Digital Reading Module at Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau: A Needs Analysis

Wandi Syahfutra
wandisyahfutra@umri.ac.id
Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau

Wan Ab Aziz Wan Daud[*]
abaziz.wd@umk.edu.my
Universiti Malaysia Kelantan

Nur Hafezah Hussein
nhafezah@umk.edu.my
Universiti Malaysia Kelantan

[*]*Corresponding author*

ABSTRACT

Developing an e-reading module tailored to university students requires a comprehensive understanding of their needs, including their reading habits, preferences, and challenges in the digital environment. This study conducted a needs analysis to inform the development of an e-reading module for university students. The method of this study was quantitative, and the data was collected through a questionnaire. Using purposive sampling, the questionnaire was administered to 134 English Education students at Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau. The questionnaire intended to assess their perceptions of existing materials and identify key challenges in reading comprehension. Results indicated moderate satisfaction with current modules but highlighted significant vocabulary, complex texts, and cultural comprehension difficulties. Students expressed strong interest in interactive, multimedia-rich e-modules. The findings justify developing a tailored e-module to enhance reading skills, emphasizing vocabulary support, cultural context, and interactive features. This study provides insights for creating more effective digital reading materials in English language education. Recommendations include developing more engaging and multimodal learning resources, implementing differentiated materials for various proficiency levels, and incorporating more technology in language instruction. The research highlights the complex interplay of factors affecting student success in English reading comprehension and emphasizes the importance of effectively adapting teaching materials and methods to address these challenges.

Keywords: EFL; e-reading module; needs analysis; reading comprehension; higher education

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the most important language skills that should be developed inside and outside the classroom. It is also one of the most common ways to get information. Reading is

a process and should have meaning to the reader. There is an interaction between the reader and the text. This process involves intentional thinking, problem-solving, and getting the information. This process will bear the concept of reading comprehension. Therefore, reading comprehension only happens if the reader can adapt to the purpose, solve the problem, and get the information clearly from the text. As a result, reading skills are critical for the success of students learning.

Kusumawanti and Bharati (2018) explained that among English proficiencies, reading skills have the most important role for students' learning success since overall learning activities are started and developed by the reading activity. McCrudden (2018) stated that understanding what we read is essential. Without understanding, reading would serve no purpose. It means that understanding the text is the most important aspect of reading. Satriani (2018) revealed that comprehending means that we should fully understand all of the aspects of the text. However, many EFL students struggle to acquire and master this skill and frequently struggle to use it in their language experiences. Since the reading process requires interaction between the reader and the passage, the reader attempts to connect the text to their own experiences and the outside world. Furthermore, students can leverage their personal experiences and background knowledge to help with the reading process.

In the digital era, the rapid advancement of educational technologies has reshaped how students engage with learning materials. At the university level especially in Indonesia, reading proficiency is essential for academic success, and the ability to navigate digital texts has become increasingly important. However, many students face challenges adapting to e-reading, mainly when traditional reading skills do not quickly transfer to digital formats. The researcher conducted a brief survey before the study to identify student challenges. Students reported difficulties with understanding main ideas, connecting ideas, supporting details, vocabulary, implied meanings, and culturally specific texts. These problems were linked to the current reading module used in online classes via Sikuli. This module was developed by instructors based on the course syllabus, but there are issues. The course lacks a standardized syllabus, and the materials drawn from various internet sources may not match students' English levels or align with the syllabus. The content, unverified by experts, is largely from a Western perspective, which may not fit the local context. Additionally, the module is in print format and must be downloaded for class, which may contribute to students' reading comprehension difficulties. To address this gap, it is critical to design instructional resources that support reading comprehension and enhance students' digital literacy.

Developing an e-reading module tailored to university students requires a comprehensive understanding of their needs, including their reading habits, preferences, and challenges in the digital environment. Conducting a need analysis serves as a foundational step in this process. Educators and instructional designers can create a practical module that supports the development of digital reading skills by systematically assessing students' current abilities and difficulties. Some previous studies have developed reading materials for reading (Livingston et al., 2022; Wahyuningsih, 2018) or conducted need analysis to develop reading materials (Bontisesari et al., 2023; Karani et al., 2022). However, none of them conducted need analysis to develop e-reading module which is different with printed reading materials or e-book.

This research presents the findings from a need analysis conducted to inform the design of an e-reading module for university students. The study aims to identify the key features and pedagogical strategies necessary for creating an engaging, user-friendly, and educationally sound e-reading module. By addressing students' specific needs, the module can enhance reading comprehension, critical thinking, and overall academic performance in the digital age.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading, especially in English, involves emotion and thought, making it important in education (Al-Haydan, 2020). One becomes a good reader by applying those aspects. A good reader also sets a purpose while reading to enrich mental experience and organise information for critical thinking (Suggate & Lenhard, 2022). The reader will predict and form the text's idea to understand reading's purpose. Some research suggests that EFL students struggle with reading. Qrqez and Rashid (2017) found that students struggle with ambiguous words, unfamiliar vocabulary, and limited cognitive processing time. Satriani (2006) found that students struggle to understand reading due to motivation, low reading skills, difficult text, unfamiliar words, and grammatical complexity. Reading problems often involve vocabulary. Reading comprehension relies on vocabulary. Strong vocabulary helps readers understand sentences and connect ideas across a passage (Kamal, 2019; McKeown, 2019). Without enough word knowledge, readers struggle to understand complex ideas, make inferences, and analyse the material.

