E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-3258

Halaman 38-62
Volume 3 Nomor 3 Tahun 2026

Validation Analysis of Teacher Readiness Instruments in Implementing the School Literacy Movement (GLS)

Otang Kurniaman[1], Radini[2], Eddy Noviana[1], Dede Permana[1], Ningrum Melihayatri[1], Beny Al Fajar[1], Zufriady[1], Fadhila Rahman[3]

[1,] Program Studi Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar, Universitas Riau

[2]Program Studi Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan, Universitas Riau

[3]Program Studi Bimbingan Konseling, Universitas Riau

e-mail: otang.kurniaman@lecturer.unri.ac.id radini@lecturer.unri.ac.id

eddy.noviana@lecturer.unri.ac.id dede.permana@lecturer.unri.ac.id

ningrum.melihayatri@lecturer.unri.ac.id benyalfajar@lecturer.unri.ac.id

zufriady@lecturer.unri.ac.id Fadhillarahman@lecturer.unri.ac.id

Abstract

The School Literacy Movement (GLS) is a national priority program designed to strengthen literacy culture in primary and secondary education. The success of this program is greatly influenced by the readiness of teachers as the main facilitators. This study aims to develop and test the validity and reliability of an instrument that can measure the level of teacher readiness in implementing GLS. The study used a quantitative approach with a survey design and involved 200 elementary school teachers in Riau Province selected through a purposive sampling technique. The instrument was a questionnaire with 156 statements, arranged based on indicators covering aspects of literacy habits, literacy activity development, and literacy-based learning. Validity analysis was conducted through an item-total correlation test, while reliability was calculated using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. The results showed that of the 156 statements, 141 were declared valid with item-total correlation values ranging from 0.251 to 0.906, while the remaining 15 items did not meet the criteria. The overall reliability value of the instrument reached 0.91, which is categorized as very high. In detail, the validity test at the habituation stage revealed that indicators related to the provision of a literacy environment and reading habits obtained high scores, while several items regarding independent reading activities and writing assignments needed revision. At the development stage, the majority of items were declared valid, particularly the indicators for diverse reading activities, creative writing, and book discussions, although there were some weaknesses in aspects of institutional facilities and certain writing practices. Meanwhile, at the learning stage, all instrument items were declared valid with strong factor loading values. These findings confirm that the developed instrument is suitable for use as a measuring tool for teacher readiness in supporting GLS. Furthermore, the research results can be used

as a reference in developing training programs, mentoring, and formulating more targeted school literacy policies. Thus, this instrument not only contributes to the evaluation of teacher readiness but can also support improving the quality of literacy implementation in elementary schools.
Keywords: **instrument validation, reliability, teacher readiness, school literacy movement, literacy culture.**

INTRODUCTION

Literacy is a fundamental pillar of 21st-century education. The 2018 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) survey results showed that Indonesian students' reading ability only reached 371, far below the OECD average and lagging behind several countries in the Asian region (OECD, 2019). This situation underscores the urgency of implementing the School Literacy Movement (GLS) as one of the government's priority programs to build a culture of literacy in primary and secondary education. GLS is not simply defined as reading and writing skills, but also encompasses the ability to understand, analyze, and use information critically in various contexts (Kemendikbud, 2017).

The School Literacy Movement (GLS) is an initiative by the Ministry of Education and Culture to create a culture of literacy in schools. Its goal is to go beyond reading and writing skills—it encompasses other aspects of literacy such as digital literacy, numeracy, and science (Reddy et al., 2023). The success of this program is highly dependent on the readiness of all school components, especially teachers as the main implementers (Rochmah & Bakar, 2021).

The successful implementation of GLS is inseparable from the active role of all school elements (Supriadi et al., 2022). Teachers are central actors because they function as learning facilitators and role models for students in developing literacy habits (Condie & Pomerantz, 2020). In addition to teachers, the support of principals, librarians, and the involvement of parents and the community are also necessary for this movement to truly foster a sustainable literacy culture (Hanin & Islamy, 2020).

The success of GLS implementation is largely determined by the readiness of elements within the educational unit, especially teachers, as they serve as the primary implementers and drivers of literacy culture in schools. The role of teachers includes initiating reading habits,

mentoring students in reading, and managing the literacy environment in the classroom (Ria, 2023). Furthermore, the involvement of principals, librarians, and other stakeholders contributes to the development of implementation policies, the provision of infrastructure, and the promotion of literacy (Rochmah & Bakar, 2021).

Qualitative studies also show that the implementation of GLS is not always optimal in all educational units. There are variations in the stages of habituation, infrastructure readiness, and commitment of educators (Listanto & Firmansyah, 2022). This indicates that systemic school readiness, as well as individual readiness, such as teachers, are determining factors in the effectiveness of this movement (Ulumudin, 2019).

