

Journal of Research and Multidisciplinary

ISSN: 2622-9536 Print

ISSN: 2622-9544 Online

<http://journal.alhikam.net/index.php/jrm>

Volume 9, Issue 2, September 2026, Pages 1219-1229



The Effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching Strategy in Improving EFL Students' Reading Comprehension: A True Experimental Study

¹Sitti Nurjannah, ²Syamsul Rijal

¹English Department, Universitas Islam Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

²Indonesian Language Department, Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Indonesia

Email : sittinurjannah.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id

Abstract

This study investigated the effectiveness of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy in improving EFL students' reading comprehension. A quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design was employed. The participants were 30 tenth-grade EFL students from two intact classes at a senior high school in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia, with 15 students assigned to the experimental group and 15 to the control group. The experimental group received reading instruction through Reciprocal Teaching based on predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing, while the control group received conventional reading instruction. Data were collected using a reading comprehension test consisting of 40 multiple-choice items and 10 essay items and were analyzed using descriptive statistics, assumption tests, paired-samples *t*-tests, independent-samples *t*-tests, and effect-size analysis. The findings showed that both groups significantly improved their reading comprehension. However, the experimental group demonstrated substantially greater improvement, with a mean gain of 46.33 points compared with 18.80 points in the control group. The difference in gain scores was statistically significant, $t(28) = 5.02$, $p < .001$, with a very large effect size ($d = 1.83$). The findings indicate that Reciprocal Teaching provided greater support for reading comprehension improvement than conventional instruction. The study suggests that the systematic integration of predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing can provide a structured and student-centered framework for EFL reading instruction.

Keywords : EFL, Reading Comprehension, Reciprocal Teaching, Reading Instruction, Reading Strategy

Introduction

Reading comprehension is a fundamental component of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning because it enables learners to understand, interpret, evaluate, and construct meaning from written texts. Effective reading comprehension involves more than recognizing words and sentences; it requires learners to identify main ideas, understand supporting information, make inferences, interpret vocabulary in context, and connect

textual information with prior knowledge. These abilities are essential for students to access academic information and participate effectively in learning activities in which English texts serve as important sources of knowledge. Therefore, reading instruction should not only focus on students' ability to obtain information from texts but also provide opportunities for them to actively process, monitor, and construct meaning. Developing students' reading comprehension consequently requires instructional practices that encourage strategic and meaningful engagement with written texts.

EFL students commonly experience difficulties in reading comprehension, particularly in identifying main ideas, making inferences, interpreting unfamiliar vocabulary, and monitoring their understanding of texts. Inferencing is an important component of comprehension because readers need to draw conclusions from information that is not explicitly stated in a text. (Lee, 2013) emphasizes the importance of explicit instruction in inferencing to support learners' comprehension. Similarly, (Bengeleil & Paribakht, 2004) found that lexical inferencing is influenced by learners' proficiency and their ability to use contextual cues effectively, indicating that vocabulary knowledge and strategic processing are closely related to successful comprehension. In addition, (Šamo & Mikulec, 2018) reported that prolonged exposure to EFL does not necessarily lead to adequate metacomprehension skills without appropriate instructional support. These findings indicate that reading difficulties cannot be addressed solely through vocabulary or text exposure; learners also need explicit support in developing strategies that help them understand, monitor, and regulate their reading processes.

The need for more active reading instruction is particularly relevant in the Indonesian EFL context. Traditional reading instruction has often relied on teacher explanations and question-and-answer activities, which may provide limited opportunities for students to actively construct meaning from texts. The development of English language education in Indonesia, however, has increasingly emphasized communicative and student-centered approaches that encourage active learner participation (Bambang Yudi Cahyono, 2006) . Various instructional approaches, including literature circles, Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), Project-Based Learning, and Contextual Teaching and Learning, have been used to promote students' engagement, collaboration, and reading development (Nabila et al., 2025) . Furthermore, (Sangaji et al., 2023) reported that the integration of local cultural content into literacy instruction can support students' critical reading by strengthening inferential thinking and contextual understanding. These developments suggest that Indonesian EFL reading instruction needs strategies that move beyond teacher-dominated activities and provide students with systematic opportunities to participate actively in the construction and monitoring of meaning.