Reading comprehension means understanding a text. Reading comprehension is a complex thought process that requires a deep understanding of a reading to integrate information (Barber & Klauda, 2020). It shows that readers learn about the text by analysing its word structures, ideas, paragraphs, and other components. According to Yunus and Ubaidillah (2021), readers interpret texts by using prior experience to relate, contrast, or include their cognition. Reading comprehension measures text/message comprehension. Reading comprehension requires logic and critical thinking (Can, 2020). Both involve readers' stimulation of information outside the text/message. Modern formal education requires reading comprehension, among other skills (Zaccoletti et al., 2020). Reading and comprehension are essential for school success, and reading is more than decoding; it includes text comprehension. Ahmadi et al. (2013) found that reading comprehension is an interactive process in which readers use their prior knowledge to interact with the text. This understanding comes from how written words stimulate information outside the text/message. Language and topic also affect reading comprehension (Rokhmansyah et al., 2021). This shows that reading difficulty depends on content and scope. Reading difficulties also depend on the reader's ability. Without good skills, a reader will struggle to understand and retain the reading (Shofiah, 2017)

The latest innovations are needed to increase student interest in reading and solve reading problems. As centres for teaching, research, and service, educational institutions and lecturers must solve these problems by innovating and being creative to improve graduate competence (Aini et al., 2020). Technology and close reading strategies can improve reading comprehension. Nelson (2019) suggests that close reading strategies can enhance students' comprehension of texts by increasing their awareness of reading. Due to its convenience, accessibility, and practicality, digital text makes students interested in reading and improves their understanding, according to Manalu (2019). Only continuous reading will ensure reading comprehension (Renandya et al., 2018).

Reading instruction for English study programs is crucial to Indonesia's foreign language talent development. University students still struggle to understand English texts for various reasons. This issue stems from poor reading comprehension and critical thinking (Yolanda Melandita, 2019). Reading is essential to learning, and the goal of reading instruction is to teach reading comprehension. Some strategies are needed to improve students' reading comprehension. In addition to knowing and using learning strategies, students' individual traits

affect their ability to self-regulate and act strategically during learning (Dermitzaki et al., 2008). Understanding what they read will help students succeed.

Ahmadi et al. (2013) cite Stanovich (1980)'s interactive-compensatory model, which adds function to interactive. He claimed that this model combines bottom-up and top-down features to make reading more meaningful. Reading engages readers most. Thinking and experience help readers understand and expect the information (Baha, 2017). Communicative activities and integrated skills improve reading comprehension in this model (Baha, 2017). Reading comprehension can also be improved by using interactive models that engage readers. Interactive models synthesise patterns from multiple knowledge sources simultaneously (Rumelhart, 2005). Students must identify text from the keyword and then move on to the next sentence for more detail (Amartha, 2013).

Popular models include online learning. Online learning uses technology to learn simultaneously without time or distance constraints (Hergüner et al., 2020). Today, distance learning includes correspondence, telecourses, CD-ROM, online, and mobile courses (Kessler, 2018). Every year, many terms describe e-learning. E-learning is a product of the technology revolution that uses many digital tools and processes (Mikroyannidis et al. 2013 as cited in Wahyudin, 2022). E-learning software was promoted as a modern necessity. E-learning was implemented based on structure and purpose. This model gives students equal access to online learning while meeting requirements. Overall, distance learning can make a big contribution to teaching online by delivering materials to students and giving them the chance to study properly (Balbay & Erkan, 2021). Teaching through applications or platforms in online learning improves technological skills and concurrent learning structures, especially for reading classes (Hill, 2016). Online learning in reading provides students with learning materials through the teaching platform. Learning activities depend on reading material because its quality can affect students' comprehension (Rokhmansyah et al., 2021). Students are expected to read the material independently using their devices or digital text. Digital texts cause students to read English on devices according to their personalities and preferences (Dewi & Sahiruddin, 2020). Online reading comprehension instruction is an interactive way to improve students' reading skills, especially in Indonesia (Hamra, 2010).

However, online reading requires good decision-making skills, ensuring the right information, and quickly evaluating each decision. T. Yaghi (2021). Online or e-learning is a unique learning experience. It takes good reading skills to comprehend lessons and materials.

METHOD

This research was conducted at English Education Study Program of Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau, using a quantitative method. The data were collected through a questionnaire that included items ranging from multiple choice to Likert scale 1 to 5. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section A dealt with demographic information to generate similarities and contrasts between students. Section B addressed students' needs to develop an e-module for reading. Section C attempted to identify students' difficulties in the reading process. The distribution of items by section was summarised in the Table 1.

TABLE 1. The Need Analysis Questionnaire Sections

Section	Components	
A. Demographic Background	a)	Gender
	b)	Language Background
	c)	Mother Tongue
	d)	Preferable Teaching Method
B. Need Analysis	a)	Existing Module
	b)	Printed Module
	c)	Interactive Module
	d)	Language Need
	e)	User Interface
	f)	Preferable Features
C. Student's Problem	a)	Learning Strategies
	b)	Pedagogy
	c)	Learning Tools

Through the questionnaire, the researcher uncovered the needs of English Language Education students throughout the analysis phase. This section emphasized the "lacks" discovered in students' English reading learning materials. The sample in this research was English Education Study Program students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau. The total population is 176 students, and the sample to participate in this study used a purposive sampling technique. The total of participants as sampling in this study was 134 students, considering the participants' willingness.

FINDING

TABLE 2. Needs Analysis Respondents' Background

No	Item	Indicator	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
A1	Gender	Male	14	24
		Female	44	76
A2	Age	<18	2	3,4
		18 – 20	52	89,7
		>20	4	6,9
A3	Printed Module or			44,83
	Digital Module			55,17

Table 2's data revealed an educational module study. This comprehensive analysis examined participants' demographics, module format preferences, and current and ideal teaching materials. These elements were examined in detail to draw connections and explore educational practices and module design implications.

58 people participated in the survey, a gender imbalance. The sample was 76% female (44 people) and 24% male (14 people). This gender representation gap may affect the study's findings. It may reflect the gender composition of the educational program or institution where the study was conducted or indicate that female students are more engaged in surveys. Another

option is a course or subject that traditionally attracted more women. This gender imbalance may skew results towards female students, regardless of the causes.

The age distribution of participants helped explain survey results. Most participants (89.7%, or 52 people) are 18–20 years old, like traditional undergraduates. This concentration indicated that the study focused on early college-aged young adults. Only 3.4% of participants—2 people—were under 18, possibly advanced high school students taking college courses. Only 6.9%, or 4 people, were over 20, which may be non-traditional or transfer students. Age homogeneity should be considered when generalising the findings to other student populations, as the experiences and preferences of this predominantly 18–20-year-old group may differ from those of older or younger students.

