JOURNAL OF ENGLISH TEACHING, APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND LITERATURES (JETALL)

English Language Education Study Program, FKIP Universitas Lambung Mangkurat Banjarmasin
Volume 9 Number 1 2026

THE EFFECT OF LRD STRATEGY ON STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION VIEWED BY THEIR READING INTEREST

Dika Sakina[1]
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang
dikasakinaa3003@gmail.com

Annisa Astrid[2]
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang
annisaastrid_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Husnaini[3]
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang
husnaini_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Abstract: Reading comprehension remains a crucial skill for EFL students, yet many junior high school learners still experience difficulties in understanding texts. This study aimed to investigate the effect of the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy and reading interest on students' reading comprehension achievement, as well as the interaction between both variables. A factorial design was employed involving eighth-grade students of MTsN 4 Musi Banyuasin in the 2025/2026 academic year. The sample comprised control and experimental classes, and the data were collected using a reading interest questionnaire and a reading comprehension test. Both instruments were considered valid and reliable. The data were analyzed using Two-Way ANOVA in IBM SPSS Statistics version 27. The results revealed a significant main effect of teaching strategy on reading comprehension, $F(1,52) = 5.07$, $p = .029$, with students taught using the LRD strategy achieving higher scores than those taught using Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). Reading interest also showed a significant main effect, $F(1,52) = 50.46$, $p < .001$. However, no significant interaction was found between teaching strategy and reading interest, $F(1,52) = 0.001$, $p = .981$. These findings indicate that the LRD strategy improves students' reading comprehension regardless of their reading interest levels, thereby levelling the playing field and providing equitable learning opportunities for students with both high and low reading interest in EFL classrooms.

Keywords: *reading comprehension, LRD strategy, reading interest, two-way ANOVA*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the four essential skills in English language learning, and teachers expect learners to acquire it as a fundamental academic ability (Ngatimah & Hanapi, 2018). Through reading, students can expand their vocabulary and enhance their knowledge. However, reading is not merely a matter of decoding written symbols; students are expected to understand a text's information and purpose, identify its main ideas, and comprehend both explicit and implicit meanings. This process requires readers to think critically and creatively to gain a comprehensive understanding of the text. In practice, achieving this level of understanding is not always easy for EFL learners.

Reading, therefore requires comprehension, which is a crucial aspect of successful reading. Sattar and Branch (2017) explain that reading comprehension is a complex process involving understanding a text and constructing meaning from it. Despite its recognized importance, many Indonesian EFL learners continue to struggle with reading comprehension. Results from the Programme for International Student Assessment conducted by the OECD

consistently show that Indonesian students perform below the international average in reading literacy. These findings indicate that a substantial number of students experience difficulties in interpreting texts critically and meaningfully. This national concern is also reflected in classroom contexts, where students often struggle to identify main ideas, draw conclusions, and understand implicit information in English texts.

Most students have difficulty in understanding the text. Based on Nazara et al. (2023) in their research state that students have problems comprehending the text. Students could not identify the main ideas or concluding topics and found it difficult to find important points in the text. To interpret the text effectively, readers must combine skills such as recognizing words, relating new information to prior knowledge, and applying appropriate reading strategies. These strategies include identifying the main idea, connecting the content of the reading to personal experiences, asking questions to clarify understanding, summarizing the information in the text, and relating the reading to other sources or real-life contexts. Comprehending the English reading text is not an easy thing. Therefore, many students have difficulties comprehending English texts.

Teachers can employ various instructional strategies to improve students' reading comprehension. One strategy is Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD), which emphasizes the activation of prior knowledge before students engage with a text. Mckenna (2002) explain that the LRD strategy assists students in developing background knowledge through a structured listening phase prior to reading. The strategy begins with a teacher-led "Listen" stage, in which students receive a brief but focused explanation of the topic to establish a shared conceptual foundation. This structured initiation differentiates LRD from Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR), which relies more heavily on student-led previewing and collaborative meaning construction. By ensuring that all students start with adequate background knowledge, the Listen phase reduces comprehension gaps and supports learners who may struggle to activate prior knowledge independently. The subsequent reading and discussion stages further reinforce understanding and promote critical engagement with the text.

