ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS 4 BY CREATING AN INCLUSIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT THROUGH LITERACY PROGRAM INTEGRATED WITH THE ANTI-BULLYING PROGRAM

Zidniyati[1], Kurniyatul Faizah[2], Lia Anggraeni[3]

[1,2] Department of Teacher Training of Islamic Elementary School, Faculty of Tarbiya
Institut Agama Islam Ibrahimy Genteng, Banyuwangi, Indonesia
[3] Sekolah Indonesia Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia
E-mail: taravizidni@gmail.com[1], kurnia_fz@yahoo.co.id[2], liaanggraeniofficial@gmail.com[3]

Abstract

This study aimed to create a literate and inclusive school environment by providing literacy and anti-bullying training to elementary school teachers and principals. The research was conducted in 20 primary schools in Banyuwangi Regency, Indonesia over three years from 2021 to 2023. In the first year, the focus was on a balanced literacy program that followed key stages: 1) developing reading and writing habits, 2) searching, browsing, processing, and understanding information, 3) analyzing, responding, and using written texts, and 4) developing understanding and potential to participate in the social environment. The second year focused on an anti-bullying program that targeted indicators like setting consistent rules, creating inclusive study groups, and identifying potential behavior problems. By the third year, 75% of teachers were able to create literacy-rich and inclusive classroom environments, apply consistent rules, and conduct ongoing socialization with other teachers. The results showed improvements in teachers' abilities to implement balanced literacy activities, use reading comprehension methods, create student-authored books, and apply anti-bullying strategies. The study concludes that the integrated literacy and anti-bullying program was successful in preparing students with strong literacy skills while also creating a safe and inclusive learning environment. Overall, this research demonstrates how a holistic approach targeting both literacy development and anti-bullying measures can lead to positive outcomes for elementary school students.

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia faces challenges in developing student literacy, as indicated by its low ranking in the PISA assessment (OECD, 2020c). The Merdeka Curriculum introduced in 2019 aims to improve literacy through various policies such as the replacement of USBN with school-based assessments and the implementation of AKM and character surveys (Ismaya et al., 2021). Previous studies have shown that good literacy skills are correlated with a country's economic strength, as seen in the superior achievements of Chinese students compared to other OECD countries (OECD, 2019a; OECD, 2020b). This aligns with research demonstrating the link between a country's education system and its industrial, technological, and artistic development (Koyuncu & Fırat, 2020; Tavsancil et al., 2019). However, the problem of bullying in Indonesia, experienced by more than 40% of 15-year-old students, is also a challenge with a negative impact on learning outcomes (GSHS, 2015; PISA, 2018). Studies have found that bullying can have long-term and short-term impacts in the form of mental health disorders and social functioning disorders (Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Holt et al., 2015). Furthermore, the demands of Society 5.0 for high information literacy skills have not yet been met by the current learning system (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019). Research has found that less than 1 in 10 students in OECD countries can distinguish fact from opinion, highlighting the need to develop critical thinking and digital literacy (OECD, 2020a). To address these gaps, this study aims to develop a literate and anti-bullying school environment as an effort to improve the quality of education in Indonesia. Literacy is one of the important programs proclaimed in the Merdeka Curriculum, which emphasizes the ability to access, understand, and use information intelligently (Faizah et al., 2016). The research was designed to assist teachers in implementing literacy learning while creating a safe and inclusive classroom environment. This program also aimed to direct student behavior to be more pro-social, which was integrated into the literacy content.

Literacy is a key focus of Indonesia's Merdeka Curriculum, established by Minister of Education and Culture, Research and Technology, Nadiem Makarim, on December 10, 2019, as an improvement to the 2013 curriculum (Ismaya et al., 2021). The Merdeka Curriculum introduces four main policies as followed. The first change is Assessment Changes.In 2020, the National Standardized School Examination (USBN) was replaced by school-based assessments tailored to student needs. The second change is National Examination Revisions. Starting in 2021, the National Examination shifted from solely assessing cognitive abilities to evaluating the services provided by schools. This includes the Minimum Competency Assessment (AKM) and a Character Survey focused on literacy, numeracy, and character skills. These assessments are informed by international benchmarks such as PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) (OECD, 2020c). The third change is Simplified Learning Implementation Plan (RPP). The RPP was streamlined from 13 components to three core elements: learning objectives, activities, and assessments. This aims to give teachers more time for effective preparation and evaluation (Ismaya et al., 2021). The fourth change is Flexible New Student Admissions. Policies have been made more flexible to ensure equal access to educational services for all students (Ismaya et al., 2021). The literacy initiative, part of the School Literacy Movement, is defined as the ability to

access, understand, and utilize information through activities like reading, viewing, listening, writing, and speaking (Faizah et al., 2016). This program gained urgency due to Indonesia's low ranking in PISA assessments, where it placed 72 out of 78 countries (OECD, 2020c). Additionally, the push for literacy aligns with the demands of Society 5.0, which emphasizes the need for information and digital literacy skills (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019).