TABLE 3. The Mean of Perception of Current Module and Good Teaching Material Needs Analysis

No	Items	Mean	SD	Label
1	Reading materials are very complex and challenging to understand	3,31	0,83	Moderate
2	The subject specific material is more technical and difficult	3,26	0,73	Moderate
3	Texts are old; the language structure is different, take longer to read	3,22	1,02	Moderate
4	Difficult to understand the prescribed texts	3,02	1,06	Moderate
5	The content is difficult to understand as it is not in a simple format	2,90	0,90	Moderate
6	Some topics are difficult to understand due to vocabulary	3,62	0,74	High
7	Readings are challenging and contain complex vocabulary	3,52	0,81	High
8	Difficult vocabulary adding to incomprehensible nature of text	3,43	0,67	High
9	Use of strange difficult words, making it hard to understand the work	3,62	0,74	High
10	Many texts are containing unfamiliar words	3,57	0,85	High
11	The challenge is understanding the vocabulary used	3,88	0,83	High
12	Difficulty is added when readings are too long	3,36	0,78	Moderate
13	Struggle to do the reading within the given frames	3,16	0,78	Moderate
14	Readings are too long and too many	2,98	0,97	Moderate
15	Hard to get to main points of the reading due to length	3,10	0,86	Moderate
16	Texts are too long and when reading them focus is lost	3,31	0,91	Moderate
17	The contents are relevant with the learned subject	3,71	0,93	High
18	The contents are containing vocabulary builder	3,53	0,81	High
19	The topics are interesting	3,48	0,99	High
20	The topics are up-to-date and relevant	3,71	0,87	High
21	The topics are provided introduction	3,72	0,64	High
22	The topics are available summary	3,69	0,86	High

23	The instructions of exercises are easy to understand	3,93	0,83	High
24	The content of exercises can be understood	3,91	0,90	High
25	The types of exercises are various	3,81	0,78	High
26	The types of exercises are interesting	3,71	0,79	High
27	The types of exercises are challenging	3,60	0,83	High
28	The types of exercises are reading practice	3,67	0,84	High
29	The topics are containing summative test	3,40	0,67	Moderate
30	The design of teaching material is attractive	3,55	0,97	High
31	There are illustrations (pictures, tables, graphs, etc.) of the material/explanation	3,74	1,15	High
32	The font type and font size can be read easily	3,76	0,92	High
33	The colors are interesting	3,52	1,04	High
34	The teaching material is involving the use of other learning media (audio, video, and hypertext)	3,28	1,01	Moderate
35	I am interested in using interactive media in learning to use electronic device such as mobile phones, laptops, and others	3,74	0,94	High
36	I am interested in using interactive media as a practical learning media	3,67	0,92	High
37	There are vocabulary lists	3,10	0,82	Moderate
38	There are useful phrases (expressions) that help increase language proficiency	3,52	0,91	High

The study analysed teaching materials' complexity, vocabulary, length, relevance, exercises, design, and multimedia use. Examining these factors revealed the strengths and weaknesses of existing materials and areas for improvement. Teachers, course designers, and material developers needed this analysis to create more effective and engaging learning resources.

Table 3 shows student survey data. The survey had 38 Likert-scale questions. The mean scores, standard deviations (SD), and categorical label (High or Moderate) for each item were provided. Mean scores above 3.50 were labelled "High" and those below were labelled "Moderate" although the exact boundaries were not specified.

For this analysis, the researcher divided the items into several thematic categories and discussed the findings. These results were also compared to previous language teaching material development and evaluation studies. Questions 1-5 in the survey addressed reading material complexity and difficulty. The mean scores for these items are "Moderate" (2.90–3.31). This indicated that students found the materials challenging but not overwhelming.

The statement "Reading materials were very complex and challenging to understand" (Item 1) had the highest mean (3.31). This showed that students found the materials challenging but not too difficult. The lowest mean (2.90) was associated with "The content was difficult to

understand as it was not in a simple format" (Item 5), suggesting that the materials' format did not hinder comprehension.

According to Krashen (1981) language acquisition occurs when students are exposed to input slightly above their level of competence. The moderate difficulty reported by students suggested the materials may provide this optimal challenge. However, Item 4, "Difficult to understand the prescribed texts" had a high standard deviation (1.06), indicating a wide range of student opinions. Variability in language proficiency may be affecting students' perceptions of material difficulty.

Items 6-11 addressed vocabulary issues. Interesting, all of these items received "High" ratings with mean scores of 3.43–3.88. This suggested that students struggled with vocabulary when engaging with materials. The highest mean (3.88) was associated with "The challenge is understanding the vocabulary used" (Item 11), emphasising vocabulary's central role in students' perceived difficulties. Items 9 and 10 showed unfamiliar and difficult words (mean scores of 3.62 and 3.57, respectively).

These results supported previous research on language learning and vocabulary. Nation (2006) suggested students needed 98% of a text's words to comprehend it alone. The survey's high vocabulary-related challenge ratings suggested that students' current materials may not meet this threshold. The findings also support Coxhead's (2000) academic word list research on discipline-specific vocabulary. The high mean vocabulary scores suggested that the materials may have specialised academic or technical vocabulary that students struggle with.

Reading length was covered in items 12-16. These items had "Moderate" mean scores of 2.98–3.36. This suggested that students struggled with vocabulary more than reading length. This group's highest mean (3.36) is for "Difficulty is added when readings are too long" (Item 12). Thus, reading length contributed to the overall challenge but not as much as vocabulary issues.

The lowest mean (2.98) was associated with "Readings are too long and too many" (Item 14), suggesting that most students did not think readings were excessive. Student opinions on this matter were variable, as shown by the high standard deviation (0.97). These findings concerned reading comprehension cognitive load. Sweller (1988) suggested that working memory overload impaired learning. Some students worried about cognitive overload from text length, despite moderate ratings for length-related items.