One factor that can influence students' reading comprehension achievement is reading interest. Interest strongly influences cognitive and affective aspects of reading, influencing our thoughts and emotions about the material we read (Renninger & Bachrach, 2015). Moreover, (Fitria, 2019) emphasizes that reading interest is an emotional drive that compels an individual to pay more attention to the activity of reading. Students tend to be more active in reading when interested in it. To succeed in reading, students need to desire to learn, which can help them regard reading as part of their daily routine. In addition, reading interest greatly affects students' reading engagement. Furthermore, (Prawiyogi et al., 2020) stated that interest in reading is the knowledge and enjoyment one has of reading without external pressure. In the context of the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy, this affective factor may influence how students respond to each instructional phase. Students with higher reading interest may benefit more from the reading and discussion stages due to their stronger engagement, whereas students with lower interest may rely more on the structured guidance provided during the listening phase. Therefore, reading interest is considered a moderator variable in this study, as it is theoretically possible that the effectiveness of the LRD strategy varies depending on students' levels of reading interest.

The preliminary study was conducted to see the methods used by English teacher in MTs N 4 MUBA. English teacher in MTsN 4 Muba used Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). Collaborative Strategic Reading is a strategy that improves students' reading

comprehension by working in groups. Its strategy includes previewing the text, click and clunk, getting the gist and wrapping up (Anwar, Ah, 2020). Based on the results of interviews with teachers and observations of teaching steps applied in the classroom. The teacher revealed that some students are often not involved in group discussions, so they often depend on their groupmates without really understanding the content of the reading, which can hinder their individual reading development. In addition, observations of the teacher's instructional steps indicate that, during the "preview" stage, students activate prior knowledge based on the understanding of the individual student discussed in the group, without the teacher first providing an explanation. As a result, some students may find it difficult to connect their prior knowledge with the text being read, especially if they do not have sufficient background knowledge on the topic being discussed. In this case, the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy can overcome the weaknesses found in the CSR implementation. LRD provides stronger support at the Listen stage, where the teacher explains the text to be read. This helps students who are less involved in group discussions to gain a basic understanding before reading the text independently.

Several previous studies have reported positive findings regarding the implementation of the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy in improving students' reading comprehension at different educational levels. At the junior high school level (Fajrudiansyah et al., 2024; Listiarini et al., 2021; Ngatimah & Hanapi, 2018; Purnama & Ramdhani, 2023; Serita et al., 2024; Syamsir et al., 2021; Tawali, 2021), at the senior high school (Adean et al., 2024; Adelia & Darmawan, 2021; Ibrahim, 2017; Nanda et al., 2022; Sudibyo et al., 2020; Syafitri & Maisaroh, 2020; Terasne et al., 2018). consistently indicate that LRD enhances students' ability to identify main ideas, comprehend textual information, and improve overall reading achievement. These studies generally highlight the effectiveness of LRD in activating prior knowledge and increasing classroom engagement. However, most of these studies focused primarily on overall achievement gains and did not examine the role of affective factors such as reading interest as a moderating variable. In addition, limited research has compared LRD directly with other established reading strategies such as Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). Therefore, further investigation is needed to explore whether the effectiveness of LRD varies depending on students' reading interest levels and how it performs in comparison with other structured reading strategies.

In addition, several previous studies have highlighted the important relationship between reading interest and reading comprehension. Empirical evidence consistently shows a positive correlation between students' reading interest and their reading comprehension achievement (Alfatihah & Tyas, 2022; Fitria, 2019; Kurniati et al., 2023; Nisaa et al., 2023). Students with higher reading interest tend to engage more actively with texts, which enhances their ability to identify main ideas, understand detailed information, and construct meaning from reading materials. These findings suggest that reading comprehension outcomes are influenced not only by instructional strategies but also by individual learner factors such as reading interest.