The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an assessment process that has been used by various countries since 2000 to measure how well a country's students academically performing are. PISA is carried out every three years for students aged 15 (fifteen years). Each cycle focuses on one of these three main study domains, namely reading literacy, Mathematical literacy, Science literacy. Reading literacy is defined as a learner's ability to understand, use, evaluate, reflect on and engage with texts to achieve one's goals, develop one's knowledge and potential, and participate in society (OECD, 2020a). Mathematical Literacy is defined as a learner's ability to formulate, use, and interpret Mathematics in various contexts. This includes mathematical reasoning and using Mathematical concepts, procedures, facts, and tools to describe, explain, and predict phenomena (OECD, 2020a). Science literacy is defined as the ability to engage with science-related issues, and with science ideas, as a reflective citizen (OECD, 2020b). A person who has scientific literacy is willing to engage in reasoned discourse about science and technology, which requires competence to scientifically explain phenomena, evaluate and design scientific investigations, and interpret data and evidence scientifically.

Education plays an important role in social development because a good education system contributes to industry, technology, and artistic development (Koyuncu & Fırat, 2020). Countries that started pioneering in the fields of industry, technology and artistic development began to implement several educational policies and began to design and hasten to allocate a large part of the state budget for education. Therefore, all countries that want to test how well the academic achievements and competencies of students in their country are in the national and international arena, involve thousands of their students in the assessment process and start conducting a review of their country's education system (Tavsancil et al., 2019). PISA is the choice for countries that have hopes of improving academic achievement and the competence of their students in order to pioneer the country's economic power. Therefore, not a few academics have asked the OECD to reconsider the welfare of students as human beings, not merely as a means of supporting the economy of a country (Tikly, 2017; Unterhalter, 2019).

Based on the results of PISA 2018, there were findings that were quite surprising to the world regarding the achievements of students in Mathematics and Science literacy. The PISA
scores of 15-year-old students from Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu, and Zhejiang Provinces, China outperformed participants from 78 other national education systems that participated in the Mathematics and Science literacy test (OECD, 2019a). Based on the 2018 PISA findings, data also obtained that the 10 percent of students who were the most disadvantaged in the four provinces in China demonstrated reading skills and similar skills that were better than the average 10 percent of the most fortunate students in several other OECD member countries (OECD, 2019b). The data that is no less surprising is that the income levels of the four Chinese

Provinces were far below the average of other OECD member countries (OECD, 2020b). It is stated in the 2018 PISA results that good literacy skills possessed by students in a country, as in China, will become a country's economic strength (OECD, 2020a).

In 2015, the World Health Organization (WHO) through Global School-Based Student Health (GSHS) conducted a survey. The survey concluded that 21 percent or around 18 million children aged 13-15 years experienced bullying in the last month of the year. The GSHS survey also described 25 percent of these cases in the form of physical fights, 36 percent experienced by boys reported higher than girls which was only 13 percent. The report further describes that the impact of bullying causes 1 in 20 or 20.9 percent of teenagers in Indonesia were to have the desire to commit suicide. It was also reported that bullying can have long-term and short- term impacts in the form of mental health disorders and social functioning disorders. Other data comes from the 2018 PISA study concluded that 41 percent of 15-year-old students in Indonesia have experienced bullying, at least several times a month. The report also describes the devastating impact of bullying on its victims. The PISA researchers concluded that in general the victims had poor learning outcomes, including lower reading performance (Peren, 2022).

In 2021, the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) recorded 53 cases of bullying in the school environment, and 168 cases of bullying in cyberspace. This was the year that the school was in the process of online learning. This explained that cases of bullying in the school environment were lower than cases in cyberspace. The latest data also comes from KPAI. In 2022 KPAI reported 226 cases of bullying with physical and mental violence occurred in the school environment, including 18 cases of bullying in *cyberspace* (Peren, 2022). It was possible then that the number of cases of bullying was much higher than the cases released by KPAI, if many cases occurred but were not reported to KPAI, or did not appear in the media.

As stated in the PISA results, the economic strength of a country is largely determined by the quality of education, especially literacy skills. In the 21st century, students' literacy skills are closely related to the demands of reading skills which lead to the ability to understand information analytically, critically, and reflectively (Faizah et al., 2016). However, the system of learning in schools is currently not able to realize this yet. Meanwhile, the advancement of digital technology, especially in the era of society 5.0 as meant by Serpa and Ferreira, demands highly honed literacy skills, especially information literacy (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019)..

Society 5.0 refers to the concept of society proposed by the Japanese government as a vision for a sustainable and innovative future society. Society 5.0 is based on the use of digital technology and artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence) to increase efficiency and productivity in various sectors, including industry, transportation, health care, and the environment (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019). This concept emphasizes the importance of collaboration and integration between technology and humans to create a more inclusive, sustainable and humane society (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019). Serpa and Ferreira also explained how digital innovation can contribute to sustainability and how Society 5.0 can become a social process to achieve this Goal.

Digital and information literacy skills are essential to achieving the sustainable and

inclusive vision of Society 5.0. Digital and information literacy capabilities enable people to use digital technology and Artificial Intelligence effectively, to understand the social and ethical implications of these technologies, and to participate in technology-related decision-making. In the context of Society 5.0, digital and information literacy skills can also help people overcome the digital divide and ensure that the benefits of digital innovation are distributed evenly throughout society. Therefore, developing digital and information literacy skills as part of a social process to achieve the goals of a sustainable and inclusive Society 5.0 is very important (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019).

