

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DIFFICULTIES IN SOLVING
PISA READING LITERACY QUESTIONS LEVELS 5 AND 6
AT ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP
SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY**

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Gita Tirtyaswari

NIM. 06011381722060

ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM



**FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY**

2021

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DIFFICULTIES IN SOLVING PISA
READING LITERACY QUESTIONS LEVELS 5 AND 6 AT ENGLISH
EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY**

A Thesis by

GITA TIRTYASWARI

06011381722060

English Education Study Program

Language and Art Education Departement

**FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY
PALEMBANG
2021**

Approved by,

Advisor



Dr. Rita Inderawati, M.Pd.

NIP. 196704261991032002

Certified by,

Coordinator of English Education Study Program



Hariswan Putra Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIP 197408022002121003

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DIFFICULTIES IN SOLVING PISA
READING LITERACY QUESTIONS LEVELS 5 AND 6 AT ENGLISH
EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY**

A THESIS

By

Gita Tirtyaswari

Student Number: 06011381722060

English Education Study Program

Department of Language and Arts Education

FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION

SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY

PALEMBANG 2021

Approved by,

Advisor



Dr. Rita Inderawati, M.Pd.

NIP. 196704261991032002

Certified by,

Coordinator of English Education Study Program



Hariswan Putra Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIP 197408022002121003



**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DIFFICULTIES IN SOLVING PISA
READING LITERACY QUESTIONS LEVELS 5 AND 6 AT ENGLISH
EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY**

A THESIS by

Gita Tirtyaswari

Student Number: 06011381722060

This thesis was defended by the writer in the final program examination and was approved the examination committee on:

Day : Tuesday

Date : July, 27th 2021

EXAMINATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL:

1. Chairperson : Dr. Rita Inderawati, M.Pd.

()

2. Member : Dr. Ismail Petrus, M.A

()

Palembang, 27 July 2021

Certified by,

Coordinator of English Education Study Program



Hariswan Putera Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIP. 197408022002121003



DECLARATION

I, the undersigned,

Name : Gita Tirtyaswari

Place, Date of Birth : Musi Banyuasin, July 7th, 1999

Student Number : 06011381722060

Study Program : English Education

Certify that thesis entitled “Preservice Teacher Difficulties in Solving PISA Reading Literacy Questions Levels 5 and 6 at English Education Study Program FKIP Sriwijaya University” is my own work. I did not do any plagiarism or inappropriate quotation against the ethic and rule commended by the Ministry of Education of Republic Indonesia Number 17, 2010 regarding plagiarism in higher education. Therefore, I deserve to face court if I am found to have plagiarized this work.

Palembang, July 27th 2021

The Undersigned



Gita Tirtyaswari

NIM. 06011381722060

BIOGRAPHY

Name : Gita Tirtyaswari
Place, Date of Birth : Musi Banyuasin, July 07th 1999
Gender : Female
Status : Single
Religion : Islam
Citizen : Indonesia
Father's Name : Nanang Pramono
Mother's Name : Rita Rachmawaty
No. Telephone : 083177995293
E-Mail : gtirtyaswari@gmail.com
Educational Background :

Educational Institution	Faculty	Major	Year
SD Negeri 139 Palembang	-	-	2005-2011
SMP Negeri Unggul 54 Palembang	-	-	2011-2014
SMA Negeri 22 Palembang	-	IPA (Science)	2014-2017
Universitas Sriwijaya	FKIP	English Education	2017-2021

Palembang, July 15th, 2021



Gita Tirtyaswari

06011381722060

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise and gratitude to the Almighty God, Allah SWT., for the mercy and grace the author was able to complete a thesis entitled "Preservice Teacher's difficulties in Solving PISA Reading Literacy Questions Levels 5 and 6 at English Education Study Program FKIP Sriwijaya University". This thesis was prepared to fulfill one of the requirements to complete education at the undergraduate level in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University.

