E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 134-149
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

Socio-Affective Support for Confidence and Participation in English Reading

Rini Aprilianti[1], Heri Hidayatullah[2], Aprianoto[3]

[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
E-Mail: riniapr99@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji penerapan dukungan sosio-afektif dalam pembelajaran membaca bahasa Inggris dan perkembangan partisipasi, keterlibatan, kemandirian, serta kepercayaan diri yang dilaporkan dalam penelitian sumber. Penelitian menggunakan intervensi kelas berorientasi tindakan dengan penilaian awal dan akhir, observasi, diskusi kelompok, penguatan positif, dan kegiatan membaca terbimbing. Sumber melaporkan peningkatan profil empat kriteria dari 68,41% menjadi 89,77%, atau selisih 21,36 poin persentase. Artikel mempertahankan angka tersebut sebagai hasil profil kelas yang didokumentasikan, bukan mengubahnya menjadi skor tes pemahaman membaca terstandar. Pembahasan diperdalam dengan penelitian dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika tentang questioning, Listen–Read–Discuss, ECOLA, partner reading, cooperative learning, critical reading, dan strategi membaca berbasis genre. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa dukungan sosial dan emosional paling bermanfaat ketika membantu siswa berani mencoba, berdiskusi, meminta klarifikasi, dan kemudian kembali pada bukti tekstual secara lebih mandiri. Namun, peningkatan kepercayaan diri dan partisipasi tidak boleh disamakan dengan peningkatan pemahaman membaca yang terukur langsung. Guru disarankan memadukan pemerataan partisipasi, umpan balik spesifik, tugas membaca individual, dan pengurangan bantuan secara bertahap agar perkembangan afektif dan kognitif dapat dievaluasi secara terpisah.

Kata kunci: socio-affective strategies; reading confidence; classroom participation; learner independence; reading instruction

E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 134-149
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

Abstract

This study examined socio-affective support in English reading and the reported development of participation, engagement, independence, and confidence in the source classroom research. The action-oriented intervention used initial and later assessments, observation, group discussion, positive reinforcement, and guided reading activities. The source reports an increase in its four-criterion classroom profile from 68.41% to 89.77%, a difference of 21.36 percentage points. The article retains these values as the documented classroom-profile outcome rather than relabeling them as a standardized reading-comprehension score. The discussion is strengthened through studies by English Education lecturers at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika on questioning, Listen–Read–Discuss, ECOLA, partner reading, cooperative learning, critical reading, and genre-based reading strategies. The findings indicate that social and emotional support is most defensible when it helps learners attempt answers, discuss interpretations, seek clarification, and then return to textual evidence with greater independence. However, increased confidence and participation should not be treated as direct evidence of improved comprehension. Teachers are encouraged to combine equitable participation, specific feedback, individual reading tasks, and gradual withdrawal of assistance so that affective development and reading performance can be evaluated separately.

Keywords: socio-affective strategies; reading confidence; classroom participation; learner independence; reading instruction

LATAR BELAKANG

Reading comprehension is an active process in which learners coordinate word recognition, sentence-level interpretation, background knowledge, inference, and monitoring in order to construct meaning from a text. Classroom success therefore depends on more than willingness to pronounce written words. A learner can read aloud confidently while misunderstanding a passage, or understand a passage while remaining reluctant to speak publicly. This distinction is central to the present study because the source reports changes in participation, engagement, independence, and confidence alongside reading activity. These indicators are educationally important, but

they should remain analytically distinct from demonstrated comprehension (Snow, 2002; Palincsar & Brown, 1984).

The social environment can affect whether learners expose their understanding to examination. Students who anticipate embarrassment or harsh public correction may avoid answering even when they have a tentative interpretation. Such avoidance reduces opportunities to test meaning, receive feedback, and repair misunderstanding. Foreign-language anxiety research shows that apprehension can interfere with language processing and performance, while supportive classroom interaction can make participation more manageable (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). Socio-affective support is therefore pedagogically relevant when it creates access to the cognitive work of reading rather than replacing that work with reassurance alone.

