students' difficulty moving beyond literal reading toward analysis of arguments, authorial purpose, and

evidence. The LRD strategy was used to organize the lesson into an initial orientation, individual engagement with the text, and subsequent discussion. The classroom-action design allowed the teacher to revise materials and implementation after Cycle I. The reported mean increased from 49.93 to 69.29 in Cycle II, indicating a favorable development on the source study's questionnaire-based measure.

The present article therefore has two connected purposes. First, it explains the classroom trajectory without overstating what the questionnaire scores demonstrate. Second, it deepens the pedagogical interpretation by connecting the LRD sequence with UNDIKMA scholarship on reading comprehension, critical thinking, task design, motivation, and critical-reading materials. The study asks what the available evidence supports, how the three stages of LRD can create opportunities for critical engagement, and what additional assessment would be needed to demonstrate independent critical-reading performance more directly.

METODE

The research employed classroom action research with 35 students in Grade XI TPTU at SMKN 3 Mataram. The study was implemented in two cycles organized through planning, action, observation, and reflection. Listen–Read–Discuss functioned as the focal instructional strategy. The second cycle incorporated revisions to the materials and classroom implementation based on reflection from the first cycle. Consequently, the intervention should be understood as an evolving instructional arrangement rather than as a fixed treatment held constant across two measurement occasions (Burns, 2010).

The source manuscript identifies two principal forms of evidence: closed-ended questionnaires using a Likert-type response format and classroom observation sheets. The reported results tables describe questionnaire scores for Cycle I and Cycle II. The present article therefore retains the numerical values as questionnaire-based outcomes and does not relabel them as objective critical-reading test scores. Observation

evidence is used to describe participation, implementation, and changes in the classroom process rather than to create an additional numerical achievement measure.

The quantitative analysis in the present manuscript is descriptive and limited to the values documented in the source. Cycle I produced a reported mean of 49.93 and Cycle II a mean of 69.29, yielding a difference of 19.36 points on the stated measure. No participant-level data, item scores, standard deviations, significance tests, effect sizes, or additional achievement scores were invented. The interpretation therefore focuses on the direction of the classroom trajectory and on the relationship between the intended construct of critical reading and the instrument used to represent development.

The qualitative interpretation was organized around the functional relationship among the three LRD stages. Listening was examined as orientation and background activation; reading as direct engagement with textual information; and discussion as an opportunity to compare, justify, or revise interpretations. The analysis also considered the cycle-to-cycle instructional revisions, the distribution of participation, and the extent to which observed engagement could reasonably support claims about critical-reading development.

Student names and individual records were not reproduced. Authorship and correspondence information follow the supplied manuscript. No undocumented ethics approval code, consent procedure, participant characteristic, or additional data-collection event was introduced during manuscript preparation. Recommendations for performance-based reading assessment and future instructional refinements are presented explicitly as proposals rather than as procedures already completed in the source study.

HASIL DAN PEMBAHASAN

The documented numerical result shows a clear upward trajectory from Cycle I to Cycle II. The questionnaire-based mean increased from 49.93 to 69.29, a difference of 19.36 points. The source associates the later score with revisions to the instructional

materials and classroom implementation. Within the logic of classroom action research, this pattern provides evidence that the revised learning arrangement was experienced more favorably or was more consistent with the measured reading-related responses. It does not, however, establish by itself that learners demonstrated a 19.36-point gain on an independent critical-reading performance test.

Table 1. Reported cycle outcomes and interpretive boundaries

Cycle	Mean	Evidence type	Interpretive boundary
Cycle I	49.93	Closed-ended Likert questionnaire	Represents the reported learner-response outcome; it is not automatically an objective critical-reading score.
Cycle II	69.29	Closed-ended Likert questionnaire	Reflects the revised instructional cycle and the same reported measurement framework.
Difference	+19.36	Descriptive cycle comparison	Shows a favorable trajectory but does not isolate the causal contribution of one LRD component or prove transfer to unfamiliar texts.

Observation	Qualitative	Classroom observation sheets		Supports interpretation of participation and implementation, not an independently scored critical-reading proficiency estimate.

The distinction in Table 1 is central to the article. A questionnaire can capture learners' perceptions of how they approach reading, how useful they find a strategy, or how confident they feel about a reading process. Those responses are educationally meaningful, particularly in action research where the teacher needs evidence about classroom usability. Yet a questionnaire cannot by itself show whether a learner can independently evaluate the quality of evidence in an unfamiliar text. Keeping these forms of evidence separate strengthens rather than weakens the interpretation because it prevents a measurement label from becoming broader than the instrument supports.

