

## The Effectiveness of Using Listen-Read-Discuss (Lrd) Strategy Towards Students Reading Comprehension at Four Semester FKIP in Batanghari University Jambi

Kartika Dewi

Universitas Batanghari Jambi

Correspondence Email: kartika.dewi@unbari.ac.id

**Abstract:** This research is conducting four Semester FKIP in Batanghari University. The purpose of this study is to determine the students' to find out the effectiveness of using Listen – Read – Discuss (LRD) strategy towards students' reading comprehension. This type of research is quantitative. Setting of the research conducted at Four Semester with class consists of 13 students FKIP in Batanghari University Jambi. Data collecting technique was used to find out the research. This research used a test instrument with multiple choice questions with total 25 items. The test consists of Narrative Text. The technique of data analysis is calculation the students 'score and analyzing using SPSS. Based on the findings and discussion of this research, the researcher had conclusion about effectiveness of using the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) on students' reading comprehension. The researchers compared the average free test class was scores found that the average 76, 92. And while the average post-test score in the control class was 79, 53 with the LRD strategy were higher than the students' posttest scores in the control class without being taught using the LRD strategy. It means that that using this Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy can be increased the reading comprehension.

**Keywords:** Reading Comprehension, Listen-Read-Discuss Strategy

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini dilaksanakan pada semester empat FKIP di Universitas Batanghari. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui efektivitas penggunaan strategi Listen – Read – Discuss (LRD) terhadap pemahaman bacaan mahasiswa. Jenis penelitian ini adalah kuantitatif. Latar penelitian dilaksanakan pada semester empat dengan kelas yang terdiri dari 13 mahasiswa FKIP di Universitas Batanghari Jambi. Teknik pengumpulan data digunakan untuk mengetahui hasil penelitian. Penelitian ini menggunakan instrumen tes dengan soal pilihan ganda dengan total 25 soal. Tes tersebut terdiri dari teks naratif. Teknik analisis data adalah menghitung skor mahasiswa dan menganalisis menggunakan SPSS. Berdasarkan temuan dan pembahasan penelitian ini, peneliti memiliki kesimpulan tentang efektivitas penggunaan Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) terhadap pemahaman bacaan mahasiswa. Peneliti membandingkan nilai rata-rata kelas tes bebas dengan nilai rata-rata 76, 92. Sedangkan nilai rata-rata post-test pada kelas kontrol dengan strategi LRD adalah 79, 53 lebih tinggi dibandingkan nilai post-test siswa pada kelas kontrol tanpa diajarkan menggunakan strategi LRD. Hal ini berarti bahwa dengan menggunakan strategi Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) ini dapat meningkatkan pemahaman bacaan.

**Kata Kunci:** Pemahaman Bacaan, Strategi Listen-Read-Discuss

### INTRODUCTION

Students can learn new things by reading. Books, periodicals, journals, and the internet are still useful resources for learning that call on the capacity to read and understand English-language content, even in the present day. Students who read will have more chances to advance their English language proficiency. This explanation is backed by Harmer (2007), Reading is helpful for language learning. The more students read, the better their comprehension. It suggests that reading is a language-learning exercise that calls on pupils to understand what they have read. The reading proficiency of students is crucial. The ability of students to comprehend what they read must be improved. For reading activities, reading comprehension is crucial since without it, readers won't be able to locate and comprehend what they read.

The goal of reading comprehension is to learn about and comprehend what is read. (quoted in Snowball, 2005) Pardo. Understanding what has been read is known as reading comprehension, and it is an active thinking process that relies on students' past knowledge and experience in addition to their comprehension abilities. From this vantage point, it can be

concluded that reading comprehension is crucial for pupils as they cannot decipher the meaning of a book if they do not comprehend what they read.

The researcher use LRD (Listen – Read – Discuss) strategy. Listen - Read - Discuss (LRD) is an effective strategy in teaching reading in order for the students to improve their reading comprehension.

According to Burner ( cited in Manzo & Casale, 1985), Effective literacy, which includes learning how to be an effective schoolteacher, needs a way to get started, a way to keep going, and a way to cover it from getting arbitrary or deceived. meanwhile, McKenna and Stahl( as mentioned in Karin, 2007 10) revealed that Listen - Read - Discuss (LRD) is a precious tutoring approach when the student’s vocabulary is not sufficient to understand the content of the reading.

The advantage of employing Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) include aiding scholars in understanding information delivered verbally, according to Manzo and Casale( 1995). Can helps them expand their previous knowledge of textbooks, and engages floundering compendiums in class conversations.