The author would like to say thank you to those who have helped a lot in the preparation of this thesis, including:

1. My parents, Nanang Pramono and Rita Rachmawaty, always provide moral and material support in carrying out lectures and completing the thesis.
2. Hariswan Putra Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd as Coordinator of the English Education Study Program.
3. Dr. Rita Indrawati, M.Pd. as a thesis supervisor who give me knowledge, input, corrections, and directions in completing the thesis.
4. Alhenri Wijaya, S.Pd., M.Pd. as an academic supervisor who helps me a lot during lectures in the English Education Study Program
5. Drs. Bambang Apriady Loeneto, M.A., PH.D., and Dra. Zuraida, M.Pd., as the validators who have validated the research instrument.
6. Satria Juli Pratama Putra, S.T., who always give me a lot of support and help in everything
7. Amilia Yulita S.Pd., Adelia Novrita S.Pd., Lita Meidina S.Pd., SEESPA 2017, senior, junior, and all of my friends who give me a lot of support and help in completing this thesis.
8. SEESPA 2017, seniors and juniors at the English Education Study Program, and all of my friends who always encourage completing the thesis.

Finally, with all the shortcomings, I hope this thesis can use for the family of English Education Study Programs and readers in general.

Palembang, July 15th 2021

The Author

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Gita Tirtyaswari', written on a light blue rectangular background.

Gita Tirtyaswari

NIM. 06011381722060

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	i
APPROVAL	iii
DECLARATION.....	v
BIOGRAPHY	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
ABSTRACT.....	xiv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. The Problem of The Research	4
1.3. The Objective of The Research	5
1.4. The Significance of The Research	5
1.5. Limitation of Terms in The Research	6
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1. Reading	8
2.2. Reading Comprehension.....	9
2.3. Metacognitive Strategic in Reading.....	11
2.4. PISA.....	12
2.5. PISA Reading Literacy	13
2.5.1. Texts.....	14
2.5.2. Processes	15
2.5.3. Task.....	18
2.6. PISA Reading Literacy Questions Levels 5 and 6.....	18
2.6.1. PISA Reading Literacy Questions Level 5	19
2.6.2. PISA Reading Literacy Questions Level 6	20

2.7. Factors Affecting Reading Literacy Items Difficulty	21
2.8. Preservice Teacher.....	22
2.9. Previous Study	23
CHAPTER III METHOD AND PROCEDURES	26
3.1. Research Design	26
3.2. Time and Place	26
3.3. Participants of The Research	26
3.4. Research Instrument	27
3.4.1 Reading Literacy Test.....	27
3.4.2 Interview Test.	28
3.5. Data Collection Steps	28
3.6. Data Analysis Technique.....	29
3.7. Data Validity.....	31
3.8. Subject Selection Results.....	31
CHAPTER IV RESULT AND DISCUSSION.....	33
4.1 Research Result	33
4.1.1. Reading Literacy Test Results	34
4.1.2. Description of the Difficulties of Subject High Proficiency.....	36
4.1.3. Description of the Difficulty of Subject Medium Proficiency	42
4.1.4. Description of the Difficulty of Subject Low Proficiency.....	49
4.2 Discussion.....	55
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	62
5.1 Conclusion	62
5.2 Suggestion	63
REFERENCES.....	64