In line with the development of literacy skills that want to equip all students with the skills needed in Society 5.0, the fourth goal of the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals) also wants to create educational services that are inclusive and equitable for all children without exception (Boeren, 2019; Elfert, 2019). The world agenda summarized in the SDGs is targeted to be realized in 2030. There is not enough time to prepare everything including the transformation of the education system, especially now that the world is accelerating with information technology with various media and smart devices equipped with Artificial Intelligence. It is undeniable that the literacy skills and responding skills of each student to the rapid advancement of technology information must be carried out carefully, inclusively without leaving a single child behind.

Smartphones have changed the way people read and exchange information; and digitization has resulted in the emergence of new forms of text, ranging from concise, to long and heavy. In a time when the speed of information was not as fast as it is today, students could find clear and single answer to their questions in carefully selected, government-approved textbooks, and students could be sure the answers were correct. In contrast to today, students can find hundreds of thousands of answers to their questions online, and they can find out what is right and what is wrong based on information searching from online media easily and quickly. Reading is no longer just about extracting information, but also about building knowledge, involving critical thinking processes and making logical judgments (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019). In line with this, findings from the 2018 PISA indicated that less than 1 in 10 students in OECD member countries were able to distinguish between fact and opinion, based on implicit cues relating to the content or source of the information. The surprising fact is that in just four provinces in China, as well as in Canada, Estonia, Finland, Singapore and the United States, more than one in seven students demonstrates this level of reading proficiency (OECD, 2020a). Based on this fact, it can be assumed that educational practices carried out in schools have not fully demonstrated the function of the school as a learning organization that seeks to make all its members in the process of becoming more skilled at reading to support them as lifelong learners (Faizah et al., 2016). Therefore, literacy programs in schools that are integrated with anti-bullying programs are something that deserves to be rushed. Based on the explanation background, the research was designed to assist teachers in implementing literacy learning while creating a safe and inclusive classroom environment. This program also aimed to direct student behavior to be more pro-social, which was integrated into the literacy content.

METHODOLOGY

This research used a qualitative descriptive approach (Aspers & Corte, 2019; Gehman

et al., 2018) to describe and analyze the implementation of the literacy and anti-bullying programs in the schools. Qualitative techniques such as content analysis and thematic analysis were employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomena studied (Aspers & Corte, 2019).

The content analysis technique was used to analyze in-depth the data collected through interviews, observations, and documentation related to the implementation of the literacy and anti-bullying programs in the schools (Krippendorff, 2018). The thematic analysis technique was used to identify important themes that emerged from the qualitative data and understand the patterns in the application of the literacy and anti-bullying programs (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The research instruments used in this study were developed based on the indicators listed in the Guidelines and Evaluation of the School Literacy Movement (Koesoema et al., 2017) and the Guide to Assessment of Strengthening Character Education (Handarman et al., 2017). These instruments included:

1) Assessment checklists: Used to evaluate the initial conditions of the participating schools, including the presence of literacy activities, teachers' classroom management abilities, and the creation of a positive classroom atmosphere.
2) Training modules: Developed based on the guidelines for the School Literacy Movement and Strengthening Character Education, covering topics such as balanced literacy activities, DRTA and DRA reading strategies, and anti-bullying indicators.
3) Monitoring checklists: Utilized by school assistants to monitor the implementation of the literacy and anti-bullying programs in the schools, based on the established indicators.
4) Evaluation instruments: Designed using the assessment guidelines to evaluate the outcomes of the programs in terms of teachers' abilities and the creation of a literate and inclusive school environment.

The data analysis techniques employed in this research enabled the researchers to gain a comprehensive understanding of the implementation and impacts of the integrated literacy and anti-bullying program within the participating elementary schools.

The learning techniques used to provide material in this POP are online learning and offline learning. In first (2021) and second stage (2022), the learning techniques were carried out through online learning. In this case, the presenter gave material online from the location of the Yayasan Tunas Cerdas Gemilang (YTCG) in Yogyakarta by using the zoom application. Activities via zoom were carried out outside of school hours. This was done so that all research subjects could carry out their duties as school principals and as class teachers. All forms of assignments after learning via zoom were carried out by all research subjects at the school where they are assigned. The assignments submissions were in the form of videos, portfolios, and documentation. In the third stage in 2023 the program was carried out through offline learning. In this case, the activity process was carried out directly at the YTCG location in Yogyakarta. All research subjects also directly observed literacy-based learning practices that were integrated with character education at YTCG Yogyakarta. This was done with the aim of the research subjects were able to see directly the management of classes that were rich in literacy and inclusiveness (anti-bullying).

This research involved 20 elementary schools spread across 11 (eleven) districts in the

Banyuwangi Regency. Each target school sends 1 (one) Principal and 2 (two) class teachers. The total number of research subjects was 20 elementary school heads and 40 class teachers. The selection of research subjects was carried out based on the criteria of the subject's ability to carry out an impact after participating in the Program Organisasi Penggerak (POP) to other schools. The process of selecting target schools was assisted by the Banyuwangi District Education Officers. The selection of teachers as research subjects was proposed by the target schools with the criteria of 1 (one) low-grade-teacher (teacher in charge of grades 1, 2 or 3) and 1 (one) high-grade-teacher (teacher in charge of grades 4, 5 or 6) who had potential to make an impact to other schools.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the theory will be presented, the results of the research implementation, as well as a discussion between the theory and the results of the research implementation. Some of the topics that will be discussed include SDGs 4 & inclusive school environment, the stages of literacy, DRTA & DRA, antibullying program, activity design and program targets, results of program implementation.

