

Learning Profile of Narrative Text Reading Comprehension Using DRTA Strategy in Seventh Grade Students

Afifah Zulfa Azzah¹, Setyawan Pujiono²

{afifahzulfa.2025@student.uny.ac.id¹, setyawan_p@uny.ac.id²}

Indonesian Language and Literature Education, FBSB, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia¹²

DOI: 10.37729/scripta.v13i1.7644

Abstract. Reading comprehension at SMP Negeri 1 Nanggulan remains critically low, with an average score of 58.3 against a minimum standard of 75. This reflects a substantial gap between current instructional methods and student needs. This study details the actual learning profile of narrative text reading comprehension and analyzes the need for implementing the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy among seventh-grade students. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, the research involved 30 students and 2 Indonesian Language teachers, with data collected through interviews, observations, and document analysis, analyzed through Miles and Huberman's model. The findings show that existing teaching modules rely solely on a single narrative textbook, without involving process guidance, print-only media, and literal assessment. Classroom instruction lacks strategic reading phases, and teachers face limited training, time constraints, and a lack of DRTA-based materials. Needs analysis indicates that most students struggle with inferential comprehension, few have received structured reading-strategy instruction, and nearly all strongly require DRTA-based instructional materials. The pronounced gap between existing conditions and student needs underscores the immediate necessity for DRTA-based narrative reading comprehension materials.

Keywords: DRTA strategy, Narrative text, Reading comprehension, Learning profile, Needs analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension is a higher-order cognitive process that requires readers not only to recognize words in a text but also to construct a coherent mental representation of its meaning. Somadayo defines reading comprehension as a reading activity that seeks to understand the content in a text holistically, both explicitly and implicitly, encompassing decoding proficiency, vocabulary comprehension, and inferencing [1]. Tampubolon adds that this ability essentially trains the reader's reasoning in capturing meaning hidden beneath written language [2]. Thus, reading comprehension is not merely recognizing words one by one but an active thinking process that requires readers to integrate new information with prior knowledge to achieve a thorough and deep understanding [3], [4].

Indonesia's reading literacy ability remains below international standards. The 2022 PISA survey results show that Indonesia obtained a mean score of 359 in the reading literacy dimension, far below the OECD country average of 476 [5]. Snow and Duke and Pearson affirm that effective reading comprehension instruction requires explicit emphasis on cognitive strategies, including prediction, inference, and self-monitoring of comprehension [6], [7]. At the local level, several factors contributing to low reading comprehension in junior high school students, namely lack of variety in learning strategies, insufficient reading motivation, and limited availability of relevant and engaging instructional materials [8-10]. This situation is increasingly relevant in the context of the implementation of Kurikulum Merdeka (Emancipated Curriculum), which emphasizes student-centered learning, holistic literacy competency development, and continuous formative assessment principles [11]. These principles require teachers to shift reading practices from conventional patterns toward active and structured strategy-based learning, one of which is the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy. Prior research further affirms that teachers' ability to apply reading strategies is a decisive factor in students' success in comprehending texts, and that the absence of varied strategies contributes directly to persistent reading difficulties [12]. Classroom-based studies have confirmed that teachers commonly employ strategies such as previewing text, guessing word meaning, skimming, and scanning when teaching reading, and that these strategies are applied systematically across pre-reading, whilst-reading, and post-reading phases [13]. Reading strategy

instruction applied systematically across these phases has been documented even among younger learners, and students' critical thinking ability has been shown to positively influence their overall reading comprehension performance positively [14], [15].

Based on grade records documented by the Indonesian Language subject teacher, the average reading comprehension score of seventh-grade students at SMP Negeri 1 Nanggulan reached only 58.3, far below the Learning Objective Achievement Criteria (KKTP) set by the school at 75. Indonesian Language teachers at the school acknowledged that no specialized instructional materials designed to systematically improve reading comprehension were available, and the textbooks in use did not provide adequate guidance on reading strategies.

The Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy is a learning strategy that focuses attention on students' active engagement with reading materials. Stauffer states that through this strategy, teachers build students' motivation and concentration by intellectually engaging and encouraging them to ask questions, formulate hypotheses, process information, and devise tentative solutions to the reading content [16]. Duke and Pearson affirm that effective reading comprehension strategies must be taught explicitly, modeled, and practiced, all of which are embedded in the DRTA framework [7]. DRTA implementation encompasses three main phases: prediction, reading, verification, and confirmation. The effectiveness of DRTA has been empirically demonstrated: Hanafi and Septiana showed a significant improvement in students' reading comprehension with the significance value of $0.002 < 0.05$, while Kartini recorded an increase in the average student score from 46.56 to 86.13 [13], [17]. In a broader context, Sakina, Rahmawati, Ngafif, and Sujarwo proved that the implementation of a cooperative learning model based on strategy, in this case, Think-Pair-Share (TPS), was able to consistently improve students' reading comprehension from 50% mastery in the first cycle to 88.89% in the third cycle [18]. This result confirms that active and structured learning strategies are far more effective than conventional instruction in developing reading comprehension [19].

Although extensive research exists on the DRTA strategy, descriptive studies that clearly depict the learning profile and specific needs for DRTA implementation in seventh-grade junior high school narrative texts are scarce. This study thus aims to:

- (1) find the detail the actual learning profile of narrative text reading comprehension at SMP Negeri 1 Nanggulan, including Teaching Module content, classroom practices, and teacher challenges;
- (2) assess the instructional material needs of students and teachers for DRTA-based reading comprehension.

2. METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach to describe in depth the actual learning profile of seventh-grade junior high school students' narrative text reading comprehension during the implementation of the DRTA strategy. This approach was chosen because the study seeks to understand the learning phenomenon holistically as it occurs in the field, without manipulating or intervening in the existing conditions [20].

Participants

The study was conducted at SMP Negeri 1 Nanggulan, Kulon Progo Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta, during the even semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. The school was selected because it is one of the schools that provides special sports classes in Kulon Progo Regency. The characteristics of students in such classes, which involve a higher proportion of physical activity than regular classes, make it particularly important to provide effective, structured reading comprehension instruction. The research subjects consisted of 30 seventh-grade students from the special sports class, selected through purposive sampling based on three criteria: (1) actively enrolled as seventh-grade students in the special sports class, (2) attending Indonesian Language instruction taught by the teacher who served as the research subject, and (3) present at all data collection sessions. Two Indonesian Language teachers were selected because they had taught at the school for more than five years and were directly responsible for teaching the classes under study.

Instruments

Three instruments were employed to collect data. First, a semi-structured interview guide consisting of 17 core questions was used with both Indonesian Language teachers, covering learning conditions, strategy use, Teaching Module content, and barriers encountered during instruction. Second, a structured

observation sheet aligned with the three phases of DRTA was used during three non-participatory classroom observation sessions (every 80 minutes). Third, a needs questionnaire was administered to 30 students to identify their perceptions and needs regarding instructional materials. All instruments were validated by two experts in language education before use, to ensure alignment with research objectives and readability for the subjects [21]. The overall research design followed established procedures for qualitative educational research [22].

Procedures

Data collection was carried out through three complementary techniques. First, in-depth interviews were conducted with two Indonesian Language teachers. Second, non-participatory classroom observation was conducted over three sessions (every 80 minutes) using the structured observation sheet. Third, document analysis was performed on the Teaching Modules of both teachers, examining learning objectives, learning activities, materials, media, and assessment instruments, as well as the Indonesian Language teacher's grade records, to obtain actual data on students' reading comprehension abilities. In addition, the needs questionnaire was administered to 30 students to identify their perceptions and needs regarding instructional materials.

Data Analysis

Interview and observation data were analyzed using the Miles and Huberman model through three stages: (1) data reduction, namely the selection and simplification of raw data; (2) data display in the form of tables, matrices, and descriptive narratives; and (3) conclusion drawing based on identified patterns [23]. Triangulation was conducted through source triangulation (comparing data from teachers, students, and documents) and technique triangulation (comparing data from interviews, observation, grade documentation, and document analysis). Quantitative data from grade documentation and questionnaires were analyzed descriptively using percentages and arithmetic means.