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1	The subject SH answer sheet in PISA reading literacy question level 5.....	36
Figure 4.2	The subject SH answer sheet in PISA reading literacy question level 6.....	39
Figure 4.3	The subject SM answer sheet in PISA reading literacy question level 5.....	43
Figure 4.4	The subject SM answer sheet in PISA reading literacy question level 6.....	45
Figure 4.5	The subject SL answer sheet in PISA reading literacy question level 5.....	50
Figure 4.6	The subject SL answer sheet in PISA reading literacy question Level 6.....	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Subject Code Giving Scheme.....	30
Table 4.1 The List of PISA Reading Literacy Test Scores.....	34
Table 4.2 Research Subjects.....	36
Table 4.3 The Interview transcripts of the subject SH on level 5 question.....	37
Table 4.4 The Interview transcripts of the subject SH on level 6 question.....	40
Table 4.5 The Interview transcripts of the subject SM on level 5 question.....	43
Table 4.6 The Interview transcripts of the subject SM on level 6 question.....	46
Table 4.7 The Interview transcripts of the subject SL on level 5 question.....	50
Table 4.8 The Interview Transcripts of the Subject SL on Level 6 question.....	53
Table 4.9 Table of Difficulties Faced by the Research Subjects.....	56

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 : Reading literacy question and scoring guidelines.

Appendix 2 : Interview guidelines.

Appendix 3 : Expert judgment.

Appendix 4 : Documentation of subject's answer sheet and interview.

Appendix 5 : Research License.

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' DIFFICULTIES IN SOLVING PISA
READING LITERACY QUESTIONS LEVELS 5 AND 6 AT ENGLISH
EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY**

Gita Tirtyaswari¹, Rita Inderawati²

¹Student of English Education Study Program, FKIP, Sriwijaya University

²Lecturer of English Education Study Program, FKIP, Sriwijaya University

Abstract

The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a program managed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). PISA is an international study that measures student achievement in reading literacy, mathematics literacy, and science literacy. Indonesia's low ranking in each PISA period is due to several supporting factors that are not running optimally. This study aims to find out the pre-service teachers' difficulties in solving PISA reading literacy questions levels 5 and 6 at the English Education Study Program FKIP Sriwijaya University. The instrument in this study consisted of two stages, such as reading literacy test and interview test, which were analyzed based on PISA proficiency standards. The sample used in this study was the 6th-semester preservice teacher at the English Education Study Program FKIP Sriwijaya University. The result of this study indicates that preservice teachers faced difficulties in solving PISA reading literacy questions levels 5 and 6. The difficulties faced consist of finding information, understanding, evaluating, and reflecting processes.

Keywords : *Difficulties, PISA Reading Literacy, Pre-service Teacher*

Palembang, July 2021

**Approved by,
Advisor**

**Certified by,
Coordinator of English Education Study Program**



Dr. Rita Inderawati, M.Pd.
NIP. 196704261991032002



Hariswan Putra Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd.
NIP 197408022002121003

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background, the problem of the research, the objectives of the research, and the significance of the research.

1.1 Background

Reading is a way of getting new information. People in the world can get a lot of new information that is very useful for their future. Chettri (2013) states that reading opens the door to a treasure trove of knowledge because it is one of the literacy skills people want to succeed in their future. Especially for the next generation in one nation, reading as the primary way to obtain knowledge, also reading is one of the ways to increase self quality. Of course, reading is a skill that everyone must have to be successful in the future because people who are less able to read are empty. Empty means they are not having knowledge, which will affect their future.

The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a program regulated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). PISA is an international study that assesses student achievement in the field of reading literacy. In addition, PISA also assesses mathematics and science literacy skills. However, reading literacy is a significant area that needs more discussion. Because Rinzin (2019) defines that poor reading literacy affects student performance in other fields because they cannot understand the language. Indonesia is one of the countries joining this program. Indonesia has been following the PISA program since 2000 until the latest PISA results are in 2018 Indonesia is still joining this program. Harsiati (2018) states that the purpose of The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is to set up its effective education system from an international perspective. PISA results have been used by policymakers to understand better the factors associated with educational success in a certain context compared to other countries. Harsiati (2018) defines

that PISA becomes an international measuring or benchmarking tool for the quality of education. That way, the government can measure the quality of education in Indonesia and help the government to make better education design for the future.