Although various studies have examined the effectiveness of the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy and the role of affective factors in reading comprehension, most prior studies have treated these two aspects as separate. Research on the LRD strategy generally focuses on the cognitive aspects of reading comprehension, whereas studies involving affective factors examine only reading motivation. Therefore, empirical studies linking the LRD strategy to reading interest as an affective factor in reading learning remain limited, particularly at the

junior high school level. Given this research gap, this study aims to investigate the influence of LRD strategies and reading interest on students' reading comprehension and to determine whether an interaction between teaching strategy, reading interest, and reading comprehension achievement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental 2×2 factorial design. The design involved two independent variables: reading strategy (Listen-Read-Discuss and Collaborative Strategic Reading) and reading interest (high and low), which were examined for their effects on students' reading comprehension.

Table 1. Factorial Design

Reading Interest	Reading Techniques	
	Conventional (A1)	LRD Strategy (A2)
Low (B1)	A1B1	A2B1
High (B2)	A1B2	A2B2

Descriptions:

1. A1 : Score post-test with teacher technique
2. A2: Score post-test with LRD strategy
3. B1 : Score post-test of students' low interest
4. B2 : Score post-test of students' high interest
5. A1BI : Score post-test of students' low interest with conventional
6. A1B2 : Score post-test of students' high interest with conventional
7. A2B1 : Score post-test of students' low interest with LRD strategy
8. A2B2 : Score post-test of students' high interest with LRD strategy

The study was conducted at MTsN 4 MUBA, an A-accredited public junior high school, during the 2025/2026 academic year, specifically in the eighth grade. The population consisted of all eighth-grade students, comprising three intact classes totalling 91 students. Since the classes had already been formed by the school and random assignment of individual students was not feasible, convenience sampling was used to select two accessible classes as research samples. One class was assigned as the experimental group using the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy, while the other served as the control group using Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). Each class consisted of 28 students. Both groups received the same instructional materials and equal instructional time during the treatment period to ensure comparable learning conditions.

The categorization of students' reading interest into high and low levels was determined using the composite score classification method proposed by Alkharusi (2022). The reading interest questionnaire consisted of 36 items measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The minimum possible score was 36 (1 × 36), and the maximum possible score was 180 (5 × 36), resulting in a total score range of 144. The score range was divided equally into two categories. Therefore, the interval width for each category

was calculated as 144/2 = 72. Students with total scores ranging from 36 to 108 were categorized as having low reading interest, while those with scores ranging from 108.01 to 180 were classified as having high reading interest.

The data were collected in four main stages across thirteen meetings for each group. The first stage involved administering a reading comprehension pre-test to both groups to determine their baseline equivalence before the treatment. The second stage consisted of administering a reading interest questionnaire to classify students into high- and low-reading interest groups. The questionnaire used was adapted from Putro and Lee (2017) and consisted of 36 items measured on a 5-point Likert scale. The indicators of reading interest comprised three categories of reading modes: Printed Materials (Elaboration, Enjoyment, and Competence Experience); Online Reading Materials (Value, Confidence, Enjoyment, Competence Experience, and Flow); and Reading Through Social Media (Sense of Belonging and Enjoyment of Reading).

The third stage consisted of ten instructional meetings in which the experimental group was taught using the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy, while the control group was taught using Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). To ensure treatment fidelity, detailed lesson plans based on the established procedures of each strategy were prepared prior to the intervention. An observation checklist was used during implementation to ensure that each instructional phase of the LRD strategy (Listen, Read, and Discuss) was consistently carried out across meetings. The final stage involved administering a post-test to measure students' reading comprehension after the treatment.

The reading interest questionnaire was adapted from Putro and Lee (2015), who had conducted a validity analysis using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) covering 993 undergraduate students in Indonesia. CFA results confirmed a good fit for a 10-factor model with 36 items. The reading comprehension test was developed based on the Merdeka Curriculum implemented at the research site, and the instrument comprised descriptive and recount texts. Both the research instruments and the lesson plans were validated by expert lecturers prior to implementation. A try-out of the reading comprehension test was administered to 30 students outside the research sample who had similar reading comprehension ability. Item analysis using Pearson product–moment correlation indicated that 14 out of 60 items did not meet the validity criterion. These items were primarily clustered within three texts; therefore, to maintain content balance and proportional representation across text types, all items from those texts were excluded. The removal was conducted systematically to ensure that the remaining items still adequately represented the targeted reading skills and text genres. Consequently, 42 valid items from seven texts were retained for the final test. The reliability analysis demonstrated that the reading comprehension test was highly reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.946), indicating strong internal consistency after item refinement. In addition, the reading interest questionnaire was administered to 30 students outside the sample and showed high reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.934), confirming the consistency of the instrument.

The collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 27. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize students' reading comprehension test scores, including minimum score, maximum score, mean, and standard deviation. Prior to hypothesis testing, prerequisite analyses were conducted to ensure that the data met the assumptions for parametric testing. The normality of the data was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test, while the homogeneity of variance was tested using Levene's Test. After the assumptions were fulfilled,

a Two-Way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of teaching strategy, reading interest, and their interaction between these variables on students' reading comprehension achievements.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the data analysis, based on descriptive statistics, prerequisite analysis, and hypothesis testing. The descriptive statistics provide an overview of students' reading comprehension achievement by summarizing the distribution of scores, including the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation. These results provide an initial comparison among students taught using the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy, those taught using the teacher's strategy, and students with varying levels of reading interest.

Prior to hypothesis testing, prerequisite analyses were conducted to ensure that the data met the assumptions required for parametric statistical analysis. After these assumptions were satisfied, hypothesis testing was conducted using a Two-Way ANOVA to examine the effects of teaching strategy, reading interest, and their interaction on students' reading comprehension achievement.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics of the pre-test scores were calculated to provide an overview of students' initial reading comprehension abilities prior to the treatment.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of Pre-Test Scores by Group

	Decriptive Statistic			
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Pre-Test Control	28	19	67	38.21
Pre-Test Experiment	28	24	67	38.79

The results showed that the experimental group obtained a mean score of 38.79 with a minimum score of 29, a maximum score of 67, while the control group achieved a mean score of 38.21 with a minimum score of 24 and a maximum score of 67. The mean scores of both groups were relatively similar, indicating that the students' initial reading comprehension levels were statistically equivalent before the treatment.

Table 3 . Descriptive Analysis of Reading Comprehension Test (A1 & A2)

	Decriptive Statistic			
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Post-Test Control	28	29	83	52.50
Post-Test Experiment	28	33	90	59.36

From the table above, the descriptive statistics of the students' post-test reading scores, the control group (A1), taught using the teacher's strategy, comprised 28 students, with a

minimum score of 29, a maximum score of 83, and a mean score of 52.50. Meanwhile, the experimental class (A2), which was taught using the Listen–Read–Discuss (LRD) strategy, comprised 28 students. The minimum score obtained was 33, the maximum score was 90, and the mean score was 59.36.

Table 4. Descriptive Analysis of Students' Post-Test on Reading Interest Category (B1 & B2)

Descriptive Statistic				
Reading Interest Category	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Post-Test Low Reading Interest	28	29	69	45.11
Post-Test High Reading Interest	28	40	90	66.75

Based on the table above, the descriptive statistical analysis of the students' post-test reading scores, categorized according to reading interest level, it was found that the group of students with low reading interest (B1), consisting of 28 students, obtained a minimum score of 29, a maximum score of 69, and a mean score of 45.11 on the post-test. Meanwhile, the group of students with high reading interest (B2), comprising 28 students, had a minimum score of 40, a maximum score of 90, and a mean score of 66.75.

Table 5. Descriptive Analysis of Reading Comprehension Scores in Control Class based on Reading Interest Category: A1B1 (Low) and A1B2 (High)

Descriptive Statistic				
Reading Interest Category	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Low Reading Interest	14	29	62	41.71
High Reading Interest	14	40	83	63.29

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of students taught using teaching strategies usually used by teachers (A1), who showed differences in reading achievement based on reading interest levels. In the group with low reading interest (A1B1), consisting of 14 students, the minimum score was 29, the maximum score was 62, and the mean score was 45.71. Meanwhile, the group of students with high reading interest (A1B2), comprising 14 students, obtained a minimum score of 40, a maximum score of 83, and a mean score of 63.29.