The listening stage can be understood as a scaffold that reduces unnecessary entry difficulty. In a vocational English class, unfamiliar terminology, technical context, or the topic itself may consume attention before students can engage with the intended analytical question. A concise teacher explanation can activate relevant knowledge and clarify the purpose of reading. The risk is that the teacher may also supply the interpretation that students are later expected to discover. Effective listening input should therefore establish a problem or question while leaving the evaluative work open for learners.

The reading stage is where learners obtain direct access to the evidence that should constrain their interpretation. Critical reading requires a return to the text: readers need to distinguish a claim from support, notice qualifiers, identify what is stated versus inferred, and examine whether a conclusion follows from the information provided. Grabe and Stoller (2014) emphasize the strategic nature of reading, and the local evidence from Firman et al. (2021) shows that limited strategy use is one of the difficulties faced by secondary EFL readers (La Djamudi, N, et. al. 2024). LRD is most

productive when the reading phase requires students to perform specific operations rather than simply finish the passage.

The discussion stage then has the potential to make reasoning visible. Classroom discussion research shows that comprehension benefits when learners explain, challenge, and elaborate ideas rather than merely exchange answers (Murphy et al., 2009). In the present context, a discussion can ask students to identify the sentence that supports an interpretation, explain why another reading is less convincing, or state what evidence would be needed before accepting a claim. These moves transform group talk from participation alone into evidence-oriented reading activity.

The strongest local comparison is Terasne et al. (2018), who also used LRD and documented reading-comprehension development through pre-test and post-test evidence. Their mean scores progressed from 69.5 in the pre-test to 72.2 in the first post-test and 78.25 in the second post-test. The similarity lies in the staged LRD routine and the classroom-action orientation; the difference lies in measurement. Their study employed a reading test, whereas the present source reports questionnaire means. This difference should not be treated as a weakness to hide. Instead, it demonstrates why the same strategy can be investigated with complementary instruments that answer different questions.

The present cycle-to-cycle improvement can also be compared with work by Haerazi et al. (2019), who used classroom action research to improve reading comprehension through contextual teaching while tracking learner motivation. Both studies show the value of revising instruction in response to classroom evidence. At the same time, motivational or perceptual improvement should remain conceptually distinct from direct comprehension performance. A learner may become more engaged with the reading routine before that engagement is fully reflected in an independently scored analytical task.

Hasby and Iswara (2019) provide another relevant local perspective because they examined reading comprehension together with motivation. Their work reinforces the practical need to design reading activities that learners are willing to enter and sustain.

For the present LRD intervention, the listening and discussion stages may make the reading task more approachable, but the educational objective should not stop at enjoyment or perceived usefulness. The strategy becomes more defensible when increased participation is linked to progressively more demanding textual reasoning.

In a vocational-school setting, the work of Firman and Hasby (2020) is particularly pertinent. Their Information Search study involved vocational learners and used a reading test to investigate the effect of an active search-oriented strategy. The common instructional principle is that students should do something purposeful with information rather than remain passive recipients. LRD can extend this principle by requiring learners not only to locate information but also to discuss what that information supports and what remains uncertain.

UNDIKMA research on critical thinking in reading provides a more direct conceptual bridge. Terasne and Sugianto (2019) examined PQ4R in relation to critical-thinking ability in reading comprehension, and Wahab and Terasne (2020) investigated inquiry-based learning for critical thinking in reading. Both approaches give the learner a problem, question, or reflective demand that guides reading. LRD similarly benefits from an explicit question before reading; otherwise, the sequence can become listen to information, read the same information, and discuss a predetermined answer. The critical dimension comes from what learners are required to judge and justify.

Imran et al. (2020) showed that Think–Talk–Write can connect reading comprehension with critical-thinking activity. Their sequence is pedagogically comparable to LRD because it moves learners across individual cognition and social articulation. The important lesson is not that the two strategies are interchangeable, but that transitions among thinking, text engagement, talk, and written or oral justification can make reasoning observable. For the present study, a short individual written justification after discussion would be a useful way to determine whether the group process resulted in independent understanding.