Even though reading is very important, many students in Indonesia do not realize it. Based on the results of a survey from the program of International Students' Assessment (PISA), the achievement of reading literacy rank of Indonesia is always ranked below when compared with the scores of other countries. Indonesia's achievement in each PISA period is still below average from the international reading literacy score. In 2000 the average reading literacy score of Indonesia was 371. In 2003 the average reading literacy score of Indonesia was 382. In 2006 the average reading literacy score of Indonesia was 393. In 2009 the average reading literacy score in Indonesia was 402. In 2012 the average reading literacy score of Indonesian students was 396. In 2015 the average reading literacy score of Indonesian students was 397. In 2018 the average reading literacy score of Indonesian students decreased by 371. Even though, OECD (2009) states that the minimum average score for international reading literacy should be 500. This is a problem for Indonesia's educational field. Supposedly, Indonesia can evaluate its previous failures by paying attention to the weaknesses for the eighth time Indonesia has participated in the PISA period.

The low score of Indonesian reading literacy in each PISA period is because many Indonesian students do not good at reading literacy. This is proven by Puspita (2017) in a research conducted at SMA N 2 Metro showed that there are 80% of students had difficulties in five aspects of reading, two of which are finding specific information and understanding the English reading text. Another fact was discovered by Harida (2014) in research conducted at the IAIN Padang Sidempuan English Study Program shows that students' proficiency in understanding texts was still low. They faced several difficulties in understanding English texts. This fact does not only occur in national research but also international research. One research conducted by Mullis, Martin, Foy, and Drucker (2012) also shows a report from international research by the Progress in

International The Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), which investigates student reading achievement shows that Indonesian students at all levels of education do not have adequate proficiencies to understand texts. Therefore, this causes students in Indonesia only to be able to solve PISA reading literacy questions at a low level. *Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia* (Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia) (2013) presents an analysis of the 2009 PISA results show that almost all Indonesian students are only competent to solve PISA questions up to level 3, and only a few students are competent to solve questions up to level 4. At the same time, students in other countries have achieved an average level of 5 and 6. This is confirmed by the results of PISA 2018 in the OECD (2019) states that the low percentages of students in Indonesia that have the best performance in reading literacy. In the PISA reading literacy questions levels 5 and 6, Indonesia's percentages are 9% from the OECD average, while students in other countries have reached more than 10%. The low literacy skills of students in Indonesia as proved by each PISA period indicate that several supporting factors are not optimal. Thus, this problem has an impact on the low score of PISA reading literacy.

Based on several previous problems, it is necessary to evaluate several roles that act as factors that influence the high and low quality of education in Indonesia. Based on the research by Malaty (2006), the results show that the main reason a country with higher education qualifications, such as Finland, can get the top ranking in PISA is the success of preservice teachers. In other words, the country has a high quality of preservice teachers. Ustun & Eryilmaz (2018) state that the quality of preservice teachers is the most prominent factor in this system. Also, this is an important factor in the success of each PISA period. This is an important point for Indonesia to improve the quality of preservice teachers to create a better quality of education in the future. However, other problems arise, this is evidenced by the results of research conducted by Saenz (2009) the results show that preservice teachers in Indonesia do not yet have qualified proficiency, preservice teachers have difficulty in solving PISA questions, especially difficulties in understanding and reflecting on these questions. One similar study

conducted by Sulastri, Johar & Munzir (2014) showed that the preservice teachers faced difficulties in solving high-level PISA questions (levels 5 and 6), they were unable to solve the questions correctly, and preservice teachers only tried to answer the high-level questions by using instinct, trial, and system error. According to the OECD (2019), if a subject has difficulty solving high-level questions, it is important to know what kind of difficulty is faced. In fact, Widjaja (2009) states that giving PISA questions to prospective teachers as training materials would be very useful for teaching purposes. Moreover, if they are equipped with it, they will be able to face the challenges or difficulties required by the students, and of course, this makes them complete and be qualified teachers.