3. FINDINGS

Actual Learning Profile of Narrative Text Reading Comprehension

This subsection presents the actual learning profile based on three data sources: document analysis of Teaching Modules, classroom observation, and teacher interviews. The profile is described across three dimensions: Teaching Module content, classroom instruction, and barriers faced by teachers.

Document analysis of the Teaching Modules used by both teachers revealed a consistent pattern across four main components. In terms of learning objectives, both modules listed only one general objective: students being able to identify the elements and moral values of narrative texts without specifying reading comprehension competencies at the inferential, evaluative, or appreciative cognitive levels. The objectives were formulated using operational verbs from the lowest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (identify, list), with no verbs reflecting higher-order thinking abilities such as concluding, evaluating, or synthesizing.

The materials component relied entirely on a single narrative text taken from the Grade VII Indonesian Language Textbook provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture. No supplementary texts, authentic materials, or student-selected texts were used. Trianto asserts that good instructional materials must be systematically selected and organized in accordance with learning objectives and student characteristics, rather than simply following the textbook sequence [24]. Most critically, the module provided no text processing guidance in any form: no pre-reading questions, prediction guides, graphic organizers, or marginal notes to support active reading. Students were expected to read the text independently and answer comprehension questions directly.

Concerning the media and learning resources component, both Teaching Modules listed only one medium: the printed textbook. No visual media (images, illustrations, infographics), digital media (presentation slides, instructional videos), or interactive materials were integrated. This is particularly noteworthy given that the special sports classroom was equipped with a projector and screen that were never used in reading comprehension instruction. No media adaptations for varied student learning styles were found in either module. This finding is consistent with Munadhiroh, Sudar, and Triana [25], whose study at a comparable senior high school level demonstrated that students' learning styles, which are visual, auditory, and kinesthetic, significantly influence reading ability, accounting for 57.7% of the variation in reading scores; the absence of varied media and teaching methods means that diverse learner profiles remain unaddressed, further suppressing reading comprehension achievement.

The assessment component in both modules consisted of 10 multiple-choice questions and 5 short-answer questions, all of which measured literal comprehension, with answers explicitly stated in the text.

Not a single item was found that measured inferential comprehension (concluding, predicting story continuation), evaluative comprehension (assessing the author's message or character motivation), or appreciative comprehension (personal response to the text). Prastowo asserts that quality instructional materials must guide students through tiered levels of thinking, from basic comprehension to critical evaluation, rather than merely measuring memorization or surface-level understanding [26]. No formative assessment instruments or rubrics were found in either module.

Classroom observation conducted over three sessions (every 80 each) revealed a uniform, consistent pattern. Across all three sessions, the learning sequence was identical: (1) the teacher opened the lesson with administrative activities and a brief apperception (5–8 minutes); (2) the teacher asked students to open the textbook and read the designated narrative text independently and silently (25–35 minutes); (3) students answered the comprehension questions in the textbook (20–25 minutes); and (4) the teacher reviewed a small number of answers orally and closed the lesson. Table 1 presents a systematic observation matrix of conditions that should be present in DRTA-based instruction.

Table 1. Classroom Observation Matrix (3 Sessions)

DRTA Phase	Expected Conditions	Observed Conditions (All Three Sessions)
Pre-Reading	Structured prediction activity; activation of cognitive schema through questions or visual cues	There were no pre-reading activities in any session; the teacher immediately asked students to read. In session 2, the teacher asked students to guess story content from the cover image for <2 minutes without formalizing it as a prediction step.
During Reading	Teacher guidance; comprehension monitoring; ongoing prediction and hypothesis revision	The teacher sat at the desk; students read independently without strategy guidance, comprehension monitoring, or prediction pauses.
Post-Reading	Structured prediction confirmation; multi-level comprehension discussion	Students only answered 10 multiple-choice and 5 literal short-answer questions, with no discussion of the text's meaning.
Student Engagement	Active, critical, and predictive thinking; peer discussion	Students were predominantly passive with no peer discussion. Question-and-Answer activities are dominated by 3–4 students.
Media Used	Varied: visual aids, prediction cards, structured note-taking guides	Teachers only applied printed textbooks; the projector was available but never used.