Table 6. Descriptive Analysis of Reading Comprehension Scores in Experiment Class based on Reading Interest Category: A2B1 (Low) and A2B2 (High)

Descriptive Statistic				
Reading Interest Category	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean

Low Reading Interest	14	33	69	48.50
High Reading Interest	14	48	90	70.21

Table 4 presents descriptive statistics for the group of students taught using the Listen-Read-Discuss (A2) strategy, who showed differences in reading achievement based on reading interest levels. In the group of students with low reading interest (A2B1), which consisted of 14 students, the post-test scores showed a minimum score of 33, a maximum score of 69, and a mean score of 48.50. Meanwhile, in the group of students with high reading interest (A2B2), which also consisted of 14 students, the minimum score was 48, the maximum score was 90, and the average score was 70.21.

Independent Sample t-Test

An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in reading comprehension between the experimental and control groups prior to the treatment.

Table 7. Independent Samples t-Test of Pre-Test Scores

Independent Sample Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	N	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. 2-tailed	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Pre-Test	Equal variances assumed	2.298	.135	.175	54	.862	.571	3.271	-5.968	7.129
	Equal variances not assumed			.175	52.660	.862	.571	3.271	-5.990	7.133

Based on the results above, the significance value of Levene's Test was 0.135, which is greater than 0.05, indicating that the assumption of equal variances was met. Therefore, the row of equal variances assumed was used for interpretation. The t-test result showed that t = 0.175 with a significance (2-tailed) value of 0.862. Since the p-value was greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the pre-test. This finding indicates that both classes had equivalent reading comprehension ability before the treatment was administered, meaning that the two groups were statistically comparable at the beginning of the study.

Prerequisite Analysis

Normality

A normality test was conducted to ensure that the post-test data in both research groups met the assumption of normal distribution, which is a prerequisite for parametric statistical analysis.

Table 8. The Result of the Normality Test in the Control (A1) and the Experimental Class (A2)

Test Type	Statistic	df	Sig. (p)
Post-test Control	.936	28	.087
Post-test Experiment	.962	28	.391

The table above shows that the group of students taught using the teacher strategy (A1) has a p-value of 0.087, whereas the group taught using the Listen-Read-Discuss strategy (A2) has a p-value of 0.391. Both p-values are greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the post-test data in both groups are normally distributed.

Table 9. The Result of the Normality in Students' Reading Comprehension based on Reading Interest Category: B1 (Low) and B2 (High)

Test Type	Statistic	df	Sig. (p)
Post-test Low Reading Interest	.939	28	.107
Post-test High Reading Interest	.976	28	.736

Based on the table test of analysis above, the post-test scores of students with low reading interest (B1) showed a significant value of 0.107, while those of students with high reading interest (B2) showed a significant value of 0.736. Both values are greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the post-test data in both reading interest categories are normally distributed.

Table 10. The Result of the Normality Test on Students in the Control Class Based on Reading Interest Category: A1B1 (Low) and A1B2 (High)

Test Type	Statistic	df	Sig. (p)
Post-test Control with Low Reading Interest	.882	14	.062
Post-test Control with High Reading Interest	.971	14	.894

Based on the results of the analysis in the table above, the post-test scores of students with low reading interest (A1B1) showed a significant value of 0.062, while those of students with high reading interest (A1B2) showed a significant value of 0.894. Both values are greater than 0.05, indicating that the post-test data in both subgroups are normally distributed.

Table 11. The Result of the Normality on Students in the Experimental Class Based on Reading Interest Category: A2B2 (Low) and A2B2 (High)

Test Type	Statistic	df	Sig. (p)
Post-test Experiment with Low Reading Interest	.967	14	.836
Post-test Experiment with High Reading Interest	.949	14	.547

Based on the results of the analysis in the table above, the post-test scores of students with low reading interest (A2B1) showed a significant value of 0.836, while those of students with high reading interest (A2B2) showed a significant value of 0.547. Both values are greater than 0.05, indicating that the post-test data in both subgroups are normally distributed.