## **THEORITICAL REVIEW**

### **The Purpose of Reading**

According to Grabe William and L. Fredrika (2002), the categories of purpose for reading are:

- a. Reading to search for simple information.  
This exertion is frequently used in reading, so it can be considered as a type of reading skill. When we do a reading hunt, the destination can be a specific term, a bit of specific knowledge, or a many general expressions.
- b. Reading to skim quickly.  
This strategy is used to snappily prognosticate where the information in the textbook is located to form a general idea and can apply the anthology's reading appreciation chops.
- c. Reading to learn from texts.  
The anthology must be suitable to identify the main ideas of paragraphs, figure paragraph outlines, and arrange textbook grounded on what has been read.
- d. Reading to integrate information.  
Is that reading can combine information grounded on connected and reciprocal textbooks, connected to each other and form a structural frame of the textbook to accommodate information from numerous sources.
- e. Reading to write and reading to critique texts  
Read these styles must have the capability to dissect, and be suitable to compose the contents of a textbook.
- f. Reading for general comprehension.  
The general meaning of the main ideas requires words to be reused snappily, and there's collaboration of the process within a limited time.

### **Reading Comprehension**

According to Grabe and Stoller (2013), The capability to understand and interpret information in textbook is appertained to as reading appreciation. To epitomize, the anthology attempts to understand and interpret the information included in the textbook during the complex process of reading appreciation, which involves the anthology and the pen over the textbook. In the view of Healy (2002), Reading Comprehension is the process of understanding written words, understanding the content being read, and constructing meaning from the textbook. He stated that reading is a purposeful and involved act.

### **Technique of Reading Comprehension**

According to Maxwell (1970) in Diaz, S., & Laguado, J. (2013: 138), there are two reading comprehension techniques:

1. Skimming  
Skimming is a fashion of reading written textbook snappily to understand the crucial idea or named substance. In addition, the skimming system can also speed up the content analysis process and advance scholars' reading skill.
2. Scanning  
Scanning defined as the capacity to snappily discover specific data and details, similar as dates, names, places, among others, is seen as a desirable reading skill and is tutored in utmost development reading courses.

### **Components of Reading Comprehension**

According to King and Stanly (1998: 331), reading comprehension consists of the following elements:

1. Finding Factual information  
Factual information questions that involve understanding 5W1H (what, when, who, why, where, and how) words are typically provided to students.
2. Finding main ideas.  
Typically, this paragraph's opening key concept mirrors the text's overall main theme.
3. Finding the meaning of vocabulary in context  
This is significant because, while reading the initial section of the text, it aids pupils in understanding the paragraph's substance.
4. Identifying references  
Repeating phrases or sentences in English will come off as uncomfortable and uninteresting; instead, it is preferable to refer to a synonym that has the same meaning.
5. Making inference
6. It is evident from the text's stated and implicit elements that readers must be able to draw inferences from what they have read. It's a skill of inference.

### **Definition of Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy**

Listen, Read, Discuss (LRD) is a comprehension technique that helps pupils build up prior knowledge before reading a piece of content, according to Manzo and Casale (1985). Basic reading comprehension can be taught to kids who are unable to read entire books on their own. In order to make it simpler for them to comprehend the content during the reading stage, students who have not previously studied the subject might do so during the listening stage. According to McKenna (2002: 94), Listen-Read-Discuss is a technique designed especially for struggling readers. Before, during, and after the reading process in a learning format are the three phases that make up this approach.

By giving more details in the preceding section, the instructor ensures that the pupils comprehend the material. During section talks, it keeps students' thoughts active. By following the reading process and applying the Listen-Read-Discuss technique, children who struggle with reading might benefit from having a better understanding of the material. They will discuss the target language options with others. Additionally, employing the Listen Read Discuss technique might help.

### **Benefits of the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Method**

One advantage of employing the Listen-Read-Discuss method, which was first proposed by Manzo and Casale (1995), is that it

1. can help pupils comprehend the information that is being delivered.
2. By supplying past information, it can help children become more proficient readers.
3. may help difficult readers have class discussions.

According to Manzo's argument, it is assumed that listening, reading, and discussing aid pupils in verbally understanding the information. Furthermore, this approach, as outlined by McKenna (2002), has been acknowledged as a successful way to enhance subject learning and reading comprehension. According to the study, one advantage of the LRD technique for students is that it enables them to expand on existing information.

### **METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH**

The goal of this study's quasi-experimental design was to determine how the read, cover, recall, retell method affected reading comprehension. Creswell (2008) defines an experiment as a test of a concept (method or process) to see if it affects a dependent variable or an outcome. Additionally, according to Creswell (2000), a quasi-experimental design is one in which a single class is used and given a pre- and post-test.