Observation was conducted across three Indonesian Language learning sessions. DRTA phases based on Stauffer [16].

Observation data confirmed that all three main DRTA phases, pre-reading (prediction), during-reading (monitoring and ongoing prediction), and post-reading (multi-level confirmation and evaluation), were absent from all three observed sessions. The only approach resembling a pre-reading activity occurred in session 2, when the teacher asked students to guess the story content from the cover image. However, this activity lasted less than two minutes and was neither formalized as a structured prediction step nor followed up during or after the reading activity.

In-depth interviews with both teachers identified three main categories of barriers to implementing structured and strategy-based reading comprehension instruction. First, knowledge and training barriers. Both teachers acknowledged limited mastery of structured reading strategies. Teacher A stated, "I have heard the term DRTA, but I have never received specific training on how to implement it step by step in class." (T1) Teacher B also confirmed having no experience with formal strategy-based reading instruction. Neither teacher had received professional development in reading comprehension instruction in the past three years, and no school-level guidance on the use of reading strategies. Nurhadi argues that teachers' ability to select and apply appropriate reading strategies is a key factor in the success of reading comprehension instruction in the classroom [27].

The second barrier encompasses time constraints and curriculum pressure. Both teachers cited the breadth of the Kurikulum Merdeka content as the primary barrier. The teacher stated: "There is a lot of material every semester. If we spend too long on one text, the others can fall behind." (T1) Strategy-based reading instruction that requires pre-reading, during-reading, and post-reading phases was perceived as too time-consuming compared to the conventional read-answer-questions pattern that could be completed in one session.

The third barrier relates to the availability of materials and learning resources. Both teachers reported the absence of ready-to-use instructional materials that integrate the DRTA stages. Digital resources for reading strategy instruction remain limited. Teacher B stated: "Even if we want to use a different approach, there are no materials already prepared. We just follow what is in the textbook." (T2) The absence of DRTA-based modules effectively compelled both teachers to rely entirely on government textbooks, further entrenching the conventional read-answer-questions pattern.

These structural and pedagogical barriers coincide with student learning outcome data. Based on the Indonesian Language teacher's grade records, the average reading comprehension score of seventh-grade students reached only 58.3. Of 30 students, only 8 (26.7%) met or exceeded the KKTP, while 22 (73.3%) remained below the KKTP. Grade documentation showed consistently low scores throughout the semester, confirming that the conventional instructional pattern consistently produced inadequate learning outcomes.

Needs Analysis of Students and Teachers for DRTA Strategy-Based Instructional Materials

This subsection presents the need analysis findings based on the student questionnaire, supported by teacher interview data. A complete overview is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Student Learning Ability and Needs Data (n=30)

No.	Observed Aspect	Number of Students	Percentage
1	Students below KKTP (score < 75)*	22	73.3%
2	Difficulty understanding implicit (inferential) information	24	80.0%
3	Difficulty concluding reading	22	73.3%
4	Frequently forget to read the content after finishing	20	66.7%
5	Lack of adequate reading strategy guidance in the textbook	27	90.0%
6	Lack of exposure to structured reading strategies (e.g., DRTA)	25	83.3%
7	Strongly need dedicated reading comprehension instructional materials	28	93.3%
8	Preference for visually attractive modules (colorful, with illustrations)	29	96.7%

*Score data from teacher's grade records; data for aspects 2–8 from student needs questionnaire.

Questionnaire data showed that students' comprehension difficulties were concentrated at the inferential level and in concluding. A total of 80% of students (24 students) experienced difficulty understanding implicit or inferential information, and 73.3% (22 students) had difficulty concluding reading. These two difficulties are interrelated: inferential comprehension, the ability to read between the lines, is a prerequisite for drawing valid text-based conclusions [28]. Both require active and predictive engagement with texts, which is systematically trained by the DRTA strategy.

In addition, 66.7% of students frequently forgot the reading content after finishing, indicating weak processing and retention of information during reading. This pattern is consistent with a lack of metacognitive strategy instruction [28]. Without guided pauses, prediction tasks, or comprehension monitoring guides during reading, students process texts passively and superficially, resulting in poor retention. Regarding the availability of instructional material, 90% of students stated that textbooks did not provide adequate guidance on reading strategies, and 83.3% admitted they had never been taught structured reading strategies such as DRTA.