Hanan et al. (2020) similarly reported that Genre-Based Directed Reading Thinking Activities affected reading comprehension when viewed from critical-thinking

skills. Their use of genres is particularly relevant because the purpose of critical reading changes with text type. Evaluating a recommendation, interpreting an explanation, following a technical procedure, and judging an argument require different kinds of evidence. A vocational LRD lesson should therefore specify what kind of text is being read and what constitutes a strong response for that genre.

The critical-reading materials work of Imran and Hidayatullah (2020) further supports this interpretation. Their needs analysis showed that learners valued critical-reading goals and that cooperative learning was a preferred model. The present study operationalizes both concerns at classroom level: LRD makes cooperation part of the reading process, while the critical-reading objective requires learners to move beyond literal understanding. However, cooperation is only pedagogically useful when each learner still has responsibility for interpreting the text.

This individual responsibility matters because a group can produce a convincing answer even when only one learner has performed the analytical work. Cooperative learning research therefore emphasizes accountability and distribution of participation (Gillies, 2016). Within LRD, roles can help: one learner identifies the claim, another locates supporting evidence, another tests an alternative interpretation, and another summarizes the group's reasoning. Rotating these responsibilities can prevent the discussion stage from becoming a performance by the most confident reader.

Observation data are especially valuable for identifying this distribution. A classroom may appear active because several groups are talking, but activity volume does not reveal who is reading, who is explaining, and who is only listening. Short observation indicators such as referring to the text, offering a reason, asking for clarification, challenging an interpretation, and contributing an independent response would provide richer evidence about how the LRD stages function. Such indicators could be added in a future cycle without changing the basic strategy.

The improvement from Cycle I to Cycle II also needs to be interpreted as the outcome of an evolving instructional package. The source notes revisions to the materials and implementation. Action research is designed for precisely this kind of

responsive adaptation, but it means that the higher Cycle II score cannot be attributed to discussion alone, to listening alone, or to a single material change. Familiarity with the routine, clearer instructions, more accessible texts, teacher feedback, and changes in group organization may have contributed together (Burns, 2010).

This limitation is pedagogically informative. Teachers often need to improve a whole lesson rather than isolate one variable. The appropriate claim is therefore that the revised LRD implementation was accompanied by a more favorable questionnaire-based outcome and classroom process. A subsequent experimental study could isolate particular components if that becomes the research purpose. For current classroom decision-making, documenting what was changed between cycles is more useful than forcing a single-cause explanation that the design cannot support.

The role of cognitive load also deserves attention. A critical-reading task can fail because students lack analytical skill, but it can also fail because too many lower-level language difficulties consume working attention. Sweller (1988) distinguishes task difficulty from unnecessary processing burden. In practice, a teacher can preteach a small number of indispensable terms or provide concise contextual information while preserving the central reasoning demand. Support should remove access barriers without performing the critical judgment for the learner.

This point aligns with Firman et al. (2021), who identified vocabulary, grammar, limited strategy use, and low reading practice among the sources of secondary learners' reading difficulty. If learners cannot establish basic propositional meaning, asking them immediately to evaluate evidence may produce superficial discussion. LRD can respond by using the listening phase strategically: clarify what is necessary to enter the text, then require students to verify, extend, or question that initial understanding during reading and discussion.

Haerazi and Irawan (2020) offer a useful comparison through the ECOLA technique, which emphasizes extending concepts through language activity and was reported as effective for reading comprehension while considering learner motivation and self-efficacy. The common principle with LRD is that comprehension is

strengthened when learners actively transform textual information through language. The present study can therefore be interpreted as part of a broader local tradition of interactive reading instruction, while retaining its distinctive listen-read-discuss sequence.

Haerazi et al. (2021) extend the local conversation from strategy to materials. Their culture-based instructional model was designed to improve reading and writing while addressing critical thinking. This matters because no strategy can compensate fully for materials that offer only literal questions. If the text and task demand simple retrieval, learners have little reason to evaluate evidence or compare perspectives. Critical-reading development requires an alignment among material, question, discussion, and assessment.

Hanan et al. (2024) make that alignment even more explicit in their task-based reading materials for extensive reading at UNDIKMA. The materials required learners to evaluate arguments, compare perspectives, synthesize information, question assumptions, and draw reasoned conclusions. Those task types provide a concrete model for deepening LRD. The teacher's listening input can introduce the problem, the reading phase can supply the sources, and the discussion phase can require students to defend a judgment against competing evidence.