Items 17-22 addressed content relevance, interest, and organisation. All of these items were rated "High" with mean scores of 3.48–3.72. This showed that students found the content relevant and engaging despite vocabulary and length issues. This group's highest means (3.72) were "The topics are provided introduction" (Item 21) and "The topics are up-to-date and relevant" (Item 20). This suggested that students liked the contextual framing and found the content relevant to their studies. CBI and CLIL principles are supported by positive content relevance and interest ratings. These methods emphasise using authentic, relevant content to motivate language learners and provide meaningful context (Snow & Brinton, 2017).

Exercises and practice activities were covered in items 23-29. Most of these items scored "High" with mean scores of 3.40–3.93. This indicated that students found the exercises useful and well-designed. The highest mean (3.93) was for "The instructions of exercises are easy to understand" (Item 23), indicating that instructional clarity was a material strength. The next item, "The content of exercises can be understood" (Item 24, mean 3.91), suggested that the exercises were challenging enough.

Students reported high variety (Item 25, mean 3.81) and interest (Item 26, mean 3.71) in the exercises. Gardner and Hatch (1989) multiple Intelligences theory stressed the importance of variety for student engagement and learning styles. This category's only

"Moderate" item was "The topics are containing summative test" (Item 29, mean 3.40). This suggested that while formative assessment through exercises was well-represented, summative assessment could be improved.

Items 30-34 covered teaching material design and presentation, including visuals and multimedia. Most of these items scored "High" with mean scores of 3.28–3.76. Students liked the font readability (Item 32, mean 3.76) and illustrations (Item 31, mean 3.74). These findings support Mayer (2009) cognitive theory of multimedia learning, which emphasises combining visual and textual information to improve learning.

The category's lowest mean (3.28) was "The teaching material involves other learning media (audio, video, and hypertext)". (Item 34). Still in the "Moderate" range, this suggested material improvements. Students were asked about interactive media learning in items 35 and 36. Both items received "High" ratings (3.74 and 3.67, respectively), indicating student interest in using technology to learn. Chapelle and Sauro (2017) discuss the growing trend of technology integration in language learning. Students were interested in interactive media, suggesting they expected technology in their language learning materials.

The last two items (37 and 38) covered material vocabulary. Students were satisfied with useful phrases (Item 38, mean 3.52) but moderately satisfied with vocabulary (Item 37, mean 3.10). Students may have found contextualised vocabulary (useful phrases) more helpful than decontextualised word lists. This supports vocabulary acquisition research that emphasises context-based learning (Laufer & Nation, 2013)

Learning English reading skills was essential, especially in academic settings where English was the medium of instruction or a global language. However, many students needed help improving their reading skills. Students struggle with vocabulary, cultural comprehension, reading strategies, and learning materials, according to the study. This study examined these obstacles in detail and compared them to previous research to shed light on reading comprehension challenges and suggest ways to improve English language teaching and learning.

Table 4 displays 18 items (39–56) that assessed English reading comprehension learning obstacles. Each item was rated with mean and standard deviation scores. Each item was rated "Moderate" for learning obstacles. The data did not define this study's scale. However, the highest mean score is 6.03 and the lowest is 4.00, suggesting a scale of 1 to 7 or 1 to 10. This analysis used a 1-7 scale, with higher scores indicating enormous difficulty or agreement with the statement. Students struggle with English texts and vocabulary, according to the data. The mean score for item 39, "I have difficulties in understanding English texts," was 4.83, indicating moderate difficulty. Nezami (2012) found text comprehension to be a major challenge for EFL students.

TABLE 4. The Mean of Learning Obstacle Material Needs Analysis

No	Items	Mean	SD	Label
39	I have difficulties in understanding English texts	4,83	2,04	Moderate
40	I get difficulties in understanding some vocabularies in the texts of current (printed) module	5,22	2,00	Moderate
41	I have difficulties to understand when the text is about foreign culture	6,03	1,96	Moderate
42	I have difficulties to find main idea in the texts of the current module	5,21	1,90	Moderate

43	I have difficulties to connect and get information in the texts of the current module	4,43	2,09	Moderate
44	I am not able to interpret the meaning of implicit ideas and information	5,03	1,95	Moderate
45	I have difficulties in memorizing English vocabulary	4,55	2,65	Moderate
46	I don't have any reading strategies	4,00	2,43	Moderate
47	I have difficulties in learning reading because teaching methods are not interesting	4,24	2,38	Moderate
48	I have difficulties in learning reading due to the lack of reading activities	4,50	2,43	Moderate
49	I have difficulties to read some texts fluently	4,74	2,29	Moderate
50	My problem is how to settle down and start reading	4,29	2,53	Moderate
51	I usually list down all the vocabulary before memorizing them	4,72	2,51	Moderate
52	I am a slow reader and found the readings to be boring due to difficulty	5,47	2,68	Moderate
53	The level of vocabularies in the text of current module is ninot relevant and suitable with my level	4,74	2,15	Moderate
54	Print media is still too difficult to use in practical work	4,29	1,91	Moderate
55	It took a long time to reopen the page in printed media while practicing	4,93	2,17	Moderate
56	The textbook I use in learning English is the first publishing and is not up to date	4,90	2,56	Moderate

Several items highlighted vocabulary problems. Item 40, "I get difficulties in understanding some vocabularies in the texts of current (printed) module," averaged 5.22. The mean for item 45, "I have trouble memorising English vocabulary," was 4.55. The mean score for Item 51, "I usually list down all the vocabulary before memorising them," was 4.72. These results support Nation (2001) and Pigada and Schmitt (2006), who stressed the importance of vocabulary in reading comprehension. Students may benefit from better vocabulary acquisition strategies due to moderate vocabulary difficulty.

Item 53, "The level of vocabularies in the text of current module is not relevant and suitable with my level," had a mean score of 4.74. This suggested a vocabulary mismatch between students' vocabulary and required texts, which could hinder comprehension.