One instructional strategy that addresses these needs is Reciprocal Teaching (RT), a metacognitive approach originally developed by Palincsar and Brown (1984). RT consists of four complementary reading strategies: predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. Through predicting, students activate prior knowledge and anticipate information in the text; through questioning, they identify important ideas and monitor their understanding; through clarifying, they address unfamiliar words, concepts, or confusing information; and through summarizing, they identify and synthesize the main ideas of the text. The approach also involves a gradual transfer of responsibility from teacher modeling to student participation, allowing learners to practice and monitor

comprehension strategies more independently. Previous research has indicated that RT can support comprehension strategy use among learners with different levels of reading ability (Pilonieta & Medina, 2009; Williams, 2010) ; (Soonthornmanee, 2002a) . Thus, RT provides a theoretically grounded approach for transforming reading instruction into a more active, strategic, collaborative, and metacognitively oriented learning process.

Previous empirical studies have generally indicated positive potential for Reciprocal Teaching, although the outcomes are not always consistent across learners and instructional contexts. (Okkinga et al., 2021a) , for example, found that RT principles supported low-achieving adolescent readers in using reading strategies and addressing specific comprehension difficulties. Similarly, (Qian et al., 2023) reported a positive relationship between reading strategy instruction and reading comprehension, with strategy use and autonomous motivation contributing to this relationship. However, the effects of RT are not uniformly positive. (Decristan et al., 2024a) found that incorporating linguistically responsive elements into RT improved students' use of reading strategies among diverse learners, but the intervention did not produce a significant improvement in overall reading comprehension. (Aktaş, 2025a) also reported that online RT improved fourth-grade students' reading comprehension, particularly vocabulary and text understanding, while it did not significantly affect their intrinsic motivation. These findings suggest that RT has considerable potential to strengthen strategic reading and comprehension, but its effectiveness may depend on learners' characteristics, instructional settings, implementation procedures, and the outcomes being measured.

Despite the growing body of research on Reciprocal Teaching, empirical evidence remains limited regarding its implementation among Indonesian senior high school EFL students, particularly in the context of Makassar. Existing studies have examined RT across different age groups, learning conditions, and instructional modes, but fewer studies have specifically investigated its effectiveness among senior high school EFL learners in an Indonesian context. Preliminary observations in the research context also indicated that students continued to experience difficulties in comprehending English texts and were not consistently engaged in active reading activities. This condition highlights the need to examine whether a structured strategy based on predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing can help students become more active and strategic readers. Therefore, further investigation is needed to provide empirical evidence on the effectiveness of RT for senior high school EFL students in Makassar.

Accordingly, this study aims to investigate the effectiveness of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy in improving EFL students' reading comprehension. Specifically, the study examines whether students' reading comprehension significantly improves after participating in instructional activities based on predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. To address this objective, the study employs a pre-experimental one-group pretest-posttest design by comparing students' reading comprehension performance before and after the implementation of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy. The findings are expected to provide empirical evidence concerning the use of Reciprocal Teaching as an active and metacognitively oriented strategy for improving reading comprehension among senior high school EFL students in Makassar.

Method and Data

This study employed a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design. The design was used to examine the effectiveness of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy in improving students' EFL reading comprehension. Two intact classes were involved in the study: Class XA as the experimental group and Class XB as the control group. Both groups completed a pretest before the treatment and a posttest after the treatment. The experimental group received reading instruction using the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy, while the control group received conventional reading instruction.

Participants

The population consisted of 30 tenth-grade EFL students at a senior high school in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The participants were distributed into two intact classes, with 15 students in Class XA and 15 students in Class XB. Class XA was assigned as the experimental group, while Class XB served as the control group. Since the entire population was involved, total population sampling was employed.

Research Instrument

The main instrument was a reading comprehension test consisting of 50 items: 40 multiple-choice questions and 10 essay questions. The test assessed students' ability to identify main ideas, locate specific information, understand vocabulary in context, identify supporting details, make inferences, interpret information, and summarize the content of English texts. The test was administered as a pretest and posttest to both groups. Before administration, the instrument was reviewed through expert judgment to ensure content relevance, clarity, and appropriateness for tenth-grade EFL students. The instrument was also subjected to item analysis and reliability testing before being used as the final research instrument.