#### **Population and Sample**

Ary et al. (2010) define a population as all members of distinct classes of individuals, events, or things with distinct limits. The population in this study is the 14 students enrolled in Batanghari University Jambi's Four Semester FKIP. Quasi sampling is the sampling strategy used by the researcher to determine the sample for this investigation. According to Creswell (2000), a quasi-experimental design is a type of research design.

#### **Research Instrument**

Tests were used as the primary tool for data collecting. A test is a tool used to evaluate knowledge, abilities, or individual performance in a certain subject, claims Brown (2000: 384). The test employed in this study consists of narrative text and multiple-choice questions. This assessment uses the Listen-Read-Discuss method to gauge students' reading comprehension of narrative materials. Main concepts (themes), phrases/sentences in the content, supporting details, omitting unwritten information, supporting ideas, and language in the content are some tests frequently used to gauge reading comprehension. After evaluating many factors and facets of reading comprehension on students' narrative texts, the researcher established category classification to group students' results. The following categories are used in this study.

**Table 1.** Qualifications of Score

No	Qualifications	Score
1	Excellent	90 – 100
2	Good	80 – 89
3	Fair	70 – 79
4	Poor	60 – 69
5	Very poor	0 - 59

*Adapted from: (Brown, 2004:287)*

The pre-test and post-test scores may be computed as follows, and the outcomes of both tests are determined using the same formula:

$$\text{score} = \frac{\text{the number correct answer}}{\text{total number of item}} \times 100$$

(Gay, 1981)

### Technique of Data Collection

In order to assess the degree of students' reading comprehension using the LRD technique, the researcher gathered pre-test and post-test results from two distinct courses. The SPSS version 21 was used to analyze the data.

### FINDINGS DAN DISCUSSION

The study was carried out at Batanghari University in Jambi over the four semesters of FKIP. To ascertain the efficacy of employing the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) technique and to ascertain reading comprehension, the researcher carried out this study for three weeks. The researcher administered the test twice using multiple-choice questions. Reading comprehension is one of the assessments. The pre-test and post-test results of each of the 18 students in each class served as the source of the data for this study.

The researcher was given a pretest at the first appointment before beginning therapy. The pre-test and post-test are completed on May 30, 2024. These students all took the test. Students were given an essay question by the researcher on the subject of rainbows.

**Table 2.** The Result of Pre-Test

No	Name of Students	Score
1	Student 1	88
2	Student 2	88
3	Student 3	88
4	Student 4	84
5	Student 5	84
6	Student 6	76
7	Student 7	72
8	Student 8	72
9	Student 9	64
10	Student 10	64
11	Student 11	64
12	Student 12	60
13	Students 13	96
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>
	<b>Average</b>	<b>76,92</b>

According to the findings above, there were twelve students in the pre-test. Three students had a score of 88, one student received 76, two students received 72, and three students received 64. Additionally, just one student received a score of 60. The final score was 904 points. It may be inferred from the computation that the pre-test mean scores were 35 and 3. Table 3 displays the pre-test mean scores for the control group.

**Table 3.** The Means Scores of Pre-Test

No	Score (Mx)	Frequency (My)	Total (Mx My)
1	96	1	96
1	88	3	264
2	76	1	76
3	72	2	144
4	64	3	192
5	60	1	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>∑ M x = 456</b>	<b>∑ M y = 11</b>	<b>∑ (M x M y) = 832</b>

$$M = (\sum X) / N$$

$$M = 100 / 13$$

M = 76,9

Table 3 shows that the overall score was 456, with the lowest and greatest scores in various score intervals 0-96. One student received a mean score of 96, while three students received a score of 88. One student was among the 76. Two students made up 72. Three pupils received a score of 64. And there was just one pupil for 60. Thus, the mean scores had a total frequency of 30. In the meanwhile, 83.3 was the overall score. After gathering the data, the researcher used the scoring scale qualifications shown in the table below to categorize each score:

**Table 4. Distribution Pre-test**

Qualifications	Score interval	Pre-test Total score	Frequency
Excellent	90-100	0	0
Good	80-89	516	6
Fair	70-79	292	4
Poor	60-69	124	2
Very poor	0-59	48	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>980</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Mean</b>			<b>75,38</b>
<b>Median</b>			<b>76</b>
<b>Std. Deviation</b>			<b>12.42</b>
<b>Minimum</b>			<b>48</b>
<b>Maximum</b>			<b>88</b>

No student in the pre-test class obtained scores in the excellent category, six in the good category, four in the fair category, two in the bad category, and one in the very poor category, according to the distribution statistics above. The pretest section above has a median value of 76, an average value of 75.38, a minimum value of 48, a maximum value of 88, and a standard deviation of 12.42, according to the statistical distribution value.