These findings directly establish the need for dedicated instructional materials: 93.3% of students stated they strongly needed dedicated reading comprehension instructional materials, and 96.7% wanted visually attractive modules (colorful and with illustrations). This preference for visual materials aligns with

research demonstrating that multimodal learning design significantly improves motivation and comprehension, particularly among adolescent learners [29]. Audio-visual platforms integrated with problem-based learning have similarly been demonstrated to improve students' reading skills, and vocabulary-support tools such as word wall applications have also produced measurable gains in reading comprehension [30], [31]. Both teachers also confirmed during interviews the urgent need for ready-to-use DRTA-based instructional materials. They also expressed willingness to implement the strategy if practical and structured guidance were provided.

4. DISCUSSION

The learning profile documented in this study reveals a pattern of conventional instruction that is structurally incapable of developing reading comprehension beyond the literal level. The average student score reached only 58.3, while the minimum required score is 75, meaning students fell 16.7 points short of the established standard. Scores that remained below the KKTP reflect not merely a deficiency at the student level, but the cumulative effect of Teaching Modules lacking strategy scaffolding, classroom practices that provide no guided reading support, and an assessment system that measures only the most basic form of comprehension. This finding aligns with Nurgiyantoro, who attributes low reading comprehension scores among junior high school students to the lack of variety in learning strategies, and with Pressley and Allington, who argue that the most common reading comprehension difficulties stem from inadequate classroom strategy rather than students' cognitive limitations [8], [32]. Sakina et al. also noted that before the implementation of strategy-based learning models, 66.67% of students in the studied class scored below the KKTP [18]. A condition, similar to that identified in this study, was significantly improved only after active strategies were consistently applied. This pattern of improvement is not isolated to collaborative learning models: Nurhayah, Dewi, and Ngafif [33] similarly demonstrated that students taught through skimming and scanning structured reading strategies comparable to DRTA in their explicit and sequential nature showed a significant gain from a pre-test mean of 50.32 to a post-test mean of 69.03 ($p = 0.000$), confirming that explicit strategy instruction consistently produces measurable reading comprehension gains regardless of the specific strategy employed.

Analysis of the Teaching Modules reveals that exclusive reliance on a single printed textbook as both learning material and medium constitutes a critical barrier. McKenna and Robinson argue that effective reading instruction in content areas requires the integration of varied text types and reading supports beyond a single printed source, making the exclusive use of one textbook an inadequate foundation for developing reading comprehension [28]. Mayer demonstrated that multimedia learning, which integrates visual and verbal information, produces significantly deeper comprehension than text-only approaches, particularly for learners who require visual anchoring of new concepts [34]. The absence of visual aids, prediction guides, or graphic organizers in both modules means students received no scaffolding to connect new textual information with prior knowledge, a process Duke and Pearson [7] identify as essential for inferential comprehension. The assessment design of the modules, limited to literal-level questions, further reinforces surface-level reading habits: when students know they will only be tested on explicitly stated information, there is no incentive to engage in the deeper reading process demanded by inferential comprehension.

The three barriers identified through teacher interviews, knowledge gaps, time pressure, and absence of materials form a mutually reinforcing cycle. Without training, teachers lack the confidence to implement DRTA; without ready-to-use instructional materials, implementation becomes impractical; and without structural time support, even willing teachers revert to the textbook-based read-answer-questions pattern. This cycle is consistent with the findings of Richardson, Abel, and Morgan, who identified the absence of materials and inadequate professional development as the two most common barriers to reading strategy implementation in secondary schools [29]. Breaking this cycle requires an integrated response: providing teachers with both materials and practical training to use them. From a broader perspective of language curriculum, reading instruction must be purposefully integrated within a systematically designed curriculum framework and grounded in evidence-based reading pedagogy [35][36].