UNDIKMA scholarship provides a strong local basis for interpreting this relationship between reading strategy and participation. Hidayatullah (2016) used questioning to improve comprehension of expository texts through explaining, brainstorming, grouping, discussion, leading, concluding, and presenting. Terasne et al. (2018) and Tawali (2021) reported classroom-action results with Listen–Read–Discuss, while Sumarsono et al. (2020) examined partner reading. Across these studies, reading is treated as a process that benefits from structured interaction rather than as an isolated encounter between learner and text.

The local literature also demonstrates that affective variables should be considered without collapsing them into comprehension. Haerazi et al. (2019) examined contextual teaching and learning in relation to motivation, and Haerazi and Irawan (2020) investigated ECOLA in relation to both motivation and self-efficacy. Their work is especially relevant because it keeps a reading-performance measure alongside learner variables instead of assuming that favorable motivation or confidence automatically equals comprehension. The present article follows that construct-sensitive approach when interpreting the source profile.

A second regional strand emphasizes cognitively explicit reading activity. Imran and Hidayatullah (2020) identified learner needs for critical-reading syllabi and

materials, while Hanan et al. (2020) applied genre-based directed reading thinking activities and examined reading comprehension in relation to critical thinking. Imran et al. (2019) similarly connected Think–Talk–Write with reading comprehension and critical thinking. These studies suggest that participation becomes educationally meaningful when learners are required to predict, question, locate evidence, compare interpretations, or justify conclusions rather than simply speak more often (Iye, R, et.al, 2022).

The source study begins from a classroom problem of reluctance and dependence. Learners were described as hesitant to participate, concerned about making mistakes, and inclined to rely on teachers or peers during reading activities. Socio-affective support was used to make participation more accessible through group discussion, positive reinforcement, and guided activity. The central instructional question is therefore not whether emotional support is useful in the abstract, but whether it helps learners take a more active and increasingly independent role in constructing meaning from a text.

Confidence requires careful definition in this context. Confidence may refer to willingness to read aloud, to offer an answer, to persist with an unfamiliar sentence, or to explain an interpretation in front of peers. These situations are related but not identical. Likewise, independence should not be defined as the absence of all assistance. A learner who identifies a problem, asks a focused clarification question, and then completes the task may demonstrate more strategic independence than a learner who silently guesses. The article therefore interprets confidence and independence through observable reading actions rather than as fixed personal traits.

The study reports a classroom profile that increased from 68.41% to 89.77%. Because the profile combines four criteria—participation, engagement, independence, and confidence—the percentage should not be treated as a standardized comprehension score. The educational contribution lies in the positive trajectory of the documented classroom indicators and in the instructional arrangement that accompanied it. The present article deepens that contribution by comparing it with

relevant UNDIKMA reading research and by specifying the additional evidence needed to connect socio-affective development with independent comprehension more directly.

METODE

The research used an action-oriented classroom intervention as documented in the source study. Evidence included initial and later assessment records, classroom observations, and an account of supportive reading activities. Group discussion, positive reinforcement, and teacher support for participation formed part of the instructional arrangement. The article retains the participant context and instructional procedures at the level documented in the source and does not add an experimental comparison group, new participants, or new data-collection events.

The principal quantitative result was a percentage-based four-criterion classroom profile. The criteria concerned participation, engagement, independence, and confidence during reading-related activity. The initial profile was reported as 68.41%, and the later profile as 89.77%. These values were treated as descriptive outcomes on the source measure. They were not relabeled as standardized reading-comprehension test scores, because the source does not document them as such. Classroom observations were used as contextual evidence about learner activity and the implementation of socio-affective support.

Analysis compared the two reported aggregate percentages and examined the instructional meaning of the documented change. The difference was calculated as 21.36 percentage points. Interpretation distinguished among observed participation, confidence-related behavior, independence, and performance on a text-based task. No significance test, learner-level score, or component percentage was invented. The discussion also considered plausible alternative explanations such as repeated practice, familiarity with classroom routines, teacher guidance, and other changes occurring during an evolving instructional process.

Student identifiers were not reproduced. Authorship was retained according to the source manuscript, and no undocumented ethics approval code, funding statement, consent procedure, or additional observation was introduced. Recommendations

concerning individual comprehension checks, confidence calibration, reduced assistance, and transfer tasks are presented as future instructional or research extensions rather than as procedures already completed in the original study.