The mean score for Item 41, "I have difficulties to understand when the text is about foreign culture," was 6.03. Alptekin (2006) and Matsunaga and Koda (2006) emphasise the importance of cultural knowledge in reading comprehension. According to the high mean score, students struggle with texts that require cultural context.

Item 44: "I am not able to interpret the meaning of implicit ideas and information" (Mean = 5.03) may have contributed to this cultural barrier to comprehension. This area was moderately difficult, suggesting students may struggle with inferencing skills, which were essential for text comprehension.

Data points to reading strategy and skill issues. "I have difficulties to find main idea in the texts of the current module," item 42, averaged 5.21. Item 43, "I have difficulties to connect and get information in the texts of the current module," averaged 4.43. "I don't have any reading strategies" had a mean score of 4.00.

Main idea identification was a key skill for reading comprehension, so the moderate difficulty was notable. This finding supports Stoller et al. (2013) who stressed the importance of main ideas and supporting details in reading. Lacking reading strategies had a lower mean score, suggesting that not all students had them. Due to moderate difficulty connecting information within texts, students may benefit from explicit instruction in reading strategies that focus on textual coherence and information integration.

Data on students' reading fluency and engagement was also revealed. For item 49, "I have difficulties to read some texts fluently," the mean score is 4.74. Item 50, "My problem is how to settle down and start reading," averaged 4.29. A higher mean score of 5.47 was given to item 52, "I am a slow reader and found the readings to be boring due to difficulty".

Reading fluency was moderately difficult and slow reading was more common, suggesting that many students struggle with reading speed and automaticity. According to Grabe (2010) reading fluency improves comprehension. Boredom with difficult texts may lead to disengagement, which may hinder improvement. This finding supported Guthrie and Guthrie (2000) reading motivation and engagement research.

Students' views on teaching and learning were revealed by the data. Item 47, "I have difficulties learning reading because teaching methods are not interesting," averaged 4.24. The mean for item 48, "I have difficulties learning reading due to the lack of reading activities," was 4.50.

Despite moderate mean scores, these items suggested teaching methods and reading activities could be improved. According to Stoller et al. (2013) and Hedgcock and Ferris (2018) engaging teaching methods and varied reading activities improve reading skills.

Some data items addressed learning materials and media. "Print media is still too difficult to use in practical work" had a mean score of 4.29. Item 55, "It took a long time to reopen the page in printed media while practicing," averaged 4.93. Items 56, "The textbook I use in learning English is the first publishing and is not up to date," averaged 4.90.

This indicated moderate print material usability and relevance issues. Navigation difficulties and textbooks' perceived outdatedness suggested learning material selection and design improvements. According to Tomlinson (2012) language learning requires appropriate materials.

DISCUSSION

The need to address students' complex reading comprehension challenges drives English language teaching and learning to evolve. This essay critically analyses recent data on teaching materials and student English reading difficulties. By placing these findings in the context of theoretical frameworks and previous research, we hope to inform better teaching strategies and learning resources.

Students rate their reading materials as moderately difficult, with mean complexity scores ranging from 2.90 to 3.31. This moderate difficulty supports Krashen's (1981) Input Hypothesis, which states that language acquisition is best when students are exposed to input slightly above their level of competence. The highest mean score (3.31) for "Reading materials are very complex and challenging to understand" suggests that students find the materials difficult but not insurmountable.

However, the item "Difficult to understand the prescribed texts" has a high standard deviation (1.06), indicating student perceptions vary. Language proficiency, which Stoller et al. (2013) say is crucial to reading comprehension, may explain this variability. Educators and material developers need differentiated materials to accommodate multiple proficiency levels in a classroom.

The consistent "High" rating for vocabulary-related items, with mean scores ranging from 3.43 to 3.88, is particularly striking. The highest mean (3.88) for "The challenge is understanding the vocabulary used" emphasises vocabulary's centrality in students' perceived difficulties. Nation (2006) states that students must know 98% of a text's words to comprehend it alone. The high ratings for vocabulary-related challenges suggest students are not meeting this threshold in their current materials.

Coxhead (2000)'s academic word lists emphasise discipline-specific vocabulary, which supports these findings. The high vocabulary-related mean scores suggest that the materials may have specialised academic or technical vocabulary that students struggle with. Pigada and Schmitt (2006) and Laufer and Nation (2013) advocate explicit vocabulary instruction and curriculum integration of vocabulary learning strategies.

The moderate ratings for items related to reading material length mean scores ranging from 2.98 to 3.36 suggest that vocabulary is more important than text length in overall challenge. According to Sweller's (1988) cognitive load theory, learning is impaired when working memory capacity exceeds. Most students do not experience cognitive overload from text length, according to moderate ratings. However, the standard deviation of 0.97 for "Readings are too long and too many" suggests that some students may be more susceptible to cognitive overload.

These findings emphasise the importance of careful reading material length and density calibration to optimise cognitive load. According to Brünken et al (2010) effective instructional design should manage intrinsic cognitive load, minimise extraneous load, and maximise learning-related load.

Despite vocabulary and length issues, students find the content relevant and engaging, as shown by "High" ratings for content relevance and interest mean scores ranging from 3.48 to 3.72. The highest means (3.72) for "The topics are provided introduction" and "The topics are up-to-date and relevant" show that students value contextual framing and find the content relevant to their studies. These positive ratings follow Snow and Brinton (2017)'s CBI and CLIL principles. These methods emphasise using authentic, relevant content to motivate language learners and provide meaningful contexts. The results indicate that the materials may motivate and engage students.

Student ratings of exercises and practice activities range from 3.40 to 3.93, indicating that they are well-designed and beneficial. The materials' highest mean 3.93 for "The instructions of exercises are easy to understand" suggests clear instructions are a strength. Ellis (2003) emphasises that task-based language teaching requires clarity for independent learning and task completion.

The exercises' high variety mean 3.81 and interest mean 3.71 support Gardner and Hatch (1989) Theory of Multiple Intelligences, which emphasises addressing different learning styles and intelligences. The materials appear to accommodate diverse learning styles by providing engaging exercises, which may improve learning outcomes.