Needs analysis data confirm that students are not passive in their awareness of their own learning difficulties. The high percentages reporting difficulties with inferential comprehension (80%) and difficulty concluding (73.3%) indicate that students possess a degree of metacognitive awareness about their reading vulnerabilities, even without ever having been taught the vocabulary to name them. Pressley and Allington argue that developing this metacognitive awareness into active self-monitoring strategies is one of the most powerful interventions for improving reading comprehension [32]. DRTA, through its structured prediction-and-verification cycle, provides this metacognitive scaffolding while simultaneously training critical thinking in accessible and teacher-facilitated formats. The foundational importance of explicit

comprehension instruction has been recognized since the seminal work of Pearson and Gallagher, whose gradual release of responsibility model underpins much of the rationale for scaffolded, strategy-based reading approaches such as DRTA [37].

Narrative text is an exceptionally apt medium for DRTA implementation. The sequential, conflict-based narrative structure orientation, complication, climax, and resolution provide natural pause points at which readers can generate predictions, test hypotheses, and revise their understanding [8]. Unlike expository texts that organize information hierarchically, narrative texts develop temporally, making the question "What do you think will happen next?" cognitively engaging and text-grounded. This structure makes the prediction phase of DRTA organic rather than artificial, and directly trains the inferential skills that 80% of students in this study had not yet mastered.

The DRTA strategy is also structurally aligned with the three core principles of Kurikulum Merdeka previously mentioned: student-centered learning (the prediction phase foregrounds student autonomy and prior knowledge), holistic literacy competency development (all three DRTA phases progressively target literal, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative comprehension), and continuous formative assessment (the confirmation phase provides real-time comprehension data for teachers)[11]. The development of DRTA-based reading comprehension instructional materials is therefore not merely a pedagogical intervention, but also a curricular alignment that simultaneously addresses both student needs and national education policy. The potential of structured instructional design to improve reading comprehension has been empirically demonstrated across learning models: Prihatini, Sudar, Tusino, and Masykuri showed that students taught through a blended learning model achieved a significantly higher mean post-test score (78.33) compared to the control group (67.81), with a t-value of $7.454 > t\text{-table } 1.994$, confirming that systematic and structured instructional approaches, of which DRTA represents a strategy-centered variant, produce substantially better reading comprehension outcomes than conventional instruction alone [38]. Similarly, Kristanto, Adzkiya, Hendarto, and Tusino demonstrated that integrating Problem-Based Learning with picture media significantly improved students' critical reading of exposition texts, with the proportion of students achieving excellent scores rising from 27.78% in Cycle 1 to 58.33% in Cycle 2, underscoring that innovative, visually supported instructional approaches consistently yield measurable gains in reading performance [39]. Furthermore, students' perceptions of teachers' instructional methods are significantly related to their higher-order thinking competencies: Zulfahmi, Roza, Melani, and Kardena demonstrated a positive correlation ($r = 0.600$, $p = 0.007$) between students' perceptions of English teachers' methods and their critical thinking skills, suggesting that supportive and interactive instructional environments contribute not only to reading comprehension but also to students' broader analytical capacities [40].

Overall, the learning profile and needs analysis data construct a clear picture of a systemic gap: instruction is structured to produce literal-level passive readers, while students need and are ready for active and inferential engagement with narrative texts. This gap cannot be resolved incrementally within the existing Teaching Module framework; it requires the development of dedicated, visually engaging DRTA-based instructional materials in reading comprehension supported by teacher professional development.

This study has several limitations. First it was conducted in only school and involved 30 students from a special sports class. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized widely. Second, observation covered three sessions, which, while sufficient to establish a consistent pattern, may not represent the full range of instructional variation. Third, as a descriptive study, no intervention was tested; the relationship between the identified needs and the potential outcomes of DRTA-based instructional materials still needs to be established through developmental and experimental research.

5. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the learning profile of narrative text reading comprehension at SMP Negeri 1 Nanggulan reveals a systemic gap requiring structured intervention at the levels of materials, instruction, and professional development.

Regarding the actual learning profile, the Teaching Modules in use relied entirely on government textbook narrative texts without processing guidance, print-only media without visual variety, and literal-only assessment without higher-order thinking items. Classroom instruction was uniformly conventional across all three observed sessions, with no pre-reading, whilst-reading, or post-reading strategy-based activities observed. Three primary barriers impede change: teachers' limited knowledge of structured reading strategies, particularly DRTA; time pressure and curriculum coverage; and the absence of ready-to-use DRTA-based instructional materials.