FKIP Sriwijaya University is one of the institutions that preservice teachers, especially in South Sumatra, Indonesia. Following the mission of the FKIP Sriwijaya University, namely to make high-quality English teachers, the lack of competence of prospective teachers regarding PISA needs to be further reviewed, especially in PISA reading literacy, whose scores declined again in the last period. FKIP Sriwijaya University is responsible for investigating what difficulties preservice teachers face when solving PISA reading literacy levels 5 and 6. This study aims to find the difficulties faced by preservice teachers on PISA reading literacy question levels 5 and 6. So this study is expected to contribute directly to the preservice teacher itself in designing appropriate teaching styles for Indonesian students by adapting from the difficulties they have personally experienced.

1.2 The Problem of the Research

Based on the background that has been described before, the problem of this research formulated in one research question;

1. What is the difficulty of preservice teachers at English Education Study Program FKIP Sriwijaya University in solving PISA reading literacy questions levels 5 and 6?

1.3 The Objective of the Research

Based on the research questions that have been formulated, the objectives of this study aims to:

1. Find out the difficulty faced by the preservice teachers at English Education Study Program FKIP Sriwijaya University in solving PISA reading literacy questions levels 5 and 6.

1.4 The Significance of the Research

This research is expected to contribute as motivation and reference for improving the quality of education in Indonesia. By knowing the types of difficulties in solving PISA reading literacy questions levels 5 and 6, it is hoped that they can be minimized and evaluated to improve the quality of preservice teachers in Indonesia. Also, preservice teachers can prepare themselves for preparation to become more competent teachers. So, it can improve Indonesia's ranking for the next PISA period. In addition, this research is expected to be useful for several roles in the field of education. In detail, the significance of this research is explained in the points below:

- a. Preservice teachers are expected to have superior knowledge in PISA reading literacy after knowing what difficulties they faced in solving PISA reading levels 5 and 6 questions. It is expected that preservice teachers can evaluate themselves more and create effective teaching styles/method for their students in the future.
- b. Students are expected to explore their competencies so that they can improve their proficiency on high-level questions, such as solving PISA questions at levels 5 and 6. Also, by understanding the difficulties often faced in solving high-level questions, students are expected to have high thinking skills and foster enthusiasm to improve their quality in competing internationally.
- c. Teachers are expected to understand the models and difficulties in PISA reading literacy questions, especially at level 5 and 6. So, teachers can create effective teaching strategies for students and create students who

have superior proficiency. Teachers are expected to be able to make questions and introduce students to the types of questions that exist at high levels, such as levels 5 and 6, which are assessed in PISA and are included in the student competency assessment curriculum in Indonesia as well as introducing PISA reading literacy model questions which aim to invite students to connect with real-life with the character of PISA questions so that students are accustomed to working on questions with a high level of difficulty.

- d. Government, this research is expected to be a reference for the government to find out the difficulties faced by preservice teachers that can affect the quality of teacher's teaching styles. It is hoped that the government can make improvements and re-evaluate so that the government can make a more effective curriculum in improving the quality of education in Indonesia, especially providing prospective debriefing teachers as well as teachers regarding the concept and model of PISA questions, to create educators who are of superior quality and able to educate students to be able to compete at the international level, especially in efforts to increase PISA reading literacy ratings in the next period.
- e. Other researchers, this research is expected to be helpful as a reference for conducting other development research, significantly improving on reading literacy skills in Indonesia in the PISA ranking for each period.

1.5 Limitation of Terms in Research

For a different term that used in this study, it is necessary to define the terms as follows:

- a. The description referred to in this research is a presentation or explanation of the difficulties faced by the preservice teachers in PISA reading literacy questions.
- b. The difficulties referred to in the research are errors, problems, and obstacles faced by the preservice teachers in solving PISA reading literacy questions.