HASIL DAN PEMBAHASAN

The source reports that the four-criterion classroom profile increased from 68.41% before the later stage of socio-affective instruction to 89.77% afterward. The absolute difference is 21.36 percentage points. This is a substantial descriptive change on the source measure, but its meaning depends on what the profile represents. The result concerns the combined classroom indicators documented in the study and should not be translated automatically into an equivalent gain in standardized reading comprehension.

Tabel 1. Reported reading-related classroom profile and interpretive boundary

Evidence	Reported value	Interpretation
Initial classroom profile	68.41%	Composite profile reported in the source study.
Later classroom profile	89.77%	Favorable development on the same reported profile.
Difference	+21.36 pp	Absolute percentage-point change; not a relative percentage gain.
Profile criteria	4 criteria	Participation, engagement, independence, and confidence; no separate component percentages were invented.

Observation records complement the percentage pattern by describing favorable development in participation, engagement, independence, and confidence. These

observations matter because they show how learners approached reading activity rather than only the final aggregate value. At the same time, the source does not provide separate numerical trajectories for each criterion. A class can become more participatory without every learner becoming equally independent, and greater confidence can coexist with continuing comprehension difficulty. Table 1 therefore separates the numerical result from its interpretive boundary.

The reported trajectory is educationally meaningful because reluctance and dependence can restrict opportunities to practise comprehension. A learner who does not risk an answer gives the teacher little evidence about what has or has not been understood. Supportive responses can make an initial attempt more likely and allow misunderstanding to become visible. The instructional value of socio-affective support therefore lies in enabling participation in reading processes—such as predicting, clarifying, locating evidence, and explaining meaning—not simply in producing a more comfortable classroom.

Hidayatullah's (2016) questioning study offers a directly relevant local comparison. Its teaching sequence combined explanation and brainstorming with grouping, discussion, leading, concluding, and presenting, and it reported improvement in comprehension of expository texts. The present study differs because its reported outcome is a composite classroom profile rather than a direct reading-test result. Nevertheless, both studies show why questioning and discussion are most productive when they require learners to articulate how they understand a text. Socio-affective safety can help students enter that exchange, while the question itself keeps the activity cognitively anchored.

Listen–Read–Discuss research at UNDIKMA reinforces the importance of connecting support with text-based work. Terasne et al. (2018) reported gains in reading comprehension of report texts using LRD, and Tawali (2021) found improvement with LRD in descriptive-text comprehension. In those studies, interaction occurred around an explicit reading target and was evaluated with reading tests and observation. The comparison clarifies the evidential boundary of the present source: its positive profile

supports a claim about classroom functioning, while a separate comprehension task would be needed to make an equivalent performance claim.

Peer interaction can create a lower-risk space for constructing an interpretation before public response. Sumarsono et al. (2020) found that partner reading improved reading comprehension and emphasized the opportunity for learners to express prior knowledge during pair discussion. This principle is relevant to socio-affective support because a peer can provide time, clarification, and a second perspective. However, cooperation should maintain individual responsibility. If one learner supplies the answer while the other agrees, the group may complete the task successfully without showing that both readers understood the passage.

A gradual transfer of responsibility is therefore essential. Learners can first discuss a difficult sentence with a partner, then explain another part individually, and later approach a comparable passage with fewer prompts. Independence is visible when support changes from supplying an answer to helping the learner choose a strategy. Palincsar and Brown (1984) demonstrate the value of scaffolded comprehension routines that move learners through predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. In the present context, socio-affective support should make those actions possible while progressively reducing dependence on external guidance.

Positive reinforcement is most useful when it identifies a productive reading action. Praise such as 'good' may make the interaction pleasant but gives little information about what the learner should repeat. More informative feedback can acknowledge that the learner returned to the text, checked a reference word, reconsidered an inference, or supported an answer with a sentence from the passage. Hattie and Timperley (2007) emphasize feedback that clarifies current performance and the next step. Such specificity links confidence-building to the development of reading strategy rather than to approval alone.

The distinction between confidence and comprehension can be illustrated by public oral reading. A student may hesitate because of pronunciation concerns even when the passage is understood, whereas another may read fluently without being able

to explain the main idea. Anxiety research warns that public evaluation can affect language performance (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). Teachers should therefore avoid using willingness to read aloud as the sole evidence of comprehension. Silent reading, short written explanations, or evidence-based responses can provide alternative ways of demonstrating understanding while confidence develops.