Research Procedure

The study was conducted in three main stages: pretest, treatment, and posttest. First, both groups completed the reading comprehension pretest to determine their initial reading ability. Second, the experimental group received instruction through Reciprocal Teaching, which incorporated four main activities: predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. Students were guided to predict the content of a text, formulate questions, clarify unfamiliar or difficult information, and summarize the main ideas. The teacher gradually transferred responsibility for applying these strategies from teacher modeling to student participation. In contrast, the control group received conventional reading instruction involving teacher explanation, reading activities, question-and-answer exercises, and individual tasks. Finally, both groups completed the posttest using the reading comprehension assessment.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the mean and standard deviation of students' pretest and posttest scores. Before inferential analysis, normality and homogeneity tests were conducted to examine the assumptions for parametric analysis. A paired-samples t-test was used to examine changes in reading comprehension within each group, while an independent-samples t-test

was used to compare the improvement between the experimental and control groups. The statistical significance level was set at $\alpha = .05$. In addition, an effect-size measure was calculated to determine the magnitude of the effect of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy on students' reading comprehension.

Results

1. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics of students' reading comprehension scores are presented in Table 1. The analysis involved 30 students, consisting of 15 students in the experimental group and 15 students in the control group.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Reading Comprehension Scores

Group	N	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD	Gain Mean	Gain SD
Experimental	5	43.40	11.22	89.73	7.96	46.33	3.22
Control	15	42.87	8.05	61.67	15.85	18.80	6.62
Total	30						

As shown in Table 1, the two groups had comparable pretest scores, with mean scores of 43.40 for the experimental group and 42.87 for the control group. After the treatment, the experimental group achieved a substantially higher mean score (89.73) than the control group (61.67). The mean gain was also considerably higher in the experimental group (46.33) than in the control group (18.80), indicating greater improvement among students who received Reciprocal Teaching.

2. Assumption Tests

Before conducting the inferential analyses, normality and homogeneity tests were performed. The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the pretest and posttest scores in both groups were normally distributed. For the experimental group, the pretest and posttest values were $W = .949$, $p = .501$, and $W = .941$, $p = .389$, respectively. For the control group, the corresponding values were $W = .887$, $p = .060$, and $W = .936$, $p = .338$. All p values were greater than .05, indicating no significant departure from normality.

Levene's test also indicated homogeneous variances between the groups. The pretest scores showed $F = 1.93$, $p = .176$, while the gain scores showed $F = 1.00$, $p = .326$. The posttest scores produced $F = 3.54$, $p = .070$. Since all p values exceeded .05, the assumptions for the subsequent t -test analyses were considered satisfied.

Paired-samples t -tests were conducted to determine whether students' reading comprehension scores significantly changed from pretest to posttest within each group.

Table 2. Within-Group Changes in Reading Comprehension

Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	$t(14)$	p
Experimental	43.40	89.73	46.33	13.57	$< .001$
Control	42.87	61.67	18.80	4.38	$< .001$

As presented in Table 2, both groups demonstrated statistically significant improvements in reading comprehension. The experimental group increased from a mean of 43.40 to 89.73, with a mean improvement of 46.33 points, $t(14) = 13.57$, $p < .001$. The control group also showed a significant increase, from 42.87 to 61.67, with a mean improvement

of 18.80 points, $t(14) = 4.38$, $p < .001$. However, the magnitude of improvement was substantially greater in the experimental group.

Independent-samples t -tests were conducted to compare the two groups at baseline and after the intervention. The pretest comparison showed no significant difference between the experimental and control groups, $t(28) = 0.15$, $p = .882$. This indicates that the two groups had comparable reading comprehension levels before the intervention.

In contrast, a significant difference was found in the posttest scores, $t(28) = 6.13$, $p < .001$. The experimental group obtained a considerably higher posttest mean (89.73) than the control group (61.67). A significant difference was also found in the gain scores, $t(28) = 5.02$, $p < .001$. The experimental group showed a mean gain of 46.33 points, compared with 18.80 points for the control group. These findings indicate that students who received Reciprocal Teaching demonstrated substantially greater improvement in reading comprehension than those who received conventional instruction.

Effect sizes were calculated to determine the practical magnitude of the observed improvements.

Table 3. Effect Sizes of Reading Comprehension Improvement

Comparison	Effect Size (Cohen's d)	Interpretation
Experimental pretest-posttest	3.50	Very large
Control pretest-posttest	1.13	Large
Posttest: Experimental vs. Control	2.24	Very large
Gain score: Experimental vs. Control	1.83	Very large

Table 3 shows that the experimental group demonstrated a very large within-group effect ($d = 3.50$). Although the control group also showed a large improvement ($d = 1.13$), the between-group effect was substantially greater. The effect size for the posttest comparison was $d = 2.24$, while the effect size for the gain-score comparison was $d = 1.83$. These values indicate a very large practical difference favoring the Reciprocal Teaching group.