Homogeneity

Table 12. The Result of Homogeneity in Control Class (A1) and Experiment Class (A2)

Test Type	Statistic	df1	df2	Sig. (p)
Based on Mean	.048	1	54	.827
Based on Median	.014	1	54	.906
Based on Median and with adjusted df	.014	1	53.551	.906
Based on trimmed mean	.037	1	54	.848

Based on the table above, the homogeneity of variance between the control class (A1) and the experimental class (A2) was examined using Levene's Test. The results showed that the significance values for the mean (0.827), median (0.906), and trimmed mean (0.848) were greater than 0.05, indicating that the variances of the two groups were homogeneous.

Table 13. The Result of the Homogeneity Test on Students in the Control Class Based on Reading Interest Category: A1B1 (Low) and A1B2 (High)

Test Type	Statistic	df1	df2	Sig. (p)
Based on Mean	2.359	1	54	.130
Based on Median	2.614	1	54	.112
Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.614	1	52.911	.112
Based on trimmed mean	2.438	1	54	.124

Table 10 presents the results of the homogeneity test for students in the control class, based on reading interest categories (A1B1 and A1B2), which showed that all significant values were above 0.05. p-values for the mean (.130), median (.112), and trimmed mean (.124).

These results indicate that the variances between students with low and high reading interest in the control class were homogeneous.

Table 14. The Result of the Homogeneity Test on Students in the Control Class Based on Reading Interest Category: A1B1 (Low) and A1B2 (High)

Test Type	Statistic	df1	df2	Sig. (p)
Based on Mean	2.922	1	26	.099
Based on Median	2.901	1	26	.100
Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.901	1	25.592	.101
Based on trimmed mean	2.965	1	26	.097

Table 11 presents the homogeneity test results for students based on reading interest categories (A1B1 and A1B2) showed that all significance values exceeded 0.05. p-values for the mean (.099), median (.100) and trimmed mean (.097). Therefore, the variances between the groups were considered homogeneous.

Table 15. The Result of the Homogeneity Test on Students in the Experiment Class Based on Reading Interest Category: A2B1 (Low) and A2B2 (High)

Test Type	Statistic	df1	df2	Sig. (p)
Based on Mean	1.745	1	26	.198
Based on Median	1.332	1	26	.259
Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.332	1	24.740	.259
Based on trimmed mean	1.778	1	26	.194

Table 12 presents the homogeneity test results for students in the experiment class based on reading interest categories (A2B1 and A2B2), indicating that all significance values were greater than 0.05. p-values for the mean (.198), median (.259), and trimmed mean (.194). Therefore, the data met the assumption of homogeneity.

Hypothesis Test

Table 16. The Result of Two-Way ANOVA

Test of Between-Subject Effects					
Dependent Variable: Reading Result					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7216.143[a]	3	2405.381	18.510	<,001
Intercept	175168.286	1	175168.286	1347.933	<.001
Method	658.286	1	658.2886	5.066	.029
Reading_Interest	6557.786	1	6557.786	50.463	<.001
Method* Reading_Interest	.071	1	.071	.001	.981
Error	6757.571	52	129.953		
Total	189142.000	56			
Corrected Total	13973.714	55			

a. R Squared = .516 (Adjusted R Squared = .489)

The results of the two-way ANOVA revealed that the teaching method had a significant effect on students' reading results ($p = .029 < .05$). Reading interest also showed a significant effect on students' reading results ($p < .001$). However, the interaction between teaching method and reading interest was not significant ($p = .981 > .05$). These findings indicate that both teaching method and reading interest independently influenced students' reading outcomes, but there was no interaction between teaching method, reading interest, and reading comprehension achievement.

The result of this study show that that teaching strategies had a significant effect on students' reading comprehension achievement. This indicates that students who were taught using LRD strategy obtained higher reading comprehension achievement than students who were taught using the conventional strategy. This result is consistent with the theoretical foundation that the LRD strategy improves reading comprehension through three complementary stages: Listen, Read, and Discuss. According to Manzo (1995) explained that the Listen stage helps students activate prior knowledge, the Read stage provides an opportunity to process the text independently, and the Discuss stage allows for clarification and negotiation of meaning through group discussion. The results of this study are also supported by several previous studies (Listiarini et al., 2021; Pebriana et al., 2019; Purnama & Ramdhani, 2023; Syamsir et al., 2021; Tawali, 2021). These studies consistently show that LRD enhances students' understanding of texts by activating prior knowledge, supporting active reading, and encouraging meaningful discussion.