Regarding student and teacher needs, 80% of students struggled with inferential comprehension, and 73.3% were unable to effectively draw conclusions from, both skills trained directly by DRTA. A total of 83.3% of students had never received structured reading strategy instruction, and 93.3% strongly needed

dedicated reading comprehension instructional materials, with 96.7% wanting illustrated and colorful modules. Both teachers confirmed the urgent need for practical, ready-to-use DRTA-based instructional materials.

Three recommendations are put forward. For Indonesian Language teachers: begin implementing DRTA phases (prediction, reading, confirmation) consistently with available narrative texts, accompanied by structured DRTA training as part of continuing professional development. For future researchers: these findings provide a validated foundation for developing and field-testing structured, illustrated, and colorful DRTA-based narrative text and reading comprehension modules. For policymakers: support the procurement of strategy-based instructional materials and make reading-strategy training a regular component of continuing teacher education.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] S. Somadayo, *Strategi dan Teknik Pembelajaran Membaca*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2011.
- [2] D. P. Tampubolon, *Kemampuan Membaca: Teknik Membaca Efektif dan Efisien*. Bandung: Angkasa, 1987. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.co.id/books?id=l6N_AAAACAAJ
- [3] E. S. Masykuri, I. I. Nugraeni, B. Basuki, and Y. Prihatin, "Penggunaan Strategi Petunjuk Kontekstual sebagai Strategi dalam Memahami Teks," *Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 2022, [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252603101>
- [4] E. Sunjayanto Masykuri, K. Ekaterina Alekseevna, and I. Ike Nugraeni, "Designing Asynchronous Digital Media for Teaching Reading Comprehension by Implementing Task-Based Learning," *jet*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 109–125, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.51454/jet.v6i1.485.
- [5] OECD, *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*. OECD Publishing, 2023. doi: 10.1787/53f23881-en.
- [6] C. E. Snow, *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2002.
- [7] N. K. Duke and P. D. Pearson, "Effective Practices for Developing Reading Comprehension," in *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction*, A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels, Eds., Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 2002, pp. 205–242.
- [8] B. Nurgiyantoro, *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi*, 2nd ed. Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2016.
- [9] M. Lexmana Putra, A. Munir, and E. Sunjayanto Masykuri, "Reading Habits, Economic Background, and Academic Achievement: A Moderation Study in Indonesian EFL Learners," *New Language Dimensions*, vol. 6, no. 1, Jun. 2025, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26740/nld.v6n1.p71-82>.
- [10] E. Masykuri, I. Mezentse, N. M.S, N. Anastasi, and Y. Kamin, "New Perspectives of Flipbook as Asynchronous English Reading Media," *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, vol. 12, p. 1538, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.33394/jollt.v12i3.11352.
- [11] Kemendikbudristek, *Panduan Pembelajaran dan Asesmen: Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Pendidikan Dasar, dan Menengah*. Jakarta: Kemendikbudristek, 2022.
- [12] R. G. Trisnawan, "The Teacher's Strategies In Teaching Reading: A Classroom Observation Research At The Eleventh Grade Of MA N Puworejo In The Academic Year Of 2016/2017," *Scripta : English Department Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2019.
- [13] M. Hanafi and A. R. Septiana, "DRTA Strategy on Students' Reading Comprehension," *JES*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 543–554, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.36987/jes.v9i2.3071.
- [14] N. I. Kamelia, A. Astrid, and D. Desvitasari, "An Analysis of Reading Strategies in Teaching Reading to Young Learners," *Scripta : English Department Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 92–100, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v10i1.3067>.
- [15] L. Indriani, S. Sukarni, and J. Triana, "The Influence of Students' Critical Thinking towards Their Reading Comprehension Ability," *Scripta : English Department Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 16–22, 2025, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v12i1.6294>.
- [16] F. Rahim, *Pengajaran Membaca di Sekolah Dasar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2018.
- [17] K. Kartini, "Implementasi Model Pembelajaran DRTA (Directed Reading Thinking Activity) terhadap Kemampuan Membaca Cerpen Siswa Kelas IX SMP Negeri 4 Palopo," *DJPBS*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 227–232, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.53769/deiktis.v1i2.205.
- [18] L. A. Sakina, V. A. Rahmawati, and A. Ngafif, "Implementation of Think Pair Share Model to Improve Recount Text Comprehension," *Scripta : English Department Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 32–39, 2025, doi: 10.37729/scripta.v12i1.6068.
- [19] E. Sunjayanto Masykuri, V. O. Vladimirovna, and M. I. Evgenevichc, "First-year-students' perceptions of asynchronous media platform (AMP) for learning English," *Engl. Lang. Teach. Educational. Journal*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 188–198, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.12928/eltej.v6i3.6661.
- [20] L. J. Moleong, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2018.
- [21] S. Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2019.
- [22] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.co.id/books?id=4uB76IC_pOQC