- c. The PISA questions in this research are reading literacy questions that are tested on the PISA 2018 assessment.
- d. The type of difficulty referred to in this study is the type of difficulty faced by the preservice teachers in solving PISA reading literacy questions that are adjusted to the proficiency standards at each level set out in the PISA 2018 framework. This type of difficulty consists of several aspects, namely, find information, understand, evaluate and reflect.

REFERENCES

- Alfi, N. A., 2019. Analisis Kemampuan Matematis Dalam Menyelesaikan Soal Pisa (Programme For International Student Assessment) Pada Konten Kuantitas. *Thesis*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Makasar: Makasar.
- Ary, Donal et al. 2010. *Introduction to Reseacrh in Education (Eighth Edition)*. United States of Amerika: Wadsworth.
- Bojovic, M. (2010). *Reading Skills and Reading Comprehension in English for Specific Purposes*. Celje, Slovenia.
- Brand-Gruwel, S., Wopereis, I., & Vermetten, Y. (2005). Information problem solving by experts and novices: Analysis of a complex cognitive skill. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 21(3): 487–508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.10.005>
- Chettri, K and Rout, S.K., 2013. Reading Habits - An Overview. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. Vol. 14 Issue. 6:13–17.
- Dewi, A. I. C.,dkk. 2017. Kesulitan siswa dalam menyelesaikan soal-soal PISA tahun 2012 level 4,5, dan 6 di SMP N 1 Indralaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika*.11(2): 3.
- Dominguez, M., Vieira, J.M., Vidal., 2012. The impact of the Programme for International Student Assessment on academic journals. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*. Vol. 19 No. 4:392–409.
- Dreher, M. J., & Guthrie, R. (1990). Planning prompts and indexed terms in textbook search tasks. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 85: 662–669.
- Esen, E and Belgin, I.B., 2017. Pisa Question And Reasoning Skill. *ITM Web of Conferences*. 13.
- Fatema, K. (2008). *The Role of Metacognitive Reading Strategies in Second Language Learning*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Gay, L.R. (1992). *Education Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. London: Charles E. Milton Keynes Philadelphia Company.
- Gilakjani, A.P., 2016. How Can Students Improve Their Reading Comprehension Skill. *Journal of Studies in Education*. Vol. 6 No. 2:229-240.

- Gupta, M and Ahuja, J., 2014. Cooperative Integrated Reading Composition (Circ): Impact On reading Comprehension Achievement In English Among Seventh Graders. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)*. Vol. 2 Issue. 5:37–46.
- Harida, E. S.(2014). Students' ability and difficulties in understanding English text (a study at English program IAIN Padang Sidempuan). *Alta'lim Journal*, 21(3), 183-188. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15548/jt.v21i3.102>.
http://pisa.nutn.edu.tw/download/sample_papers/Reading_Frameworken.Pdf
- Holloway, G.J (1999). Evaluating the Alternatives. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. America. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1244089>
- Hans,b. (2013). *Literary Theory: The Basics*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2013). *Analysis of the Determinants of Learning Outcomes Using Data from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)*. Jakarta: Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.London: Routledge.
- Lee, C. J. (2015). Commensuration bias in peer review. *Philosophy of Science*. 82, 1272-1283. doi:[10.1086/683652](https://doi.org/10.1086/683652)
- Leu, D. J., Jr., Kinzer, C. K., Coiro, J., & Cammack, D. (2013). Toward a theory of new literacies emerging from the Internet and other information and communication technologies. *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, Fifth Edition (1568-1611). International Reading Association: Newark, DE
- McCrudden, M. T., & Schraw, G. (2007). Relevance and goal-focusing in text processing. *Educational Psychology Review*. 19(2), 113–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9010-7>
- Mckee, S. (2012). *Reading Comprehension, What We Know: A Review Of Research 1995 To 2011*. Bangkok, Thailand: Shinawatra International University.