The present percentage profile also benefits from criterion-level interpretation. Participation, engagement, independence, and confidence can change at different rates. A learner may participate more frequently but still rely heavily on peer prompts; another may become more independent while remaining quiet in whole-class discussion. A composite percentage can summarize a classroom trend but can conceal these patterns. Black and Wiliam (1998) argue for assessment that supports instructional decisions, and Fredricks et al. (2004) similarly distinguish behavioral, emotional, and cognitive aspects of engagement. Reporting each criterion separately would make subsequent action cycles more diagnostic.

Haerazi and Irawan's (2020) ECOLA study is especially useful because it examined reading comprehension in relation to motivation and self-efficacy rather than treating those variables as interchangeable. Their results showed relationships among strategy use, reading achievement, and learner variables, including an interaction with self-efficacy. This supports a cautious interpretation of the present findings: confidence can shape how learners approach reading, but confidence should be measured as a learner belief or response, while comprehension should be demonstrated through performance on text-based tasks.

Contextual teaching research at UNDIKMA makes a similar point. Haerazi et al. (2019) examined reading comprehension in relation to motivation and showed the value of connecting reading tasks with meaningful contexts. The present source can extend that logic by asking whether learners become more willing to participate because tasks are socially safer, more relevant, or more manageable. These are plausible pathways, but the composite profile does not isolate them. Future classroom observations should

record what learners actually do when a supportive condition is introduced—for example, whether they initiate responses, return to the text, or persist after difficulty.

Critical-reading research provides another safeguard against equating participation with understanding. Imran and Hidayatullah (2020) found that UNDIKMA students expressed needs for critical-reading goals and cooperative learning, while Hanan et al. (2020) demonstrated the value of genre-based directed reading thinking activities in relation to critical thinking. These studies emphasize operations such as activating background knowledge, making predictions, and evaluating texts. A supportive classroom should therefore preserve intellectual demand: learners need space to disagree, justify, revise an interpretation, and recognize uncertainty instead of being rewarded only for speaking confidently.

Imran et al. (2019) similarly connected Think–Talk–Write with reading comprehension and critical thinking. The sequence is relevant because it distributes cognitive and social demands across stages. A learner first develops an interpretation, discusses it, and then records a response. A socio-affective reading lesson can use the same principle without claiming to implement the identical method. Private thinking time before discussion, for example, can protect hesitant learners from immediate public exposure while still requiring each student to construct an initial meaning rather than wait for a confident peer to answer.

Information Search research by Firman and Hasby (2020) provides an additional local example of an explicit reading-performance outcome. Their pre-experimental study used a reading test and reported a significant effect of the strategy on comprehension. The contrast with the present study is instructive: a strategy can be evaluated through performance when the assessment directly samples comprehension, whereas a classroom profile primarily describes participation and learner response. Both sources are valuable, but they answer different questions. Future work should retain the socio-affective profile and add a brief individual comprehension measure instead of replacing one with the other.

Cooperative-learning research by Hanan and Tawali (2024) is relevant to the interest and participation side of the present article. Their classroom-action study reported improved interest, attentiveness, enjoyment, and participation during reading comprehension lessons. Such findings support the pedagogical plausibility of social arrangements that make reading activity more approachable. At the same time, interest is not identical to confidence, and neither is identical to comprehension. The strongest regional synthesis therefore treats social support, motivational response, and reading performance as related outcomes that should be documented separately.

More recent UNDIKMA work on reading materials also shows why support must remain connected to substantive thinking. Hanan et al. (2024) developed task-based extensive-reading materials designed to promote critical thinking through evaluating arguments, comparing perspectives, and synthesizing information. These activities illustrate the kind of cognitive demand that socio-affective support should enable. A learner should feel sufficiently secure to question a claim or admit uncertainty, but the instructional endpoint remains an evidence-based interpretation rather than confidence for its own sake.

The C-BIM model studied by Haerazi et al. (2021) adds a culturally responsive dimension. It integrated reading, writing, and critical thinking through culture-based instructional materials and reported both outcomes and perceptions. The relevance to the present study lies in aligning learner experience with skill evidence. Perceptions help explain whether learners find the activity meaningful or accessible, while performance measures show what they can do. A future version of the present classroom inquiry could similarly pair the four-criterion socio-affective profile with a short text task that requires identification of information, inference, and justification.