- [23] M. B. Miles and A. M. Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1994.
- [24] Trianto, *Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-Progresif*, 1st ed. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2009.
- [25] K. Munadhiroh and J. Triana, "Learning Style Influence on Senior High School Students'," *Scripta: English Department Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 23–31, 2025, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v12i1.6330>.
- [26] A. Prastowo, *Panduan Kreatif Membuat Bahan Ajar Inovatif*. Yogyakarta: Diva Press, 2015.
- [27] Nurhadi, *Membaca Cepat dan Efektif*. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo, 2016.
- [28] M. C. McKenna and R. D. Robinson, *Teaching Through Text: Reading and Writing in the Content Areas*. Pearson, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=i0BppwAACAAJ>
- [29] J. S. Richardson, R. F. Morgan, and C. Fleener, *Reading to Learn in the Content Areas*. Cengage Learning, 2012. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.co.id/books?id=F2Dj_NkpwOwC
- [30] Y. Yulianto, T. Rokhayati, and Y. Widiyono, "Increasing Students Reading Skills Using Audio-Visual Platform with Problem-Based Learning," *scripta*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 114–123, Jun. 2024, doi: [10.37729/scripta.v11i1.4248](https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v11i1.4248).
- [31] Sri Purwanti, S. Sudar, P. Dewi, and N. Anastasi, "The Effect of Word Wall Application on Students Reading Comprehension in Ninth Grade Students," *scripta*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 11–17, Jun. 2024, doi: [10.37729/scripta.v11i1.4855](https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v11i1.4855).
- [32] M. Pressley and R. L. Allington, *Reading Instruction That Works, Fourth Edition: The Case for Balanced Teaching*. Guilford Publications, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=3BmQBAAAQBAJ>
- [33] A. S. Nurhayah, P. Dewi, and A. Ngafif, "Skimming and Scanning Techniques in Teaching Students'," *Scripta: English Department Journal*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 278–285, 2025, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v12i2.6425>.
- [34] R. E. Mayer, *Multimedia Learning*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=5g0AM1CHysgC>
- [35] I. S. P. Nation and J. Macalister, *Language Curriculum Design*. in ESL and applied linguistics professional series. Routledge, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=cj7QLgEACAAJ>
- [36] W. Grabe and F. L. Stoller, *Teaching and researching reading*, Third edition. in Applied linguistics in action. New York London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020.
- [37] P. D. Pearson and M. C. Gallagher, "The instruction of reading comprehension," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 317–344, Jul. 1983, doi: [10.1016/0361-476X\(83\)90019-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X(83)90019-X).
- [38] N. Prihatini and E. S. Masykuri, "The Impact of Using Blended Learning to Improve Reading Comprehension," *Scripta: English Department Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 128–139, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v10i1.2361>.
- [39] R. Kristanto, N. N. Adzkiya, and E. Hendarto, "Improving Critical Reading of English Exposition Texts through Problem-Based Learning and Picture Media," *Scripta: English Department Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 81–88, 2026, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v13i1.7126>.
- [40] M. R. Y. Zulfahmi, V. Roza, M. Melani, and A. Kardena, "Correlation Between Students' Perceptions of English Teachers' Instructional Methods and Critical-Creative," *Scripta: English Department Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 134–144, 2026, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v13i1.7637>.