Assessment should mirror those operations. A more direct critical-reading task could present a short unfamiliar passage and require four observable responses: identify the central claim, select the most relevant textual support, judge whether the evidence is sufficient, and explain an alternative interpretation or limitation. Scoring could distinguish accuracy of claim identification, relevance of evidence, quality of reasoning, and recognition of uncertainty. Such an assessment would complement rather than replace the questionnaire because the two instruments serve different purposes.

Formative assessment principles support this combination. Black and Wiliam (1998) argue that assessment becomes formative when evidence is used to decide the next instructional step. In the present context, questionnaire responses can indicate

whether learners understand or value the LRD routine, observation can show how participation is distributed, and a short performance task can reveal which analytical operations remain difficult. Together, the three sources would produce a more actionable picture than any one source alone.

A teacher can also make evidence use a recurring classroom norm. Instead of asking only, 'What is the answer?', the teacher can ask, 'Which sentence supports that answer?', 'What makes that evidence relevant?', 'What information is missing?', or 'What would someone who disagrees point to?' These prompts are brief, but they change the intellectual demand of the discussion. Over time, the teacher can reduce the prompts and expect students to initiate evidence-based justification independently.

The discussion stage should not require consensus as its only indicator of success. Critical reading sometimes leads to more than one defensible interpretation, particularly when a text is incomplete, persuasive, or ambiguous. Learners can demonstrate development by identifying the limits of available evidence and explaining why a conclusion remains tentative. This kind of disciplined disagreement is more consistent with critical reading than rapid agreement produced by a dominant peer or by deference to the teacher.

Text selection is another interpretive condition. A passage that is linguistically overwhelming may prevent learners from reaching the analytical goal, while a passage that is too familiar may invite recall rather than evaluation. Grabe and Stoller (2014) emphasize the importance of matching reading purposes and text demands. In a vocational classroom, texts can be selected because they require consequential reading—for example, comparing two technical explanations, evaluating a safety recommendation, or identifying whether a procedure is adequately justified—without assuming that such exact materials were used in the original cycles.

The vocational context therefore adds practical value to the critical-reading objective. Students may eventually need to read instructions, product information, reports, workplace notices, or technical recommendations where misunderstanding has consequences. Critical reading in this setting is not merely an academic exercise. It

involves asking whether information is complete, whether a recommendation is supported, and whether different pieces of evidence are consistent. LRD can provide a manageable classroom bridge toward these practices when each stage preserves responsibility for textual judgment.

Transfer remains an unresolved question. The reported improvement occurred within the instructional cycles, and the source does not establish whether students used the same analytical processes with a new text, a different genre, reduced teacher support, or after a delay. A follow-up assessment should therefore change the passage while preserving the target operation. If learners continue to identify claims, select evidence, and justify conclusions under those conditions, the evidence for a more flexible critical-reading capability would be stronger.

Learner perception still deserves a place in this process. A student who reports that LRD makes a difficult text more approachable may be identifying an important change in access to learning. Perceptions can influence persistence, willingness to discuss, and use of strategies. The mistake would be to dismiss self-report entirely or, at the opposite extreme, to treat it as direct proof of critical-reading mastery. The source study is most informative when its questionnaire trend is retained for what it measures and supplemented in future work with performance evidence.

The local UNDIKMA literature strengthens this balanced interpretation. LRD research (Terasne et al., 2018), critical-reading syllabus development (Imran & Hidayatullah, 2020), TTW and G-BDRTA studies (Imran et al., 2020; Hanan et al., 2020), inquiry-based reading (Wahab & Terasne, 2020), ECOLA (Haerazi & Irawan, 2020), C-BIM (Haerazi et al., 2021), vocational Information Search (Firman & Hasby, 2020), and task-based critical-reading materials (Hanan et al., 2024) all point toward active, structured engagement with text. None of them makes the present questionnaire outcome equivalent to a reading test; rather, they provide design principles for strengthening the next cycle.

The study's contribution is therefore best described as a bounded classroom account of how a revised LRD implementation was accompanied by a positive change

in a critical-reading-related questionnaire outcome and classroom process. It contributes practical evidence that teacher orientation, individual reading, and peer discussion can be organized as a coherent sequence in vocational English. Its next methodological step is not to abandon the strategy but to align the evidence more closely with the intended construct through individual, unfamiliar-text tasks that require explicit textual justification.