In addition, the findings of this study indicate that students' reading interest has a significant effect on reading comprehension. Students who have a high interest in reading achieve better comprehension scores compared to students with a low interest in reading. This finding is supported by Renninger et al. (1992), who explained that reading interest significantly affects reading comprehension, information retention, and individual engagement in reading compared to other academic skills.

Furthermore, the finding that reading interest significantly affects students' reading comprehension is supported by several previous studies. Kurniati et al. (2023) found that students' reading interest significantly influenced their reading comprehension achievement. Similarly, Nisaa et al. (2023) reported that students with higher reading interest tended to have better reading comprehension, whereas those with lower reading interest showed weaker comprehension. These studies reinforce the present finding that reading interest plays an important role in improving students' reading comprehension.

However, the analysis revealed that there was no significant interaction between teaching strategy, reading interest, and reading comprehension. This indicates that although LRD and reading interest each have a significant impact, the effectiveness of LRD is independent of students' reading interest, and reading interest remains influential regardless of the strategy employed. These findings suggest that LRD provides comprehensive support for all students, both those with high and low reading interest, so that both variables function additively. Therefore, these findings are consistent with Manzo's (1995) theory, which posits that the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy is an effective method for enhancing reading comprehension and content learning among both struggling and proficient readers. LRD encourages students to become active learners by engaging in the stages of listening, reading, and discussion. This strategy also assists students who have difficulty with reading, as the listening stage allows them to understand the information presented in the text.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, learning strategies and reading interest play important roles in improving students' reading comprehension. The results of the Two-Way ANOVA revealed that learning strategies significantly affect students' reading comprehension. Students who were taught using the Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy achieved better reading comprehension than those who were taught using conventional strategies. The effectiveness of LRD lies in its structured sequence of activities. The initial listening stage allows the teacher to provide background knowledge and guide students' understanding, which supports them during the reading stage. This process then gradually shifts to student-centered discussion, where learners actively construct meaning and clarify ideas collaboratively. Such a progression from guided input to active engagement may contribute to the improvement in students' comprehension.

In addition, reading interest was found to significantly influence students' reading comprehension. Students with high reading interest demonstrated better comprehension than those with low reading interest. This finding confirms that reading interest functions as an important internal factor that enhances students' engagement and supports their learning outcomes.

However, the findings showed no significant interaction between learning strategies and reading interest in affecting students' reading comprehension. This indicates that the effectiveness of the LRD strategy does not depend on the level of students' reading interest, as both variables independently contribute to comprehension. Therefore, LRD can be effectively implemented in classrooms with diverse levels of reading interest, making it a dependable instructional strategy for teachers in varied classroom contexts.

REFERENCES

Adean, C., Puspitaloka, N., & Rahmawati, M. (2024). Investigating students' experiences in implementing Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy in reading comprehension of narrative texts. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, *7*(6), 1369–1378.

Adelia, & Darmawan, D. (2021). The use of Listen Read Discuss (LRD) strategy to improve student's reading comprehension. *JIIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, *4*(7), 588–592. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v4i7.318

Alfatihah, D. F. N., & Tyas, P. A. (2022). The correlation between undergraduate-students' reading interest and their reading comprehension. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *10*(3), 343–355. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i3.5460

Anwar, Ah, mad K. (2020). The effect of collaborative strategic reading toward students reading skill. *Anglophile Journal*, *1*(1), 1–12.

Fajrudiansyah, B., Dewi, M. P., Safitri, L., & Syahrul. (2024). Improving student's reading comprehension through LRD (Listen–Read– Discussion) strategy at the eighth grade of MTS At-Taqwa Jambi. *Education Achievment: Journal of Science and Research*, *5*(3), 879–887.