Activity Design

The study incorporated a well-structured activity design to achieve its objectives. Eight activities were carried out throughout the program's implementation (Koesoema et al., 2017; Handarman et al., 2017):

1) Assessment of participating schools: An initial assessment was conducted to evaluate the schools' existing literacy activities, teachers' classroom management abilities, and the creation of positive classroom environments.
2) Balanced literacy program training: Teachers were trained on key literacy strategies, such as Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Directed Reading Activity (DRA), to enhance students' reading comprehension skills (Hinitz, 2018).
3) Student-authored book creation: Teachers were assisted in guiding students to create their own independent books, fostering a sense of authorship and ownership over their learning.
4) Anti-bullying program training: The program targeted key indicators of effective anti-bullying strategies, such as setting consistent classroom rules, creating inclusive study groups, and identifying potential behavioral issues.
5) Integrated literacy and anti-bullying program implementation: In the third year, the program combined the literacy and anti-bullying components, enabling teachers to create literacy-rich and inclusive classroom environments.
6) Monitoring and evaluation: Checklists and assessment instruments were used to monitor the implementation and evaluate the outcomes of the program (Koesoema et al., 2017; Handarman et al., 2017).
7) Peer-to-peer socialization: Teachers were encouraged to share their experiences and best practices with their peers, facilitating the dissemination of the program's approaches.
8) Collaboration with local education authorities: The program engaged with the Banyuwangi District Education Officers to facilitate the selection of target schools and

research subjects.

This comprehensive activity design, grounded in relevant research and assessment guidelines, enabled the researchers to effectively implement and evaluate the integrated literacy and anti-bullying program within the participating elementary schools.

Research Subjects and Targets

The research subjects for this study were 20 elementary schools in Banyuwangi Regency, Indonesia. The participants included 20 elementary school principals and 40 elementary school teachers. The selection of the research sites and subjects was based on the following criteria:

1) Representation of diverse geographical and socioeconomic backgrounds.
2) Commitment to program implementation throughout the three-year duration.
3) Existing literacy and character education initiatives in the schools.
4) Accessibility and support from the local education authorities.

This targeted selection of research subjects, guided by established assessment frameworks and the researchers' collaboration with local education stakeholders, ensured the relevance and feasibility of the study within the Indonesian educational context.

The primary targets of the research were to:

1) Develop a literate and inclusive school environment through the integration of literacy and anti-bullying programs.
2) Enhance teachers' abilities to implement balanced literacy activities and anti-bullying strategies in the classroom.
3) Foster a safe and supportive learning environment for all students, promoting their academic and social-emotional development.

By focusing on these key targets, the study aimed to contribute to the improvement of the quality of education in Indonesia.

Literacy Stages From Early to Advanced

The literacy program implemented in this study followed a structured progression, addressing the development of literacy skills from the early stages to more advanced levels, drawing on the work of Gee (2015).

a. Literacy at an Early Stage

At the early stages of the program, the focus was on cultivating foundational reading and writing habits among the students (Faizah et al., 2016). Teachers were trained to implement activities that encourage regular, independent reading, such as silent reading time and shared reading experiences (Hinitz, 2018). Additionally, students were guided to develop their writing skills through journaling and other creative writing exercises. This emphasis on building reading and writing fluency aligned with Gee's (2015) view of literacy as a set of practices rooted in specific social and cultural contexts. By establishing strong foundations in these basic literacy skills, students were better equipped to progress to more complex information processing and critical thinking skills (OECD, 2020a).

b. Literacy at an Advanced Stage

As the program progressed, the focus shifted to developing more advanced literacy skills, such as searching, browsing, processing, and understanding information from various sources (Faizah et al., 2016). Students were taught strategies for effective online research, evaluating the credibility of information, and synthesizing knowledge from multiple perspectives (OECD, 2020a). Gee (2015) argues that advanced literacy involves the ability to critically engage with and transform information, rather than simply consuming it. In this stage of the program, the emphasis on critical thinking and communication skills, using techniques like Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Directed Reading Activity (DRA), aimed to prepare students for the demands of Society 5.0, which requires advanced information literacy and the ability to engage in reasoned discourse about complex issues (Serpa & Ferrreira, 2019). By addressing literacy development from the early stages to more advanced levels, the program ensured a comprehensive approach to improving students' academic and social-emotional competencies, equipping them with the necessary skills to navigate the challenges of the 21st century and beyond.

DRTA and DRA, the Comprehension Reading Methods

Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) is a teaching strategy aimed at improving students' reading comprehension. This method encourages learners to engage actively with texts by making predictions, which helps activate their prior knowledge and enhances their critical thinking skills (Beers, 2003).