Summative assessment opportunities' moderate rating of 3.40 suggests improvement. According to Wiliam (2000) formative and summative assessments are essential to learning. A balanced assessment approach with more summative elements to complement the strong formative elements would benefit the materials.

The materials use visual elements to support learning, as shown by the high ratings for font readability (3.76) and illustration (3.74). Mayer's (2009) Cognitive theory of multimedia learning emphasises the importance of combining visual and textual information to improve learning.

The moderate rating of 3.28 for audio, video, and hypertext learning media suggests room for improvement. The use of technology in language learning is growing and has many benefits, according to Chapelle and Sauro (2017). The high student interest in interactive media for learning got means of 3.74 and 3.67 highlights the need to integrate multimedia into materials.

Interesting contrast between satisfaction with useful phrases 3.52 and vocabulary lists 3.10. This suggests that students prefer contextualised vocabulary over decontextualised word lists, supporting vocabulary acquisition research (Laufer & Nation, 2013). Future vocabulary support could prioritise contextualised presentation of new vocabulary over isolated word lists.

Student mean score for "I have difficulties in understanding English texts" was 4.83, indicating significant challenges. This supports Nezami (2012)'s finding that EFL students struggle with text comprehension. Since students are struggling but not overwhelmed, the moderate difficulty level suggests a zone of proximal development Vygotsky (1978) where targeted instruction could improve performance.

Multiple data points show vocabulary issues. The high mean score 5.22 for understanding vocabulary in current module texts and moderate mean 4.55 for memorising English vocabulary emphasise the importance of vocabulary in reading comprehension. These findings support Nation (2001) and Pigada and Schmitt (2006), who stressed vocabulary's importance in language proficiency.

The mean 4.72 for listing vocabulary before memorising suggests that students are trying to learn new vocabulary, but they may benefit from better strategies. Gu and Johnson 1996 found that memorisation and contextual guessing improve language proficiency. The perceived mismatch between students' vocabulary level and text difficulty means 4.74 emphasises the need for text selection and scaffolding in language instruction. Nation (2006) recommends that students know 98% of a text's words for unassisted comprehension, and current materials may be pushing many students beyond this threshold.

Understanding foreign culture texts is a major challenge (mean 6.03). According to Alptekin (2006) and Matsunaga and Koda (2006) cultural knowledge is crucial to reading comprehension. Students struggle with texts that require cultural context, as shown by the high mean score. Cultural barriers to comprehension may be related to implicit idea and information interpretation mean 5.03. These findings demonstrate the complex relationship between language, culture, and comprehension, supporting the call for more cultural content and intercultural competence in language instruction (Byram, 1997).

Data shows moderate difficulties in several reading strategy and skill areas. Student challenges include finding main ideas in texts (5.21), connecting and getting information from texts (4.43), and a lack of reading strategies (4.00). The moderate difficulty in identifying main ideas is noteworthy because it is essential for reading comprehension. According to Stoller et al. (2013), successful reading requires identifying main ideas and supporting details.

Lack of reading strategies has a lower mean score, suggesting that not all students lack them. However, moderate difficulty in connecting information within texts suggests that students may benefit from explicit instruction in textual coherence and information integration reading strategies. This supports Carrell et al. (1998) and Grabe (2010)'s suggestion for explicit reading comprehension strategy instruction.

The data reveal students' reading fluency and engagement. Fluency issues mean 4.74, settling down and starting to read issues mean 4.29, and slow reading with boredom due to difficulty means 5.47. The moderate difficulty in reading fluently and the higher mean score for being a slow reader indicate that many students struggle with reading faster and automatically. Grabe (2010) found that reading fluency improves comprehension. Reading fluency frees up cognitive resources for higher-level comprehension (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974).

Reading difficult texts can bore, which can lead to disengagement and hinder improvement. This supports Guthrie (2000)'s reading motivation and engagement research. It emphasises the importance of choosing challenging but accessible texts and using instructional strategies to motivate reading.

The data reveal students' views on teaching and learning. The mean 4.24 for uninteresting teaching methods and 4.50 for lack of reading activities suggest that instructional methods can be improved. These items have moderate mean scores, but Stoller et al. (2013) and Hedgcock and Ferris (2018) note that engaging teaching methods and varied reading activities improve reading skills.

These findings emphasise the need for innovative and engaging instructional methods that accommodate diverse learning styles. The moderate scores suggest that while current methods are not severely flawed, more varied and interactive teaching strategies could improve student engagement and effectiveness.

Several data points address learning materials and media issues. Students struggle with print media in practical work (mean 4.29), time-consuming navigation (4.93), and outdated textbooks (4.90). These findings indicate moderate print material usability and relevance issues. The difficulty of navigating printed materials and the perceived outdatedness of textbooks suggest learning material selection and design improvements. Tomlinson (2012) found that language learners need appropriate materials.

Due to moderate print media difficulties and high interest in interactive media, digital and interactive learning resources may become more popular. The growing body of research on computer-assisted language learning (CALL) and mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) shows that technology integration in language instruction may be beneficial (Chapelle & Sauro, 2017).

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive analysis draws several important conclusions and recommendations for English language teaching and materials development. More systematic and contextualised vocabulary instruction is needed due to reported vocabulary difficulties. Materials should explicitly teach high-frequency academic and discipline-specific vocabulary. The curriculum should include vocabulary notebooks, semantic mapping, and word recycling.

Cultural content should be more integrated into language materials due to the difficulty of understanding foreign culture texts. This could include intercultural communication activities, authentic materials from diverse cultures, and explicit cultural awareness and sensitivity instruction.

The moderate difficulties reported in reading comprehension suggest the need for explicit reading strategy instruction. Strategy instruction could involve identifying main ideas, making inferences, and connecting textual information. It should also be integrated into reading activities. Materials and instruction should include reading speed and automaticity activities to improve fluency. Timed, repeated, and graded reading can boost confidence and speed. While

moderately problematic, teaching methods can be made more engaging. This could involve more collaborative learning, problem-based learning, and technology to make learning more interactive. The positive response to visual elements and interest in interactive media suggest the need for more multimodal learning resources. Digital textbooks with multimedia, interactive online exercises, and virtual or augmented reality for immersive language learning are possible.