Overall, the results show that both groups significantly improved their reading comprehension after instruction. However, the experimental group demonstrated substantially greater improvement than the control group. The groups did not differ significantly at pretest, but significant differences emerged in both posttest and gain scores. The very large effect sizes further indicate that the advantage of Reciprocal Teaching was not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful. Therefore, the findings provide empirical support for the effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching in improving EFL students' reading comprehension.

Discussion and Conclusions

The findings demonstrate that Reciprocal Teaching was more effective than conventional instruction in improving EFL students' reading comprehension. The experimental group achieved a substantially higher improvement than the control group, as reflected in the mean gain scores of 46.33 and 18.80, respectively. The between-group comparison further showed a statistically significant difference in gain scores, $t(28) = 5.02$, $p < .001$. In addition, the very large effect size ($d = 1.83$) indicates that the difference between the two groups was not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful. The absence of a significant

difference in pretest scores, $t(28) = 0.15$, $p = .882$, also indicates that the two groups started from comparable levels of reading comprehension. These findings are consistent with previous studies reporting positive effects of Reciprocal Teaching on reading comprehension. (Tseng & Yeh, 2018) , for example, found that Reciprocal Teaching integrated with an online annotation environment significantly improved English reading comprehension among low-achieving students. Similarly, (Aktaş, 2025b) reported that online Reciprocal Teaching improved students' reading comprehension. (Okkinga et al., 2021a) also demonstrated the potential of Reciprocal Teaching principles to support adolescent readers in addressing comprehension difficulties. Taken together, these findings support the present result that structured Reciprocal Teaching can provide greater support for reading comprehension than conventional instruction.

The greater improvement in the experimental group may be explained by the systematic integration of predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing in the reading process. These four strategies provide students with a structured sequence for actively processing information and constructing meaning from texts. Predicting encourages learners to activate prior knowledge and anticipate information before or during reading, while questioning directs their attention toward important ideas and encourages them to examine their understanding. Clarifying provides opportunities for students to identify and resolve difficulties related to unfamiliar words, concepts, or parts of the text. Summarizing, meanwhile, requires learners to identify the most important information and reorganize it in their own words. (Okkinga et al., 2021b) reported that the principles of Reciprocal Teaching could support low-achieving adolescent readers in using reading strategies and addressing comprehension difficulties. Similarly, (Soonthornmanee, 2002b) highlighted the contribution of the four Reciprocal Teaching strategies to reading comprehension through systematic strategy use. Therefore, the substantial gain observed in the experimental group may be related to the structured opportunities provided by these four strategies for students to engage actively with the text rather than relying primarily on teacher explanations.

The effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching may also be related to its emphasis on metacognitive monitoring and regulation during reading. The strategy requires students not only to understand textual information but also to consider whether they understand the text and what they should do when comprehension problems occur. Through questioning, clarifying, and summarizing, students are repeatedly encouraged to check their understanding and respond to difficulties encountered during reading. This process is consistent with research emphasizing the importance of metacognitive awareness and accurate monitoring in successful reading comprehension. (Okkinga et al., 2021a) showed that Reciprocal Teaching can support the strategic behavior of adolescent readers, while (Mustopa et al., 2024) highlighted the role of strategic learning processes in students' self-regulation. (van de Pol et al., 2020) also emphasized the importance of monitoring and regulating comprehension in metacognitive learning. In the present study, however, metacognitive awareness was not measured as a separate variable. Thus, the metacognitive explanation should be understood as a possible mechanism underlying the observed improvement rather than as a direct finding of the study. The substantially higher gain achieved by the experimental group nevertheless suggests that instructional activities requiring students to actively monitor and regulate their understanding may have

contributed to their reading comprehension development.

The present findings are generally consistent with previous empirical research, although the effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching has not been uniform across contexts. Tseng and Yeh (2018) found significant improvement in English reading comprehension when Reciprocal Teaching was combined with online annotation, while (Aktaş, 2025b) reported positive effects of online Reciprocal Teaching on reading comprehension. (Okkinga et al., 2021a) likewise provided evidence of the usefulness of Reciprocal Teaching principles for adolescent readers. However, (Decristan et al., 2024b) reported that linguistically responsive Reciprocal Teaching improved students' use of reading strategies but did not produce a significant improvement in overall reading comprehension. This difference indicates that the outcomes of Reciprocal Teaching may depend on factors such as learner characteristics, instructional context, and implementation procedures. The present study involved tenth-grade EFL students in a senior high school context and used a structured pretest–posttest comparison between an experimental and a control group. The stronger gain observed in this setting may therefore reflect the suitability of the strategy and its implementation for the learners and instructional context examined in the present study. At the same time, because the participants were drawn from intact classes, the findings should be interpreted within the context of the study rather than generalized to all EFL learners.