**Table 5. The Frequency Distribution Free-test**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	48	1	7.7	7.7
	60	1	7.7	15.4
	64	1	7.7	23.1
Valid	72	3	23.1	46.2
	76	1	7.7	53.8
	84	3	23.1	76.9
	88	3	23.1	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

Free-test frequency for 13 students is shown in Table 5. A presentation of 7.7% was attained by a score of 48, 7.7% by a score of 60, 7.7% by a score of 64, 23.1 percent by a score of 72, 7.7% by a score of 76, 23.1 percent by a score of 84, and 23.1% by a high score of 88.

**Table 6. The Result of Post-Test**

No	Name of Students	Score
1	Student 1	98
2	Student 2	88
3	Student 3	100
4	Student 4	84
5	Student 5	84

6	Student 6	80
7	Student 7	84
8	Student 8	88
9	Student 9	84
10	Student 10	88
11	Student 11	72
12	Student 12	84
13	Students 13	84
<b>Total</b>		<b>1034</b>
<b>Average</b>		<b>79,53</b>

The post-test results showed that the lowest score was 72 and the best score was 100. The control class's overall post-test score was 1034. The mean score of the pre-test was 79, 53, according to the calculations. Table 7 displays the mean score for the post-test.

**Table 7.** The Means Scores of Post-Test

No	Score ( M x)	Frequency ( M y)	Total ( M x M Y)
1	72	1	72
2	84	5	420
3	88	3	264
4	98	1	98
5	100	1	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>∑ M x = 442</b>	<b>∑ M y = 11</b>	<b>∑ ( M x M y) = 954</b>

$$M = (\sum X) / N$$

$$M = 954 / 13$$

$$M = 73,3$$

The lowest and greatest scores in a certain score interval between 0 and 100 are shown in Table 7. One student received a mean score of 72, five students received an 84, three students received an 88, one student received a 98, and one student received a 100. Thirteen was the overall frequency. The post-test class mean score was 73, 3.

After gathering the data, the researcher used the scoring scale qualifications shown in table 8 below to categorize each score:

**Table 8.** Distribution Post-test Score

Qualifications	Score interval	Post-test	
		Total score	Frequency
Excellent	90-100	196	2
Good	80-89	848	10
Fair	70-79	72	1
Poor	60-69	0	0
Very poor	0-59	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>1.116</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Mean</b>			<b>85,84</b>
<b>Median</b>			<b>84</b>
<b>Std. Deviation</b>			<b>6,85</b>
<b>Minimum</b>			<b>72</b>
<b>Maximum</b>			<b>100</b>

Two students in the post-test class obtained scores in the excellent category, ten in the good category, one in the fair category, and none in the low or very poor categories, according to the distribution statistics above.

The post section above has a median value of 84, an average value of 85, a minimum value of 72, a maximum value of 100, and a standard deviation of 6.85, according to the statistical distribution value.

**Table 9.** The Frequency Distribution Post-Test

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	72	1	7.7	7.7
	80	1	7.7	15.4
	84	6	46.2	61.5
Valid	88	3	23.1	84.6
	98	1	7.7	92.3
	100	1	7.7	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

The frequency of post-tests for 13 students is shown in Table 9; a score of 72 yielded a presentation of 7.7%, a score of 80 was 7.7%, a score of 84 was 46.2%, a score of 88 was 23.1 percent, a score of 98 was 7.7%, and a high score of 100 was 7.7%.

**Table 10.** The Result of Normality Test

		Free Test	Post Test
N		13	13
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	75.38	85.85
	Std. Deviation	12.420	6.854
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.218	.240
	Positive	.155	.223
	Negative	-.218	-.240
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.785	.865
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.569	.442

The normality test determines whether or not the data are normally distributed. The pre-test and post-test significance scores were determined to be 0.569 and 0.442, respectively. Neither of the significance ratings is less than 0.5. The pretest and posttest score data exhibit a normal distribution, according to these findings.

**Table 11.** Homogeneity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	728.410	5	145.682	.908	.526
Within Groups	1122.667	7	160.381		
Total	1851.077	12			

Table 11: Uniformity  $H_a$  is accepted since the computed F value is substantial (0.908) and the value is significant  $> \alpha$  (0.526). Thus, the average value is the same for all groups.