- Mullis, I.V.V., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Drucker, K.T. (2012). *PIRLS 2011 international result in reading*. Retrieved from <http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2011/international-result-pirls.html>
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching. International Edition*, McGraw-Hill, Singapore, 88.
- OECD (2019). PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do. *PISA*. OECD Publishing. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
- OECD (2019). PISA 2018 Results (Volume II): Where All Students Can Succeed. *PISA*. OECD Publishing. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b5fd1b8f-en>
- OECD (2019). PISA 2018 Results (Volume III): What School Life Means for Students' Lives. *PISA*. OECD Publishing. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/acd78851-en>
- OECD.(2000).*PISA framework 2000*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaframework>
- OECD.(2012).*PISA framework 2012*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from http://pisa.nutn.edu.tw/download/sample_papers/Reading_Frameworken.pdf
- OECD.(2015).*PISA framework 2015*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from http://pisa.nutn.edu.tw/download/sample_papers/Reading_Frameworken.pdf
- OECD.(2018).*PISA framework 2015*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from http://pisa.nutn.edu.tw/download/sample_papers/Reading_Frameworken.pdf
- OECD 2006. *Frame Work Programme International Students Assessment*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD 2009. Programme International Students Assessmen. *Assessment Framework: Key Competencies in Reading, Mathematics, and Science*. Paris: OECD.
- Puspita, A. (2017). Students difficulties in comprehending English reading text at second grade students of SMA N 2 Metro (S-1 Degree). *Thesis*. Makasar. The Language and Arts Department of Teacher training and education

- faculty. University of Lampung. Retrieved from <http://digilib.unila.ac.id/25706/3/script%20without%20result%20and%20discussions.pdf>
- Rinzin, S, 2019. Peer-learning: An Alternative Teaching Pedagogy for Highly Teacher Centered Classes. *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Science (IJELS)*. Vol-4, Issue 5:9 10. http://pisa.nutn.edu.tw/download/sample_papers/Reading_Frameworken.Pdf
- Stadtler, M, Scharrer, L., Bromme (2014) Does belief-consistency moderate the easiness effect? Evidence from two studies on the issues of GM food and vaccination. *Paper presented at the Workshop on Multiple Documents Literacy*. Valencia, Spain.
- Simalango, M.M., Darmawijoyo., Aisyah, N.,2018. Kesulitan Siswa Dalam Menyelesaikan Soal-Soal Pisa Pada Konten Change And Relationship Level 4, 5, Dan 6 Di Smp N 1 Indralaya. *Journal Pendidikan Matematika*. Vol. 12 No. 1:43-58.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sulastri, R., Johar, R., Munzir, S., 2014. Kemampuan Mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika FKIP Unsyiah Menyelesaikan Soal PISA Most Difficult Level. *Jurnal Didaktik Matematika*. Vol 1 No. 2:13-21.
- Tiro, A.M., dkk. 2010. *Analysis of the Determinants of Learning Outcomes Using Data from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)*. Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Badan Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pendidikan Pusat Penilaian Pendidikan, Jakarta.
- Tompson, S., Hillman, K., & Bortoli, L. D. (2013). *A teacher's guide to PISA reading literacy*. Australia: ACER Press
- Tshering and Choeda., 2020. Pre-service teacher's perspectives on the Programme for International Student Assessment for Development (PISA-D): A case of Samtse College of Education. *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*. Vol. 5 Issue. 1:61–66.

- Utha, K & Rinzin, S, 2019. Peer-learning: An Alternative Teaching Pedagogy for Highly Teacher Centered Classes. *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Science (IJELS)*. Vol. 4 Issue-5, 9 :10-19
- Ustun, U and Eryilmaz, A., 2018. Analysis of Finnish Education System to question the reasons behind Finnish success in PISA. *Studies in Educational Research and Development*. Vol. 2 Issue. 2.
- Widjaja, W., 2011. Towards mathematical literacy in the 21st century: Perspectives from Indonesia. *Southeast Asian Mathematics Education Journal*. Vol. 1 No. 1:70-79.