The variability in text difficulty responses suggests a need for differentiated materials that can serve multiple proficiency levels in a classroom. Tiered reading materials or adaptive learning technologies that adjust content difficulty based on student performance may be used. Formative assessment through exercises is well-represented, but summative assessment is needed. A balance of formative and summative assessments should be used to evaluate student progress.

Textbooks that seem outdated emphasise the need to update learning materials to stay relevant and engaging. The use of modular, easily updated content or current events and issues in reading materials may be used. Given the difficulties with print media and the desire for interactive learning, language instruction could benefit from more technology. This could include mobile learning apps, online learning platforms, and digital literacy in language curriculum. This extensive study of English language learning materials and reading comprehension challenges shows a complex interaction of factors that affect student success. The current materials are strong in content relevance and exercise design, but vocabulary, cultural comprehension, and reading fluency could be improved.

The findings emphasise the need for explicit strategy instruction, contextualised vocabulary learning, cultural integration, and technology-enhanced English language instruction. These areas can help researcher create more effective and engaging learning environments to help students improve their English reading comprehension.

Materials development and instructional design must remain research-informed as English language teaching evolves. Future research could examine how well these recommendations work in diverse cultural and educational contexts. Longitudinal studies on the long-term effects of improved materials and instructional strategies on student outcomes would also help improve English language education. By improving understanding of student challenges and adapting teaching methods, it can provide more effective and inclusive English language instruction that empowers students to reach their full reading comprehension and language proficiency potential.

REFERENCES

Ahmadi, M. R., Ismail, H. N., & Abdullah, M. K. K. (2013). The relationship between students' reading motivation and reading comprehension. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(18), 9.

Aini, N., Sari, E. M. P., & Rikarda, W. A. (2020). e-Module Design with Content Based Instruction in Reading for Academic Purpose. *Ilmu Pendidikan: Jurnal Kajian Teori Dan Praktik Kependidikan*, *5*(2).

Al-Haydan, D. Y. A. (2020). The Effects of Morphological Awareness on EFL Secondary School Students' Reading Comprehension Skills. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.3p.48

Alptekin, C. (2006). Cultural familiarity in inferential and literal comprehension in L2 reading. *System*, *34*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.05.003

Amartha, S. (2013). *the Effect of Using Interactive Approach on Reading*.

Baha, D. O. A. (2017). Reading Models: A Review of the Current Literature. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 44–49. https://doi.org/10.24001/ijels.2.3.6

Balbay, S., & Erkan, G. (2021). Online Language Learning in Times of Crisis: Hindrance or Opportunity? *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.936827

Barber, A. T., & Klauda, S. L. (2020). How Reading Motivation and Engagement Enable Reading Achievement: Policy Implications. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *7*(1), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732219893385

Bontisesari, Dewanti, R., & Sulistyaningrum, S. D. (2023). Development of Microlearning-Based and Problem-Solving Infused English Reading Materials for Non-English Major: a Needs Analysis. *Asian Journal of Applied Education (AJAE)*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.55927/ajae.v2i2.3782

Brünken, R., Plass, J. L., & Moreno, R. (2010). Current issues and open questions in cognitive load research. In *Cognitive Load Theory*. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511844744.014

Byram, M. (1997). "cultural awareness" as vocabulary learning. *Language Learning Journal*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/09571739785200291

Can, D. (2020). The mediator effect of reading comprehension in the relationship between logical reasoning and word problem solving. Participatory Educational Research, 7(3), 230–246. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.20.44.7.3

Carrell, P. L., Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (1998). Metacognition and EFL/ESL reading. Instructional Science, 26(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1003092114195

Chapelle, C. A., & Sauro, S. (2017). Introduction to the Handbook of Technology and Second Language Teaching and Learning . In *The Handbook of Technology and Second Language Teaching and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118914069.ch1

Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2). https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951

Dermitzaki, I., Andreou, G., & Paraskeva, V. (2008). High and low reading comprehension achievers' strategic behaviors and their relation to performance in a reading comprehension situation. *Reading Psychology, 29*(6), 471-492. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710802168519

Dewi, K. S., & Sahiruddin. (2020). Online Reading Culture Among Indonesian EFL Students at Tertiary Education Level. *Jurnal Studi Budaya Nusantara*, *4*(2).

Ellis, R. (2003). Designing a task-based syllabus. RELC Journal, 34(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400105

Gardner, H., & Hatch, T. (1989). Educational Implications of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(8). https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018008004

Grabe, W. (2010). Fluency in reading — Thirty-five years later. Readning in a Foreign Language, 22(1).

Guthrie, J. W. (2000). CHAPTER 24 Engagement and Motivation in Reading. Handbook of Reading Research, III.

Hedgcock, J. S., & Ferris, D. R. (2018). Teaching Readers of English Students, Texts, and Contexts, Second Edition. In Teaching Readers of English Students, Texts, and Contexts, Second Edition. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315465579

Hergüner, G., Buğra SON, S., Hergüner Son, S., & Dönmez, A. (2020). The effect of online leearning attitudes of university Students on their Online Learning Readiness. *TOJET:*

The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, *19*(4), 102–111.

Hill, L. (2016). Digital Literacy Instruction for eHealth and Beyond. *ORTESOL Journal*, *33*, 34–40.

Kamal, S. M. (2019). Developing efl learners vocabulary by reading english comprehension in efl classroom. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, *8*(1), 28–35. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.23.2019.81.28.35

Karani, E., Usadiati, W., Susanti, Syeba, S., & Otniel. (2022). Developing e-Book of Reading for Intensive Course in Virtual Classroom: Students' Need Analysis. *EBONY: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v2i2.5280

Kessler, G. (2018). Introduction to Teaching and Technology. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eeltv06b

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Second language acquisition. In *Work (Reading, Mass.)* (Vol. 77, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-246000

Kusumawanti, W. D., & Bharati, D. A. L. (2018). The effectiveness of close and explicit reading instructions to enhance reading comprehension to highy and lowly motivated students. *Journal.Unnes.Ac.Id*, *8*(1), 1–9.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(74)90015-2

Laufer, B., & Nation, I. P. (2013). Vocabulary. In The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition.