**Table 12.** The Result of Homogeneity

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.854	1	7	.386

## Discussion

A commentary based on the study findings is presented in this section. According to the research findings and data analysis, the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) technique had an impact on reading comprehension. Shows the frequency of free tests: 13 pupils received a presentation of 7.7% for a score of 48, 7.7% for a score of 60, 7.7% for a score of 64, 23.1 percent for a score of 72, 7.7% for a score of 76, 23.1 percent for a score of 84, and 23.1% for

a high score of 88. shows how frequently 13 students take post-tests; a score of 72 translated into a presentation of 7.7%; a score of 80 into 7.7%; a score of 84 into 46.2%; a score of 88 into 23.1%; and a score of 98 into 7.7%.

Test homogeneity of variance revealed that the Levene Test value was 0,854 with a probability of 0.386. This indicates that the significance level is greater than 0.05. Thus, the variance of the data might be said to be homogeneous. The Listen-Read-Discuss method, which consists of many steps—listening, reading the chosen material, and having a conversation about it—has been shown to be successful in improving students' reading comprehension at Four Semester FKIP in Batanghari, Jambi. This method aids in introducing children to reading comprehension while also allowing them to apply their existing knowledge and the Listen, Read, and Discuss strategy to better comprehend the text's content.

## CONCLUSION

The efficacy of implementing the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) on students' reading comprehension was determined by the researcher based on the research's findings and discussion. The average results on the free exam were 76 and 92, according to the researchers' comparison. Additionally, students in the control group who were not taught the LRD method scored worse on posttests than those in the control group, which had an average score of 79. After gathering the data, the researcher used the scoring scale criteria to categorize each score. Two students in the post-test class obtained scores in the excellent category, ten in the good category, one in the fair category, and none in the poor category, according to the researcher's findings.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, M. (2003). *Text Types in English 2*. Macmillan Education. Australia.
- Ary, Donal. Lucy, Jacob. and Asghar. (2009). *Introduction to Research in Education,(8th edition)*. Canada: Wardsworth, Cengage Learning,
- Ary, D., Jacobs. L. C., Irvine, C.K.S., & Walker, D. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education eight edition*. Cengage Learning. United States of America.
- A.V. Manzo. Casale, U. (1995). *Teaching Children To Be Literate; A reflective Approach*. Harcourt Brace College
- Barwick, Jhon. (1999). *Targetting text: Narrative, poetry, drama*. Blacke Education. Singapore.
- Brown. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices: Person education*.
- Burnes, D and Page, G. (1985). *Insight and Strategies for Teaching Reading*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanich Group. Pty Limited.
- Cline, Johnstone, & King. (2006). *Focus Group Reactor to Three Definition of Reading; as originally Developed in Support NARAP Goal 1*. National Accesible Reading Assesment Project.
- Cline, F. J. (2006). *Focus group reaction to three definition of reading as originally developed in support narap goal 1*. Minneapolis, M.N: National Accessible Reading Assasment Project.
- Cresswell, Jhon W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Gay, L.R. (1981). *Educational Research*. Columbus. Charles E Merrill Publishing Company
- Grabe William, Stoller. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Reading Second Edition*. New york : Routledge
- Grallet, F, (1986). *Developing reading skills: A practical guide to reading comprehension exercise*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). *How to Teach English (An Introduction to The Practice of English Language Teaching)*. London: Longman.
- Healy, C. (2002). *Reading : what the expert say*. The lowdown on the national reading panel.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Janette K. Klingner, Sharon Vaughn, and Alison Boardman. (2007). *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*, Second Edition.
- Karin, K., Hess. (2007). *Reading Development & Assessment of Early Literacy*
- King, K and Stanley, N. (1989). *Building Skill for the TOEFL*. Second Edition. United Kingdom. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.
- Manzo And Casale. (1985). *Listen Read Discuss: A Content Reading Heuristic.*, (Journal Of Reading)
- Manzo and Casale. (1985). *Literacy and Learning: Reading in the Content Areas*. Florida: Ted Buchhoz.
- Maxwell , Martha J. (1972). *Skimming and Scanning Improvement: The Needs, Assumption and Knowledge Base*.
- McKenna, Michael C., and Robinson, Richard D. (2002). *Teaching through text: A content literacy approach to content area reading (3rd ed.)*. New York: Longman.
- Rebecca, J. L. (2003). *A Critical Handbook of Children's Literature*. Massachuset Pearson Education, Inc.
- Rochaety , E. (2007). *Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Snowball, D. (2005). *Teaching Comprehension: An interactive professional development course*. Aussie Interactive.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D)*. CV Alfabeta. Bandung.
- William Grabe and Fredricka L. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. (New York: Pearson Education Limited)
- Winarsunu, T. (2009). *Statistik dalam Penelitian Psikologi dan Pendidikan*. Malang: UMM