E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-3258
Halaman 236-245
Volume 2 Nomor 2 Tahun 2025

Improving Eleventh-Grade Students' Reading Achievement Through The Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) Strategy At SMAN 1 Gerung

Nurul Dian Farhaini[1], Muhamad Suhaili[2], M. Asrul Hasby[3]
[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
E-Mail: dianfarhaini13@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji perubahan capaian membaca bahasa Inggris setelah penerapan strategi Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) pada 38 siswa kelas XI SMAN 1 Gerung tahun ajaran 2024/2025. Penelitian menggunakan rancangan pra-eksperimental satu kelompok dengan pretest dan posttest. Data berasal dari skor tes membaca sebelum dan setelah pembelajaran LRD. Rata-rata skor meningkat dari 61,05 menjadi 68,10, dengan peningkatan 7,05 poin. Skripsi melaporkan nilai t sebesar 7,26, sementara perhitungan ulang berdasarkan jumlah selisih dan kuadrat selisih menghasilkan sekitar 7,35. Kedua nilai menunjukkan perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik pada taraf 5%. Namun, tanpa kelompok pembanding, peningkatan tidak dapat diatribusikan secara pasti hanya pada strategi LRD. Temuan ini mendukung penelitian lanjutan menggunakan kelompok kontrol dan instrumen yang tervalidasi.

Kata kunci: Listen–Read–Discuss; prestasi membaca; pemahaman membaca; pembelajaran bahasa Inggris; pra-eksperimen

Abstract

This study examined changes in English reading achievement following Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) instruction among 38 eleventh-grade students at SMAN 1 Gerung in the 2024/2025 academic year. A one-group pretest–posttest pre-experimental design was used. Reading scores were collected before and after LRD instruction. The reported mean increased from 61.05 (SD = 10.46) to 68.10 (SD = 9.18), a gain of 7.05 points. The thesis reported a t statistic

of 7.26; recalculation from the documented sums of paired differences yielded approximately 7.35. Both indicate a statistically significant within-group difference at the 5% level. Because there was no comparison group, this change cannot be attributed exclusively to LRD. The findings suggest a promising classroom practice while underscoring the need for controlled replication and clearer documentation of test validity.

Keywords: Listen–Read–Discuss; reading achievement; reading comprehension; EFL; pre-experimental design

INTRODUCTION

Reading is central to English as a foreign language (EFL) learning because learners must identify information, infer meaning, and integrate textual ideas with prior knowledge. Comprehension involves active construction rather than passive word recognition (Grabe, 2009; Snow, 2002). In secondary education, reading tasks also require learners to distinguish main ideas, supporting details, and the purposes of texts (Nation, 2009).

Effective reading instruction connects the reader, the text, and the learning environment. Explicit support can help students develop comprehension strategies, especially when linguistic resources are limited (Duke & Pearson, 2002; Grabe, 2009). Classroom discussion may further allow students to explain interpretations, compare evidence, and resolve misunderstanding (Palincsar & Brown, 1984).

Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) provides an instructional sequence that begins with an oral introduction, proceeds to individual reading, and concludes with collaborative discussion. Manzo and Casale (1985) proposed this sequence as a way to support students before and during their engagement with text. The initial listening stage establishes relevant concepts; reading then allows students to verify or extend those concepts; discussion encourages clarification and reflection (Manzo & Casale, 1985; Snow, 2002).

From a pedagogical perspective, this sequence resembles scaffolded reading instruction. A teacher's introduction can activate relevant background knowledge, while post-reading discussion creates opportunities for meaning negotiation (Duke

& Pearson, 2002; Palincsar & Brown, 1984). Nevertheless, a plausible theoretical mechanism does not by itself establish the effectiveness of a particular intervention in a specific classroom (Creswell, 2014).

Indonesian EFL studies have emphasized the value of purposeful, interactive reading instruction. Research involving English education scholars associated with Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika has also examined collaborative reading activity: Terasne, Permana, and Setianingsih (2020) investigated Students Teamwork Learning in relation to reading comprehension. Although teamwork learning is not identical to LRD, the study offers a locally relevant perspective on peer-supported comprehension (Terasne et al., 2020).

At SMAN 1 Gerung, the source thesis described eleventh-grade students who had difficulty understanding English texts and answering comprehension questions. The study therefore investigated whether reading achievement changed after LRD was introduced in one class. Its central question was whether students' posttest scores differed from their pretest scores. Because the research employed a one-group design, the present article interprets the results as within-group improvement rather than definitive evidence of a causal effect (Creswell, 2014; Shadish et al., 2002).