For teachers, the most defensible implication is to preserve the three-stage simplicity of LRD while sharpening the cognitive demand within each stage. Listening should establish a purpose rather than supply conclusions; reading should require learners to inspect evidence; and discussion should require justification, comparison, and revision of interpretations. When these functions are supported by observation and construct-aligned assessment, LRD can move from an engaging classroom routine toward a more explicit pedagogy of critical reading.

KESIMPULAN

The two-cycle LRD intervention was accompanied by an increase from 49.93 to 69.29 on the source study's questionnaire-based outcome and by favorable classroom observations. The result supports a positive local instructional trajectory but should not be interpreted as an independently verified gain in critical-reading proficiency. LRD is most educationally defensible when listening establishes a problem, reading directs learners to textual evidence, and discussion requires justified interpretation. Teachers should retain perception and observation data while adding individual performance tasks on unfamiliar texts. Future cycles should examine claim identification, evidence selection, reasoning quality, and transfer after teacher support is reduced.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Burns, A. (2010). Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners. Routledge.

Facione, P. A. (2015). Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts. Insight Assessment.

Firman, E., & Hasby, M. A. (2020). The effect of Information Search toward students' reading comprehension. JUPE: Jurnal Pendidikan Mandala, 5(6), 67–72. https://doi.org/10.58258/jupe.v5i6.1625

Firman, E., Haerazi, H., & Dehghani, S. (2021). Students' abilities and difficulties in comprehending English reading texts at secondary schools: An effect of phonemic awareness. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 1(2), 57–65. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v1i2.613

Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39–54. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2014). Teaching reading for academic purposes. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), Teaching English as a second or foreign language (4th ed., pp. 189–205). National Geographic Learning.

Haerazi, H., Dehghani, S., Rachmawati, U., & Irwansyah, D. (2021). The C-BIM model in improving reading, writing, and critical thinking skills: Outcome and perception. Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengkajian Ilmu Pendidikan: e-Saintika, 5(2), 152–167. https://doi.org/10.36312/esaintika.v5i2.503

Haerazi, H., & Irawan, L. A. (2020). The effectiveness of ECOLA technique to improve reading comprehension in relation to motivation and self-efficacy. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 15(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i01.11495

Haerazi, H., Prayati, Z., & Vikasari, R. M. (2019). Practicing contextual teaching and learning (CTL) approach to improve students' reading comprehension in relation to motivation. English Review: Journal of English Education, 8(1), 139–146. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v8i1.2011

Hanan, A., Muhlisin, M., & Suadiyatno, T. (2020). Actuating reading comprehension through Genre-Based Directed Reading Thinking Activities (G-BDRTA) viewed from critical thinking skills. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(4), 402–411. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i4.2778

Hanan, A., Terasne, T., & Permana, D. (2024). Developing task-based reading materials to improve EFL students' critical thinking in the extensive reading class. Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities, 7(4), 2570–2588. https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v7i4.41364

Hasby, M. A., & Iswara, T. (2019). The effectiveness of Memories and Draw towards students' motivation in reading comprehension. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 6(1), 55–63. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v6i1.2352

Imran, F., Firman, E., & Raudhatunnisa, S. (2020). Applying Think-Talk-Write (TTW) in the teaching of reading comprehension in relation to students' critical thinking skills. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 7(1), 57–63. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v7i1.1439

Imran, F., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). EFL critical reading syllabus and materials for students of the English Department. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 7(1), 51–56. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v7i1.2747

La Djamudi, N., Iye, R., & Abida, F. I. N. (2024). Survival Language of Teenagers in Coastal Families in Sandi Village, Wakatobi District. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 12(1), 136-152.

Murphy, P. K., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Soter, A. O., Hennessey, M. N., & Alexander, J. F. (2009). Examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 101(3), 740–764. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015576

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Terasne, T., Sugianto, N., Wahab, A., & Ulfa, M. (2018). Improving students' reading comprehension through Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) strategy at MA Nurussabah

Praya Tengah. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 5(2), 113–120. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v5i2.2310

Terasne, T., & Sugianto, N. (2019). The effectiveness of using Preview, Question, Read, Reflect, Recite and Review (PQ4R) toward students' critical thinking ability on reading comprehension. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 6(1), 35–40. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v6i1.2348

Wahab, A., & Terasne, T. (2020). The effect of inquiry-based learning on students' critical thinking in reading. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 7(1), 26–30. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v7i1.2690