Livingston, C., Dippenaar, H., Anker, J., Simon, E., & Mashiyi, N. (2022). INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE ACROSS THE CURRICULUM (LAC) AND DISCIPLINARY LITERACY (DL) AT A FACULTY OF EDUCATION: A NEEDS ANALYSIS. *Per Linguam*, *38*(1). https://doi.org/10.5785/38-1-991

Manalu, B. H. (2019). Students' Perception of Digital Texts Reading: A Case Study at the English Education Department of Universitas Kristen Indonesi. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, *5*(3), 191. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v5i3.1312

Matsunaga, S., & Koda, K. (2006). Insights into Second Language Reading: A Cross-Linguistic Approach. Japanese Language and Literature, 40(1). https://doi.org/10.2307/30198000

Mayer, R. E. (2009). Constructivism as a theory of learning versus constructivism as a prescription for instruction. In *Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?* https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203878842

McCrudden, M. T. (2018). Text relevance and multiple-source use. In *Handbook of Multiple Source Use*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315627496

McKeown, M. G. (2019). Effective vocabulary instruction fosters knowing words, using words, and understanding how words work. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *50*(4), 466–476. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_LSHSS-VOIA-18-0126

Mikroyannidis, A., Okada, A., Scott, P., Rusman, E., Specht, M., Stefanov, K., Boytchev, P., Protopsaltis, A., Held, P., Hetzner, S., Kikis-Papadakis, K., & Chaimala, F. (2013). WeSPOT: A personal and social approach to inquiry-based learning. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, *19*(14).

Nation, I. P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language in Another Language. *English for Specific Purposes*, *23*(1).

Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(1). https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59

Nelson, S. (2019). Close Reading in the Urban Classroom: A Teacher's Introspection.

Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.4148/2470-6353.1266

Nezami, S. R. A. (2012). A critical study of comprehension strategies and general problems in reading skill faced by Arab EFL learners with special reference to Najran University in saudi Arabia. International Journal Social Science and Education, 2(3).

Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading : A case study. Reading in a Foreign Language, 18(1).

Qrqez, M., & Rashid, R. (2017). Reading Comprehension Difficulties among EFL Learners: The Case of First and Second -Year Students at Yarmouk University in Jordan. *Arab World English Journal*, *8*(3), 421–431. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no3.27

Renandya, W. A., Krashen, S., & Jacobs, G. M. (2018). The potential of series books: How narrow reading leads to advanced L2 proficiency. *Learn Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, *11*(2), 148–154.

Rokhmansyah, A., Nuryatin, A., Supriyanto, T., & Setyaningsih, N. H. (2021). Evaluation of reading materials for students in schools. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *16*(3), 1097–1105. https://doi.org/10.18844/CJES.V16I3.5828

Rumelhart, D. E. (2005). *Toward an Interactive Model of Reading*. 1149–1179. https://doi.org/10.1598/0872075028.41

Satriani, E. (2006). Reading Comprehension Difficulties Encountered by English Students of Universitas Islam Riau. *Journal of English for Academic*, *1999*(December), 1–6.

Satriani, E. (2018). Reading Comprehension Difficulties Encountered by English Students of Islamic University of Riau. *J-SHMIC : Journal of English for Academic*, *5*(2), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.25299/jshmic.2018.vol5(2).1885

Shofiah, N. (2017). Consideration of the selection of reading texts in teaching and learning to read. *Roceeding of National Seminar on Language and Literature (SENASBASA)*, 285–296.

Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (2019). Content-based instruction: What every ESL teacher needs to know. In *Content-Based Instruction: What Every ESL Teacher Needs to Know*. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.10138077

Stanovich, K. E. (1980). Toward an Interactive-Compensatory Model of Individual Differences in the Development of Reading Fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.2307/747348

Stoller, F. L., Anderson, N. J., Grabe, W., & Komiyama, R. (2013). Instructional enhancements to improve students' reading abilities. English Teaching Forum, 51(1).

Suggate, S., & Lenhard, W. (2022). Mental imagery skill predicts adults' reading performance. *Learning and Instruction*, *80*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101633

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/0364-0213(88)90023-7

T. Yaghi, E. (2021). The Impact of Metacognitive Online Reading Strategies on Online Reading Disposition of Saudi EFL Learners. *Arab World English Journal*, *1*, 364–380. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid.27

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. In Language Teaching (Vol. 45, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind and Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. In Harvard University Press.

Wahyudin, U. R. (2022). DAMPAK PEMBELAJARAN SEJARAH PENDIDIKAN ISLAM BERBASIS E-LEARNING TERHADAP KEMANDIRIAN BELAJAR MAHASISWA. Al-Ulum Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Ke ….

Wahyuningsih, S. K. (2018). DEVELOPING EXTENSIVE READING MATERIAL FOR SEMESTER 2 STUDENTS OF YOGYAKARTA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY. *Jurnal As-Salam*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/10.37249/as-salam.v2i3.107

Wiliam, D. (2000). Integrating formative and summative functions of assessment. International Congress on Mathematical Education, 58.

Yolanda Melandita. (2019). *Students' difficulties in comprehending the English reading text at the second semester of the eight grade of SMP Darul Falah Bandar Lampung.*

Yunus, M., & Ubaidillah, M. F. (2021). EFL teacher educators' experiences in teaching critical reading: evidence from Indonesia. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *11*(2), 422–441. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i2.3133

Zaccoletti, S., Altoè, G., & Mason, L. (2020). Enjoyment, anxiety and boredom, and their control-value antecedents as predictors of reading comprehension. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *79*(March), 101869. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101869