The significant improvement in the control group indicates that conventional reading instruction can also support students' reading comprehension development, although the magnitude of improvement was substantially smaller than that observed in the Reciprocal Teaching group. Students in the control group improved from a mean pretest score of 42.87 to a posttest mean of 61.67, and the within-group difference was statistically significant, $t(14) = 4.38$, $p < .001$. This finding suggests that regular reading activities, teacher explanations, question-and-answer activities, and individual tasks can contribute to learning. However, the control group's mean gain of 18.80 was considerably lower than the 46.33-point gain achieved by the experimental group. The significant difference in gain scores between the groups, $t(28) = 5.02$, $p < .001$, further demonstrates that the two instructional approaches were associated with different levels of improvement. Previous research has similarly indicated that conventional instruction can produce some improvement in reading comprehension, while more explicit strategy-based instruction may provide additional support for learners ((Ghahari & Ebrahimi, 2017) ; (Xu et al., 2022). Thus, the present findings do not suggest that conventional instruction is ineffective; rather, they indicate that the systematic integration of Reciprocal Teaching strategies may provide greater opportunities for students to engage strategically with reading texts.

The findings suggest that Reciprocal Teaching provides a practical framework for making EFL reading instruction more strategic, interactive, and student-centered. The substantially higher gain and very large between-group effect size observed in the experimental group indicate that the four Reciprocal Teaching strategies can be meaningfully incorporated into reading instruction to support students' comprehension development. For classroom practice, teachers can introduce the strategies through explicit modeling and guided practice before gradually encouraging students to apply predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing more independently. Such implementation can provide students with a clear structure for approaching texts and responding to comprehension difficulties. This

implication is consistent with (Soonthornmanee, 2002c) and (Williams, 2010), who emphasized the value of explicit reading strategies and teacher-supported practice in developing learners' comprehension processes. In the context of the present study, Reciprocal Teaching therefore provides a promising framework for supporting more strategic and student-centered EFL reading instruction. Overall, the findings indicate that Reciprocal Teaching was associated with substantially greater improvement in EFL students' reading comprehension than conventional instruction, although further studies involving larger samples, different educational contexts, and more rigorous assignment procedures are needed to examine the consistency of these effects.

Conclusion

This study examined the effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching in improving EFL students' reading comprehension by comparing students who received Reciprocal Teaching with those who received conventional reading instruction. The findings showed that both groups experienced significant improvement after instruction; however, the experimental group demonstrated substantially greater improvement than the control group. The experimental group achieved a mean gain of 46.33 points, compared with 18.80 points in the control group, and the difference in gain scores was statistically significant. The very large between-group effect size further indicates the practical significance of the observed difference.

These findings suggest that Reciprocal Teaching provides meaningful support for EFL students' reading comprehension through the systematic use of predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. The structured nature of these activities provides students with opportunities to engage actively with texts, monitor their understanding, and respond to comprehension difficulties. In contrast, conventional instruction also supported improvement but produced a considerably smaller gain.

Pedagogically, the findings indicate that Reciprocal Teaching can be incorporated into EFL reading instruction as a structured and student-centered strategy. Teachers may introduce the four strategies through explicit modeling and guided practice before encouraging students to apply them more independently. Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted within the context of the present study because the participants were limited to 30 students from two intact classes. Future research should involve larger samples, different educational contexts, and more rigorous assignment procedures to further examine the effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching in EFL reading instruction.