Three Main Stages of DRTA
1) Predicting
   a. In this initial stage, students look at the title, headings, and illustrations of the text to formulate predictions about its content. Teachers can guide this process by asking open-ended questions such as, "What do you think this text will be about?" or "What information do you expect to find?" This stage is crucial for activating prior knowledge and setting a purpose for reading (McGee & Richgels, 2012).
   b. Activities: Students can write down their predictions or discuss them in pairs or small groups, fostering collaboration and allowing them to share different viewpoints.
2) Reading:
   a. After making predictions, students read the text to gather information and confirm or revise their initial thoughts. This stage emphasizes active reading, where students focus on understanding the material and looking for evidence that supports or contradicts their predictions (Beers, 2003).
   b. Activities:Teachers can encourage students to annotate the text, highlighting key points or taking notes on important ideas as they read. This practice helps deepen their engagement with the text.
3) Confirming or Revising Predictions
   a. Once students have finished reading, they return to their predictions to discuss whether they were accurate or needed adjustment. This reflective process helps deepen their

understanding of the text and reinforces comprehension (McGee & Richgels, 2012).

b) Activities: Students can engage in discussions or write a brief reflection on how their predictions aligned with the actual content, exploring any new questions that arose during reading.

The DRTA method transforms reading into an interactive experience rather than a passive one. By encouraging prediction, active engagement, and reflection, students become more invested in their reading. This dynamic approach fosters critical thinking as they analyze and evaluate the text based on their predictions (Beers, 2003). It also promotes a deeper understanding of the material, as students learn to connect new information with their existing knowledge (McGee & Richgels, 2012). Ultimately, this process cultivates a more thoughtful approach to reading, allowing students to become active participants in their learning.

Directed Reading Activity (DRA) is a structured approach to reading instruction that focuses on developing students' comprehension skills through guided reading practices. Similar to Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA), DRA emphasizes the importance of preparing students before they read, during their reading, and after they have completed the text (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017). Here are the Key Components of DRA:

1) Pre-Reading:
   Teachers introduce the text by discussing its title, illustrations, and key vocabulary. This stage aims to activate prior knowledge and set a purpose for reading (Allington, 2001).

2) Reading:
   Students read the text independently or in small groups. Teachers may provide support by asking guiding questions and encouraging students to think critically about the content (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017).

3) Post-Reading:
   After reading, students engage in discussions to reflect on the text, clarify misunderstandings, and connect the material to their own experiences. This phase reinforces comprehension and critical thinking (Allington, 2001).

Steps to Use the DRA Method

The DRA (Directed Reading Activity) method begins with one or two anticipatory activities to motivate students and activate prior knowledge, including new vocabulary. Teachers can use mind maps or semantic maps to introduce new terms and facilitate predictions related to the text (Crawford et al., 2005). In the second step, teachers divide the text into manageable chunks for silent reading and prepare comprehension questions for each passage. This approach supports understanding, encourages silent reading through gradual questioning, and allows for discussion and oral responses referencing the text. The third step involves a peak activity for students to review and apply their understanding. This can include homework assignments, sharing knowledge through techniques like Think-Pair-Share, creating character maps with graphic organizers, and predicting character actions based on prior knowledge.Texts suitable for DRA include informational, persuasive, and narrative forms. Informational texts can come from various media, persuasive texts can be advertisements, and narrative texts encompass genres like realistic fiction, historical fiction, folklore, and science fiction. These

texts help readers anticipate actions based on genre conventions. Questions about setting, characters, problems, resolutions, and themes guide students in visualizing and analyzing the narrative, fostering deeper comprehension and personal connections to the material (Crawford et al., 2005).

Steps to Use DRTA Method

The DRTA (Directed Reading Thinking Activity) method begins by preparing the text with four or five strategic stopping points, ideally at tense moments in the story. Teachers then create a chart on a blackboard or paper, guiding students to make predictions about the text and read to confirm these predictions (Crawford et al., 2005). The chart includes columns for predictions, reasons, and actual outcomes, structured as follows:

Table 1. Supporting table questions of DRTA (Crawford. et al., 2005)

	What do you think will happen?	Why do you think so?	What do happen?
After reading the tittle			
After reading the first part			
After reading the second part			
After reading the ending part			

In the next step, the teacher reads the title and explains the genre, prompting students to predict what will happen in the story. These predictions are recorded alongside their reasoning. Students then read up to the first stopping point, revisiting their predictions to discuss what actually occurred, which is noted in the chart. The teacher reviews these predictions, asking students to read aloud parts of the text that confirm or contradict their earlier thoughts. As students progress, they make new predictions for the next section, providing evidence for their reasoning, and continue to check their predictions against the text. The final step involves students verifying their last predictions and recording their findings. The DRTA method enhances comprehension by focusing students on answering comprehension questions rather than merely reading aloud. It fosters discussion and critical thinking, making it effective when implemented correctly in schools. For optimal results, teachers should provide new texts that students have not encountered before, as familiarity can hinder the effectiveness of the method. Teachers will notice that comprehension improves rapidly when students focus on finding answers to comprehension level questions instead of just reading aloud. They enjoy discussing their answers because there is usually more than one correct answer and more than one opinion about the correct answer. DRTA will be successful if properly implemented in schools, and will benefit students given the demands of the new curriculum that focuses on thinking skills (Richardson & Morgan, 2003). What needs to be known is the provision of reading texts that are new or have never been

read (understood) by students because DRTA will not function much if students already know or hear the text given, especially if class management is not well controlled (Lubis, 2018). Overall, DRTA aligns with the Independent Curriculum's goals and prepares students for the demands of Society 5.0 by enhancing reading and critical thinking skills (Richardson & Morgan, 2003; Faisal & Lova, 2018).