METHOD

Research design. The study used a pre-experimental one-group pretest–posttest design, represented as O_1–X–O_2, where O_1 is the pretest, X is LRD instruction, and O_2 is the posttest. The design permits a within-group comparison but cannot isolate the intervention from maturation, testing effects, or other changes over time (Shadish et al., 2002).

Participants and setting. The study population comprised 383 eleventh-grade students at SMAN 1 Gerung in the 2024/2025 academic year. One class of 38 students (19 female and 19 males, approximately 16–17 years old) was selected by a class lottery as described in the thesis. The class is called XI F in the sampling description and XI Science 5 elsewhere in the source; this article does not assume

that the two designations identify different groups. Research involving English education scholars at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika offers further context: Hidayatullah (2016) examined questioning and discussion in reading instruction; Hanan et al. (2020) investigated genre-based directed reading activities; and Haerazi and Irawan (2020) examined ECOLA in relation to motivation and self-efficacy. These approaches differ from LRD, but each highlights the importance of active comprehension processes.

Instrument. Students completed reading assessments before and after instruction. The thesis describes reading indicators including identifying main ideas, retrieving information, recognizing synonyms, identifying generic structure, and determining text purpose. However, its instrument descriptions differ: one section mentions seven multiple-choice pretest questions, another five essay questions, and another a 25-item multiple-choice scale. Accordingly, the exact item format and comparability of pretest and posttest cannot be independently verified from the available report.

Procedure. The researcher administered a pretest, implemented LRD instruction, and then administered a posttest. During the listening phase, the teacher introduced text content, potentially with a graphic organizer. Students subsequently read the selection, compared it with the introduction, and discussed interpretations in small groups of approximately three to four learners. The thesis does not provide sufficiently precise treatment duration and fidelity data to support stronger implementation claims.

Data analysis. The original research summarized means, standard deviations, and a paired-samples t statistic. For transparency, the present article also recalculated the paired t statistic from the thesis's reported sum of differences ($\Sigma D = 268$), sum of squared differences ($\Sigma D^2 = 3{,}184$), and sample size ($n = 38$). No new observations or replacement scores were introduced. The significance test concerns change within the participating class, not a causal comparison against an untreated group.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reading achievement before and after LRD. The source reported a pretest mean of 61.05 (SD = 10.46) and a posttest mean of 68.10 (SD = 9.18). The mean gain was 7.05 points. These values correspond to the total pretest score of 2,320 and posttest score of 2,588 across 38 students.

Table 1. Summary of the pretest and posttest results

Measure	Pretest	Posttest
Students	38	38
Mean	61.05	68.10
Standard deviation	10.46	9.18
Total score	2,320	2,588

The mean gain of 7.05 points indicates that the class performed better on the assessment after LRD instruction. The thesis reported $t = 7.26$ and compared it with a critical value of 1.68 at the 5% level. Recalculation from the reported paired-difference totals produces $t(37) \approx 7.35$, a small discrepancy that does not change the inference of a statistically significant within-group difference. The discrepancy should be checked against the original calculation sheet before final submission.

Individual scores reveal that the overall improvement did not occur uniformly. Some students achieved substantially higher posttest scores, whereas a few scores stayed unchanged or declined. For example, student N7 changed from 76 to 72 and N9 from 72 to 64, while N23 increased from 56 to 72. These contrasting patterns caution against treating the average gain as an identical benefit for every learner.

The observed gain is consistent with the rationale behind LRD: teacher-led listening can establish context, reading enables individual engagement with the written material, and discussion can provide opportunities to clarify uncertainties (Manzo & Casale, 1985; Duke & Pearson, 2002). Nevertheless, the test results do not identify which stage of LRD contributed most to the change.

The discussion component is also compatible with interactive accounts of comprehension. Peer exchanges may prompt learners to articulate an interpretation,

notice a misunderstanding, and reconsider textual evidence (Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Snow, 2002). These processes are reasonable explanations to investigate, rather than mechanisms directly measured by the current test scores.

The findings can be situated alongside Indonesian collaborative-learning research. Terasne et al. (2020) studied teamwork learning and reading comprehension, highlighting a related interest in collaborative literacy activities among UNDIKMA-associated researchers. The present study differs in its specific LRD sequence and one-group design, so the two should not be interpreted as direct replications (Terasne et al., 2020).

The source also reports a reduction in score dispersion, from an SD of 10.46 to 9.18. Although this suggests that posttest scores were somewhat more clustered, it does not demonstrate that achievement gaps narrowed for all students. Reading performance can depend on language knowledge, background knowledge, and task demands, which should be considered in subsequent assessment (Grabe, 2009; Nation, 2009).