Text selection is another condition that can influence confidence and participation. An inaccessible passage may generate silence even in a supportive classroom because learners lack the linguistic resources to enter the task. Conversely, an overly familiar passage may create confidence without demanding substantial comprehension. Teachers should therefore calibrate text difficulty and provide selective

support for essential vocabulary or background knowledge while leaving enough uncertainty for learners to construct meaning themselves. Support should remove avoidable barriers, not remove the reading problem.

A useful diagnostic routine is to compare confidence with evidence. Before answering, a learner can indicate how certain an interpretation feels; afterward, the learner identifies the sentence or information that supports it. Four patterns become possible: high confidence with strong evidence, low confidence with strong evidence, high confidence with weak evidence, or low confidence with weak evidence. The present study did not conduct such calibration, but its confidence focus makes the procedure a logical next step. It would help teachers support hesitant but capable readers while also challenging confident responses that lack textual support.

The reported increase of 21.36 percentage points should also be interpreted within the limits of action-oriented classroom research. Repeated exposure, teacher attention, changes in task difficulty, familiarity with expectations, peer relationships, and the focal socio-affective strategies can all contribute to the observed trajectory. The study therefore provides a credible account of local classroom improvement, but it does not estimate an isolated causal effect. This limitation does not diminish the practical value of the work; it defines the level at which the findings should inform teaching.

Future classroom cycles can strengthen the evidence without becoming methodologically burdensome. The teacher can retain the four criteria but score them separately, add a short individual reading task using an unfamiliar passage, and record the amount of assistance required. A delayed task can examine whether learners maintain comprehension after the immediate intervention, while an observation record can show whether previously hesitant students initiate questions, locate evidence, and revise interpretations. These additions would clarify whether improved classroom participation develops into more independent and transferable reading performance.

Overall, the local literature converges on a useful principle: reading develops through structured interaction with texts, but different instructional studies measure

different outcomes. Hidayatullah (2016), Terasne et al. (2018), Tawali (2021), Sumarsono et al. (2020), Haerazi and Irawan (2020), Hanan et al. (2020), and other UNDIKMA scholars provide evidence for questioning, discussion, cooperative routines, strategy instruction, and affective variables. The present study contributes a socio-affective profile to that conversation and is strongest when its positive trajectory is interpreted as improved access to reading activity rather than as an unrestricted claim of comprehension gain.

KESIMPULAN

The source reports a favorable increase from 68.41% to 89.77% in a four-criterion reading-related classroom profile covering participation, engagement, independence, and confidence. Socio-affective support is most defensibly understood as a means of enabling learners to attempt, discuss, clarify, and increasingly manage reading tasks. The profile should not be equated automatically with standardized comprehension gains. Teachers should connect encouragement and peer support with textual evidence, individual checks, and gradual withdrawal of assistance. Future cycles should report each criterion separately and examine comprehension on unfamiliar texts.

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

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

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

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

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 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., & Tawali, T. (2024). Implementing cooperative learning to enhance students' interest in reading skill. JUPE: Jurnal Pendidikan Mandala, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.58258/jupe.v9i2.6858

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

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hidayatullah, H. (2016). Utilizing questioning technique to improve the students' comprehension skills on expository texts. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 3(1), 15–20. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v3i1.2425

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Imran, F., Firman, E., & Raudhatunnisa, S. (2019). 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

Iye, R., Abbas, A., & Masiri, R. (2022). Kemampuan Berbahasa Anak dengan Menggunakan Metode Bercerita pada TK Ya Bunayya Hidayatullah Muna Barat. Jurnal Lentera Anak, 3(2), 56-64.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. Language Learning, 44(2), 283–305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. Cognition and Instruction, 1(2), 117–175. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1

Snow, C. E. (2002). Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension. RAND Corporation.

Sumarsono, D., Hanan, A., Bagis, A. K., & Ayumaryani, P. P. (2020). Partner reading; Pumping up the students' reading comprehension? JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(3), 297–306. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i3.2596

Tawali, T. (2021). Improving students' reading comprehension through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy. Jurnal Paedagogy, 8(3), 322–327. https://doi.org/10.33394/jp.v8i3.3852

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