Antibullying Program

Bullying in schools is increasingly recognized as a public health issue, with extensive research highlighting its short- and long-term effects on mental health and social well-being. Victims of bullying often experience issues like suicidal ideation (Gaffney, Ttofi, et al., 2021) and low self-esteem (Hawker & Boulton, 2000). Bullying is characterized by aggressive behaviors such as name-calling, exclusion, rumor-spreading, and threats (Campbell & Bauman, 2017). It involves an imbalance of power between the bully and the victim, occurs repeatedly, and can manifest in physical, verbal, or cyber forms (Smith et al., 2013).

School bullying specifically refers to repeated aggressive behaviors intended to harm, occurring within the school environment. It typically involves a stronger individual targeting a weaker one, leading to fear and distress (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009). The consequences of school bullying can include long-term mental and physical health issues, increased substance use, and violent behavior (Gaffney, Ttofi, et al., 2021). Cyberbullying has become prevalent with the rise of digital technology, where harmful behaviors are carried out anonymously online (Campbell & Bauman, 2017). Today's adolescents have significant access to digital devices, increasing their vulnerability to cyberbullying (Redmond et al., 2020). A 2015 Pew Research Center report indicated that 88% of American teens own smartphones, with many engaging online daily (Lenhart, 2015).

To combat bullying, schools are implementing comprehensive anti-bullying programs that involve collaboration with parents and community experts. Effective programs like the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) and KiVa focus on various intervention strategies targeting individuals, peer groups, and the broader community (Gaffney, Farrington, et al., 2021). Research indicates that incorporating curriculum materials and promoting peer involvement can significantly enhance the effectiveness of these programs (Gaffney, Ttofi, et al., 2021). Key strategies for reducing bullying include active participation from school members, clear anti-bullying policies, and cooperative group work.

SDGs 4 & Inclusive School Environment

The fourth Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) aims to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (United Nations, 2020). Since the UN's establishment in 1948, inclusive education has evolved through four phases (Opertti et al., 2014):
1) Human Rights Focus: Emphasizing the importance of human rights.
2) Involvement of Special Needs: Prioritizing the inclusion of children with disabilities.
3) Marginalized Groups: Expanding to include all marginalized populations.
4) Systemic Transformation: Aiming for comprehensive changes in the education system to eliminate exclusion.

Transforming the education system involves addressing diversity in race, economic status, gender, and disability (UNESCO, 2019). This transformation requires educational institutions to serve all children and provide learning opportunities for youth and adults (UNESCO, 2009). Creating an inclusive school environment involves three justifications:

1) Educational Justification: Schools must develop inclusive teaching methods that accommodate individual differences.
2) Social Justification: Inclusive schools promote a just society by changing attitudes toward diversity.
3) Economic Justification: Educating all children together is more cost-effective than segregating them.

Three dimensions essential for fostering inclusivity in schools are:

1) Cultural Dimension: Establishing inclusive values and community collaboration (Booth & Ainscow, 2002).
2) Policy Dimension: Ensuring that all school plans reflect inclusive principles and support diversity.
3) Practical Dimension: Implementing inclusive policies in daily school practices, focusing on resource management and responsive teaching.

According to the "Index for Inclusion" (Booth & Ainscow, 2002), inclusive education should:

1) Value all students equally.
2) Increase participation and reduce exclusion in school culture.
3) Restructure policies and practices to reflect local diversity.
4) Remove barriers to learning for all students.
5) Learn from efforts to enhance access and participation.
6) View student differences as learning resources.
7) Recognize students' rights to education in their communities.
8) Improve conditions for both staff and students.
9) Promote societal values and achievement.
10) Foster sustainable school-community relationships.
11) Acknowledge the link between educational and societal inclusion.

These principles and dimensions form the foundation for creating an inclusive educational environment, ensuring that all students, regardless of their needs, can learn and grow together in a respectful community (Zidniyati, 2020). These indicators, as well as the principles of justification, both educational, social and cultural, as well as three dimensions (culture, policies, practices) to create an inclusive school environment will be embodied in the examination instrument at the research location. This is in line with the philosophy that humanizes students, both those with special needs and those without special needs can learn together and form a community of mutual respect. In detail it can be said that an inclusive school environment ensures these seven paradigms are built in the entire way of schooling: (1) acceptance and a sense of belonging in a community; (2) collaboration between families, educators, and society as a unit; (3) a positive response to the diversity and values shared by all students; (4) rewarding students by creating quality school services; (5) educational services that facilitate peer tutoring; (6) appreciation to all students; (7) openness to all children around the school to study together (Zidniyati, 2020).

RESULT

The following presents the key findings and conclusions from the implementation of the literacy program aimed at enhancing educator competence and supporting anti-bullying initiatives across elementary schools in Banyuwangi, East Java. The results are categorized by phases of the program, highlighting challenges faced, strategies employed, and the overall impact on both educators and students.

a. Phase 1 (2021)

   The program aimed to enhance educator competence in literacy and support anti-bullying in 20 elementary schools across 11 sub-districts in Banyuwangi, East Java. Success rate on phase 1 is 92% of participants successfully engaged in various reading and writing activities. Key findings included:

   1) Implementation Challenges: Required careful planning and faced issues like short training durations and teacher fatigue.
   2) Learning Material: Ambitious content with a focus on balanced literacy, but abstract language was prevalent.
   3) Classroom Management: Difficulties included large class sizes, varied student abilities, and limited reading resources.
   4) Theory vs. Practice: A gap existed between theoretical knowledge and practical application of literacy techniques.