Several methodological constraints limit the strength of the conclusion. Without a comparison group, practice effects, concurrent instruction, and maturation remain possible alternative explanations (Shadish et al., 2002). Moreover, inconsistent descriptions of the instrument make it difficult to judge whether the two assessments were equivalent. The thesis does not provide clear reliability coefficients, evidence of instrument validation, or sufficiently detailed implementation records (Creswell, 2014). Related findings from local English education research provide useful comparisons. Rusmawan et al. (2024) examined small-group discussion for EFL reading comprehension, while Firman et al. (2021) documented secondary learners' reading difficulties in relation to phonemic awareness. Hanan et al. (2020) considered critical thinking in guided reading, and Hidayatullah (2016) studied questioning as a comprehension support. These studies provide pedagogical context, not evidence that the present one-group design establishes a causal LRD effect.

Taken together, the results support a statistically significant increase in measured reading achievement within this particular class. They do not establish

that LRD alone caused the increase, nor do they establish that the same result would occur across other schools or cohorts. A future controlled study with clearly documented instruments would provide stronger evidence for instructional decisions.

Further interpretation of the pretest profile. The source describes a school passing benchmark of 75, which provides useful context for understanding why reading achievement was treated as an instructional concern. However, the study's group mean of 61.05 before the intervention cannot by itself establish how many learners met that benchmark. Similarly, a posttest mean of 68.10 remains below 75, indicating that a statistically significant mean gain need not mean that the class as a whole reached the school benchmark. This distinction between statistical change and educational attainment is important when communicating findings to teachers and school administrators.

Instructional implications should therefore be specific. In the listening phase, the teacher can introduce a short overview of a report text and highlight unfamiliar concepts without supplying all answers. During reading, students can annotate main ideas, identify details, and compare their understanding with the introduction. In the discussion phase, groups can justify answers by referring to textual evidence and report unresolved questions to the class. Such a sequence is consistent with the original LRD model (Manzo & Casale, 1985) and with guidance on explicit comprehension instruction (Duke & Pearson, 2002). These are proposed classroom applications, not separately tested components in the thesis.

Assessment design is particularly important for replication. A clear test blueprint should specify the number of items, item types, text genres, reading indicators, score weighting, and marking procedures for both assessments. If two different test forms are used, their equivalence should be demonstrated. Reporting item analysis and reliability would help readers determine whether score changes reflect improved comprehension rather than differences in difficulty or scoring. Research design guidance similarly recommends careful alignment of measures with the constructs under investigation (Creswell, 2014; Shadish et al., 2002).

Finally, the school-based context should guide interpretation. The results concern one class of 38 students and the particular reading tasks administered during the 2024/2025 academic year. Their performance cannot automatically be generalized to all 383 eleventh-grade students at the school, much less to students in different educational settings. Reading instruction should remain sensitive to learners' vocabulary, textual familiarity, and opportunities for purposeful interaction (Grabe, 2009; Nation, 2009).

CONCLUSION

Among 38 eleventh-grade students at SMAN 1 Gerung, the mean reading achievement score increased from 61.05 before LRD instruction to 68.10 afterward. The documented paired-score results indicate a statistically significant within-group difference. This finding is compatible with the potential usefulness of combining listening, reading, and discussion in EFL lessons. However, the absence of a comparison group and inconsistencies in the reported test instrument mean that a causal effect cannot be established.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers may consider LRD as a structured way to prepare learners for reading, support comprehension, and facilitate discussion. Future researchers should compare LRD with an appropriate control condition, report treatment duration and implementation fidelity, validate equivalent test forms, and document students' informed consent and confidentiality procedures. The original research record should also be consulted to resolve the instrument-description and t-statistic discrepancies.

REFERENCES

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), What research has to say about reading instruction (3rd ed., pp. 205–242). International Reading Association.

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

Grabe, W. (2009). Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice. Cambridge University Press.

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

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

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

Manzo, A. V., & Casale, U. P. (1985). Listen-read-discuss: A content reading heuristic. Journal of Reading, 28(8), 732–734.

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing. Routledge.

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

Rusmawan, P. N., Nurhalimah, Perdana, M. A., & Setianingsih, T. (2024). Enhancing EFL students' reading comprehension by applying small group discussion at higher vocational education. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 4(1), 232–243. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i1.1817

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference. Houghton Mifflin.

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

Terasne, T., Permana, D., & Setianingsih, T. (2020). The effect of Students Teamwork Learning (STWL) towards students' reading comprehension. Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature, 35–44.