References

- Aktaş, N. (2025a). The Effect of Online Reciprocal Teaching on Fourth Grade Primary School Students' Reading Comprehension Skills and Reading Motivation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 41(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2023.2192720>
- Bambang Yudi Cahyono, U. W. (2006). The teaching of efl reading in the indonesian context: the state of the art. *TEFLIN Journal*.
- Bengeleil, N. F., & Paribakht, T. S. (2004). L2 Reading Proficiency and Lexical Inferencing by University EFL Learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 61(2), 225-249. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cml.2005.0001>
- Decristan, J., Bertram, V., Reitenbach, V., Schneider, K. M., Köhler, C., & Rauch, D. P. (2024a). Linguistically responsive reciprocal teaching in primary school: effectiveness of an intervention study on students' Reading competence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(10), 4102-4120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2141757>
- Decristan, J., Bertram, V., Reitenbach, V., Schneider, K. M., Köhler, C., & Rauch, D. P. (2024b). Linguistically responsive reciprocal teaching in primary school: effectiveness of an intervention study on students' Reading competence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(10), 4102-4120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2141757>
- Ghahari, S., & Ebrahimi, F. (2017). An intensive strategies-based program: insights for literacy and socio-emotional growth of college-level students. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 2(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0031-1>
- Lee, H. C. (2013). Thinking Matters: Inferencing in <scp>ESL</scp> Reading Lessons. *TESOL Journal*, 4(4), 717-742. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.75>
- Mustopa, R. A., Damaianti, V. S., Mulyati, Y., & Anshori, D. S. (2024). Investigating Senior High School Students' Metacognition in Indonesian Learning Reading Comprehension: Does it Have a Positive Impact? *International Journal of Language Education*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v8i2.64112>
- Nabila, U. P., Istiq'faroh, N., & Sukartiningsih, W. (2025). Innovative Learning Strategies for Optimizing Literacy Competencies in Elementary Indonesian Language Instruction. *Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education*, 4(4), 3412-3421. <https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v4i4.2444>
- Okkinga, M., van Gelderen, A. J. S., van Schooten, E., van Steensel, R., & Slegers, P. J. C. (2021a). Implementation quality of principles of reciprocal teaching in whole-classroom settings: a two-year study with low-achieving adolescents. *Reading Psychology*, 42(4), 323-363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2021.1887019>
- Okkinga, M., van Gelderen, A. J. S., van Schooten, E., van Steensel, R., & Slegers, P. J. C. (2021b). Implementation quality of principles of reciprocal teaching in whole-classroom settings: a two-year study with low-achieving adolescents. *Reading*

- Psychology, 42(4), 323–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2021.1887019>
- Pilonieta, P., & Medina, A. L. (2009). Reciprocal Teaching for the Primary Grades: “We Can Do It, Too!” *The Reading Teacher*, 63(2), 120–129. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.63.2.3>
- Qian, Q., Zheng, G., Huang, X., & Liao, X. (2023). Relationship Between Student-Perceived Reading Strategy Instruction and Students’ Reading Comprehension: A Serial Multiple Mediation Model. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 39(6), 582–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2023.2165464>
- Šamo, R., & Mikulec, A. (2018). EFL Reading Metacomprehension from the Developmental Perspective: A Longitudinal Case. *Journal of Language and Education*, 4(1), 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2411-7390-2018-4-1-105-116>
- Sangaji, C. M., Ashar, I. K., & Syah, I. K. (2023). Local Culture-Based Literacy Instruction and Its Impact on Students’ Critical Reading Skills in Eastern Indonesia. *Jurnal Tahuri*, 20(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.30598/tahurivol20issue1page21-39>
- Soonthornmanee, R. (2002a). The Effect of the Reciprocal Teaching Approach On the Reading Comprehension of Efl Students. *RELC Journal*, 33(2), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820203300206>
- Soonthornmanee, R. (2002b). The Effect of the Reciprocal Teaching Approach On the Reading Comprehension of Efl Students. *RELC Journal*, 33(2), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820203300206>
- Soonthornmanee, R. (2002c). The Effect of the Reciprocal Teaching Approach On the Reading Comprehension of Efl Students. *RELC Journal*, 33(2), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820203300206>
- Tseng, S.-S., & Yeh, H.-C. (2018). Integrating reciprocal teaching in an online environment with an annotation feature to enhance low-achieving students’ English reading comprehension. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 26(6), 789–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2017.1412989>
- van de Pol, J., van Loon, M., van Gog, T., Braumann, S., & de Bruin, A. (2020). Mapping and Drawing to Improve Students’ and Teachers’ Monitoring and Regulation of Students’ Learning from Text: Current Findings and Future Directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(4), 951–977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09560-y>
- Williams, J. A. (2010). Taking on the Role of Questioner: Revisiting Reciprocal Teaching. *The Reading Teacher*, 64(4), 278–281. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.64.4.6>
- Xu, Z., Wijekumar, K. (Kay), Lin, S., Yang, X., & Nan, B. (2022). Web-Based Text Structure Instruction on Ells’ High-Order Reading Comprehension Skills. *Reading Psychology*, 43(3–4), 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2022.2094037>