   Suggestions that can be proposed after passing the first phase are emphasize careful planning, child-centered learning, active classroom engagement, and easily accessible learning materials

b. Phase 2 (2022)

   The program aimed to continued focus on literacy and anti-bullying. The success rate on phase two is 92% of participants reported feeling successful in applying the material, with 96% finding the program beneficial. Findings included are as followed:

   1) Variety: New topics introduced, but online delivery posed challenges.
   2) Efficient Activities: Classroom management strategies were new and beneficial.
   3) Attendance Issues: Conflicts with other activities led to a 53% attendance rate.
   4) Student Engagement: Increased student book production from 10 to 20 titles.

   Suggestions that can be proposed after passing the second phase are extend zoom sessions, enhance resource availability, and incorporate offline learning for better engagement.

c. Phase 3 (2023)

   The program on the third phase was focused on integrating literacy with anti-bullying efforts. The success rate of the third phase is 100% of participants applied consistent rule-setting for bullying prevention, with significant improvements in classroom management. Findings included:

   1) Effective Classroom Management: Improved skills among teachers and principals.
   2) Student Production: More books created by students with teacher support.
   3) Collaboration: Principals provided necessary support for teachers.

   The literacy program significantly contributed to a safe, enjoyable learning environment,

fostering pro-social behavior and enhancing literacy skills. Recommendations include continued integration of literacy with character education and broader dissemination of successful practices to other schools.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the literacy program across 20 elementary schools in Banyuwangi, East Java, demonstrated significant progress in enhancing educator competence and supporting anti-bullying initiatives over three phases. In the first year, 92% of participants successfully engaged in various literacy activities, although challenges such as planning, teacher fatigue, and large class sizes were noted. The second phase saw 92% of participants feeling successful in applying the material, with 96% finding the program beneficial, despite attendance issues and difficulties with online delivery. By the third phase, 100% of participants effectively applied consistent rule-setting for bullying prevention, leading to improved classroom management and increased student engagement, as evidenced by the doubling of student-created books from the previous year. Overall, the program fostered a safe and supportive learning environment, significantly enhancing both literacy skills and pro-social behaviors among students.

The success of this program underscores the importance of integrating literacy education with character development initiatives, suggesting that similar approaches can be adopted in other regions to address bullying and improve student engagement. Additionally, the findings highlight the need for ongoing professional development for educators, tailored resources, and strategies that accommodate diverse learning environments, ultimately contributing to more effective teaching practices and better student outcomes.

REFERENCES

Aspers, P., & Corte, U. (2019). What is Qualitative in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Sociology*, *42*(2), 139–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7

Allington, R. L. (2001). What Really Matters in Reading Instruction. Pearson

Beers, K. (2003). When Kids Can't Read: What Teachers Can Do. Heinemann.

Boeren, E. (2019). Understanding Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 on "quality education" from micro, meso and macro perspectives. *International Review of Education*, *65*(2), 277–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09772-7

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools. In *Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education*. https://doi.org/Furze, T. (2012). Review. Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools. Educational Psychology in Practice,445. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2012.693682

Campbell, M., & Bauman, S. (2017). Cyberbullying: Definition, consequences, prevalence. In *Reducing Cyberbullying in Schools: International Evidence-Based Best Practices* (Issue 2013). Elsevier Inc. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-811423-0.00001-8

Crawford., A., Saul, E. W., Mathews, S., & Makinster, J. (2005). Teaching and learning strategies for the thingking classroom. In *The Reading and Writing for Critical Thingking Project*.

Elfert, M. (2019). Lifelong learning in Sustainable Development Goal 4: What does it mean for UNESCO's rights-based approach to adult learning and education? *International Review of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09788-z

Faisal, & Lova, S. M. (2018). *the Development of Reading Learning Material Based. 8*(2). Faizah, D. U., Sufyadi, S., Anggraini, L., Waluyo, Dewayani, S., Muldian, W., & Roosaria, D.

R. (2016). *Panduan gerakan literasi sekolah di sekolah dasar*. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009). *School-Based Programs to Reduce Bullying and Victimization - Farrington - 2009 - Campbell Systematic Reviews - Wiley Online Library* (pp. 1–149). https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.4073/csr.2009.6

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2017). Guiding Readers and Writers (Grades 3-6): Teaching Comprehension, Genre, and Content Literacy. Heinemann.

Gaffney, H., Farrington, D. P., & White, H. (2021). *Anti-bullying Programmes Toolkit technical report* (Issue June, pp. 1–58). University of Cambridge, Campbell Collaboration, Clare Hall Cambridge.

Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2021). What works in anti-bullying programs? Analysis of effective intervention components. *Journal of School Psychology*, *85*(June 2020), 37–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.12.002

Gee, J. P. (2015). *Literacy and education*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., & Corley, K. G. (2018). Finding Theory–Method Fit: A Comparison of Three Qualitative Approaches to Theory Building. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *27*(3), 284–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492617706029

Handarman, Saryono, J., Supriyono, Kamdi, W., Sunaryo, Latipun, Winarsunu, T., Chamisijatin, L., Koesoema, D., Indriyanto, B., Hidayati, S., Kurniawan, Sufyadi, S.,

Setyorini, N. P., Utomo, E., Hadinata, O., Anggraini, L., Setiyorini, H. P. D., Kania, A., & Haura, T. (2017). *Panduan Penilaian Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter* (2nd ed.).

Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *41*(4), 441–455. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021963099005545

Hinitz, B. F. (2018). Impeding bullying among young children in international group contexts. In *Impeding Bullying Among Young Children in International Group Contexts*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47280-5

Holt, M. K., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Polanin, J. R., Holland, K. M., DeGue, S., Matjasko, J. L., Wolfe, M., & Reid, G. (2015). Bullying and suicidal ideation and behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, *135*(2), e496–e509. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2014-1864

Ismaya, B., Perdana, I., Arifin, A., Fadjarajani, S., Anantadjaya, S. P., & Muhammadiah, M. (2021). Merdeka Belajar in the Point of View of Learning Technology in the Era of 4.0 and Society 5.0. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *13*(3), 1777–1785. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i3.556

Jalal, F., Anas, Z., Hamka, M., Somantrie, H., Suharyadi, & Sumiyati. (2011). *Panduan*

Pelaksanaan pendidikan karakter. Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan.

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds? - Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health*, *78*(9), 496–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2008.00335.x

Koesoema, D., Sutjipto, Setiawan, D. I., Hanifah, N., Miftahussururi, Nento, M. N., & Akbari, Q. S. (2017). *Pedoman penilaian dan evaluasi gerakan literasi nasional*. Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Koyuncu, İ., & Fırat, T. (2020). Investigating reading literacy in PISA 2018 assessment. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *13*(2), 263–275. https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2021.189

Lenhart, A. (2015). Teens, social media & technology overview 2015:smartphones facilitate shifts in communication landscape for teens. In *Pew Researh Center* (Vol. 151, Issue April).

Lubis, Y. (2018). VISION: Journal of Language, Literature & Education. *File:///C:/Users/Lenovo/Downloads/Ijtsrd358461.Pdf*, *13*(13), 1–27.

McGee, L. M., & Richgels, D. J. (2012). Literacy's Beginnings: Supporting Young Readers and Writers. Pearson

OECD. (2019a). *PISA 2018 Results: What students know and can do (Volume I): Vol. I*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en

OECD. (2019b). PISA 2018 Results (Volume II): Where All Students Can Succeed. In *OECD Publishing: Vol. II*. https://www.oecd.org/pisa/publications/PISA2018_CN_IDN.pdf

OECD. (2020a). *PISA 2018 Results. Volume V. Effective Policies, successful schools: Vol. V*. OECD. (2020b). *PISA 2018 results (Volume IV): Are students smart about money? Vol. IV*. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/pisa-2018-results-volume-iv_48ebd1ba-en

OECD. (2020c). PISA 2018 results Are students ready to thrive in an interconnected world? Volume VI. In *The Ministry of Education: Vol. VI*. PISA, OECD Publishing. https://moe.go.kr/boardCnts/view.do?boardID=294&lev=0&statusYN=W&s=moe&m= 0204&opType=N&boardSeq=79191

Opertti, R., Walker, Z., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Inclusive education: From targeting groups and schools to achieving quality education as the core of EFA. *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education: Two Volume Set, Second Edition*, 149–170. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282236.n11

Peren, Sipri. 2002. Membaca Statistik tentang Kasus Bullying di Indonesia – depoedu.com.

Redmond, P., Lock, J. V., & Smart, V. (2020). Developing a cyberbullying conceptual framework for educators. *Technology in Society*, *60*(October), 101223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.101223

Richardson, J. S., & Morgan, R. F. (2003). *Reading to learn in the context areas* (Issue September).

Serpa, S., & Ferrreira, C. M. (2019). Society 5.0 and Sustainability Digital Innovations: a Social Process. *Journal of Organizational Culture*, *23*(1), 1939–4691.

Smith, P. K., Barrio, C. del, & Tokunaga, R. (2013). Definition of bullying and Cyberbullying: How useful are the terms? In *Principles of cyberbullying research: Definition, methods, and measures* (pp. 64–86). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-9255-10-26

Tavsancil, E., Yildirim, O., & Bilican Demir, S. (2019). Direct and indirect effects of learning strategies and reading enjoyment on pisa 2009 reading performance. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *2019*(82), 169–190. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2019.82.9

Tikly, L. (2017). The future of education for all as a global regime of educational governance. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(1), 22–57. https://doi.org/10.1086/689700

UNESCO. (2009). *Policy guidelines on inclusion in education*. 0–38.

UNESCO. (2019). *On the Road to Inclusion*. 1–20.

United Nations.(2020). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report*. https://sdgs.un.org/publications/sustainable-development-goals-report-2020-24686

Unterhalter, E. (2019). The Many Meanings of Quality Education: Politics of Targets and Indicators in SDG4. *Global Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12591

Valdebenito, S., Eisner, M., Farrington, D. P., Ttofi, M. M., & Sutherland, A. (2018). School-based interventions for reducing disciplinary school exclusion: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2018.1

Valdebenito, S., Ttofi, M., & Eisner, M. (2015). Prevalence rates of drug use among school bullies and victims: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *23*, 137–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.05.004

Zidniyati, Z. (2020). Reconstructing The Nature Of Inclusive School System In Primary School To Strengthening Inclusive Society. *Al-Bidayah: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Islam*, *11*(2), 308–329. https://doi.org/10.14421/al-bidayah.v11i2.350