Fitria, W. (2019). Reading interest and reading comprehension : A correlational study. *Journal Educative : Journal of Educational Studies*, *4*(1), 95. https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v4i1.1333

Ibrahim, R. (2017). The use of listen read discuss strategy and reading motivation. *ELT-Lectura*, *4*(2), 25–36.

Kurniati, R., Daud, A., & Masyhur. (2023). Reading interest and reading comprehension ability: The correlational study in secondary education. *Journal of Education, Language Innovation, and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.37058/jelita.v2i1.6547

Listiarini, N. L. A., Sukraningsih, G. A. G., & Wulantari, N. P. (2021). The use of Listen Read Discuss (LRD) strategy to improve reading comprehension on descriptive text to the eighth grade students of SMPN 3 Tabanan. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Pendidikan*, *3*(1).

Manzo, V. A., & Manzo, C. U. (1995). *Teaching children to be literate: A reflective approach*. Harcourt Brace Collage Publisher.

Mckenna, M. C. (2002). *Help for struggling readers: Strategies for grades 3-8*. Guilford Press.

Nanda, D. W., Saputra, R., & Melia, R. (2022). The Effect of using Listen Read Discuss (LRD) strategy to improve students reading comprehension on narrative text at tenth grade SMA Negeri 5 Bungo. *TOFEDU: The Future of Education Journal*, *1*(1).

Nazara, T. V. S., Zebua, E. P., Harefa, T., & Harefa, A. T. (2023). Improving the students' reading comprehension through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Lahewa in 2022/2023. *Academy of Education Journal*, *14*(2), 1218–1230. https://doi.org/10.47200/aoej.v14i2.2014

Ngatimah, & Hanapi, H. (2018). *The Listen, Read, Discuss (LRD) strategy in improving the student reading skill of recount text at SMP N 2 Buru*. *7*(October), 221.

Nisaa, M. A., Hidayah, R., & Ngatman. (2023). The correlation between reading interest and reading comprehension ability on Indonesian language learning outcomes to fifth grade students of public elementary schools. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, *04*(07), 157–163.

Pebriana, E., Saputri, S. W., & Qonaatun, A. (2019). The effectiveness of Listen-Discuss Strategy (LRD) toward reading students' comprehension. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature (JELTL)*, *2*(1), 16–22. https://doi.org/10.47080/jeltl.v2i1.538

Prawiyogi, A. G., Fitri, A., & Suhardiman, S. (2020). Use of big book media towards interest in reading elementary school students. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, *2*(1), 8–11. https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v2i1.164

Purnama, D. W., & Ramdhani, D. P. (2023). The influence of annotation strategy toward students reading. *Jurnal Motivasi Pendidikan Dan Bahasa*, *1*(4), 2023.

Renninger, K. A., & Bachrach, J. E. (2015). Studying triggers for interest and engagement using observational methods. *Educational Psychologist*, *50*(1), 58–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.999920

Renninger, K. A., Hidi, S., & Krapp, A. (1992). *The role of interest in learning and development* (1st ed.). Psychology Press.

Sattar, S., & Branch. (2017). The role of teaching reading strategies in enhancing reading comprehension. *International Journal Of Current Life Sciences*, *4*(11), 1–8.

Serita, M., Balik, L. M., & Eni, G. D. (2024). Improving students' reading comprehension through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy at eight-grade of ST. Yohanes Tilang Catholic Junior High School in the academic year of 2023/2024. *Edunipa Journal*, *5*(2), 1–6.

Sudibyo, D., Setiawan, A., & Rahmawati, A. (2020). The influence of using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy towards students' reading comprehension on narrative text. *Pendidikan Bahasa*, *7*(1), 8–14.

Syafitri, F., & Maisaroh, E. (2020). The influence of using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy towards students' reading comprehension on report text of the eleventh grade of Smk Swasta Pab 2 Helvetia. *MELT Journal*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.22303/melt.5.1.2020.85-101

Syamsir, N. F., Astri, Z., Suhartina, S., & Noer, F. (2021). Improving reading comprehension skill through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) learning strategy. *Journal of Science and Education (JSE)*, *1*(2), 60–71. https://doi.org/10.56003/jse.v1i2.28

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

Terasne, 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) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, *5*(2), 113. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v5i2.2310