The role of teachers is crucial to the success of GLS. Teachers act not only as facilitators but also as role models and key drivers in fostering a culture of literacy in schools (Boylu et al., 2024). Although GLS has become a national priority program, its implementation still faces several challenges, particularly related to teacher readiness (Pradana, 2020). Several studies report that teachers' understanding of comprehensive literacy concepts and their skills in integrating literacy into learning are not yet fully optimal (Ulfatin et al., 2022).

The measurement instrument ideally accommodates various dimensions of teacher competency (Putro et al., 2022). First, the cognitive aspect, which encompasses a conceptual understanding of literacy and its urgency in 21st-century learning. Second, the pedagogical aspect, namely teachers' ability to integrate literacy into subjects creatively and contextually. Third, the affective aspect, which relates to teachers' attitudes, motivation, and commitment to building a culture of literacy in schools. With a standardized instrument, measurement data can serve not only as an evaluation tool but also as a basis for formulating more targeted policies and teacher training programs (Febliza & Okatariani, 2020).

Furthermore, the ever-changing dynamics of education policy require regular mapping of field conditions (Sajidan et al., 2023). Teacher readiness is influenced not only by theoretical understanding but also by institutional support, access to adequate learning resources, and a collaborative culture in schools (Damaianti et al., 2020). Therefore, instrument design should be holistic, encompassing cognitive, affective, and contextual dimensions. With a comprehensive approach like this, the measurement results will provide a more complete picture of teacher

readiness, as well as become the basis for data-based policies in an effort to strengthen literacy culture at the national level (Ulumudin, 2019).

In the process of developing a teacher readiness instrument, a design is required that comprehensively describes indicators, starting from the learning planning stage, through the implementation of literacy activities, and finally the resulting impact on students (Švajger, 2022). A good instrument must be based on clear theoretical indicators, empirically tested, and developed through systematic procedures (Safrizal et al., 2022). Several studies have been conducted on the development of digital literacy questionnaires in schools, involving expert validators and limited trials. The instrument was developed based on structured digital literacy indicators and then tested using construct validity analysis with Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and internal reliability. The results showed that the instrument is valid and reliable for wider use in measuring the digital literacy of teachers and students (Febliza & Okatariani, 2020). What distinguishes this research is the development of a valid and reliable instrument on teacher readiness in implementing school literacy movements that can be used in further research.

METHOD

1. Research Design

This research was conducted using a quantitative approach through a survey design (Sugiono, 2019). The selection of this approach was based on the main objective of the research, which was to develop and test an instrument used to measure teacher readiness in implementing the GLS (Kurniaman, et al., 2020). Through a quantitative approach, the collected data can be analyzed objectively in numerical form, so that the process of testing the validity and reliability of the instrument can be carried out in a measurable and systematic manner (Kurniaman, et al., 2020).

2. Participants

The study's respondents consisted of public elementary school teachers in Riau Province, meeting specific criteria established through purposive sampling. These criteria included teachers being actively teaching, having at least one year of experience in GLS activities, and

expressing their willingness to participate in the study. Based on these considerations, a sample of 200 teachers was selected, deemed representative enough for instrument testing purposes.

3. Research Instruments

The research instrument was a questionnaire consisting of 156 items. All items were developed based on three main dimensions of teacher readiness in implementing GLS. The first dimension is literacy habituation, which includes routine fifteen-minute reading practices, the provision of reading corners, and teacher involvement in fostering reading habits in the classroom. The second dimension is literacy development, which includes creative writing activities, the selection of diverse reading materials, book discussions, and directed reading guidance. Meanwhile, the third dimension is literacy-based learning, which emphasizes the integration of literacy into lesson plans, the design of text-based assessments, and classroom management that supports the creation of a culture of literacy. Each statement in the instrument uses a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," allowing researchers to capture variations in teacher readiness levels and perceptions in more detail. Before the questionnaire was distributed, the instrument's item validation was analyzed to produce a valid and reliable instrument.

4. Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed in two stages. First, a validity test was conducted using the item-total correlation technique at a significance level of five percent. An item was considered valid if the correlation value obtained was greater than the rtable, which was 0.381. Second, a reliability test was conducted by calculating the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to determine the level of internal consistency of the instrument. An instrument was considered to have very high reliability if the alpha value was greater than or equal to 0.91. The entire data analysis process was carried out using SPSS software. In addition, the validity test was not only reviewed from the item-total correlation value, but also in-depth through an examination of the factor loading pattern on each dimension, so that it could identify which items were worthy of being retained, needed to be revised, or had to be eliminated.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Validity analysis of the instrument developed to measure teacher readiness for the implementation of GLS was conducted across three stages: Familiarization, Development, and Learning. The data revealed that most items demonstrated factor loadings that met validity criteria; however, a number of items failed to meet these criteria and needed to be revised or removed. The invalidity of several items in the familiarization and development stages provides important evidence that, although theoretically relevant, not all practices are consistently applied empirically in the field. This reinforces the view that the development of educational instruments must be iterative, involving continuous revision, retesting, and refinement before widespread use. With largely strong validity results and high reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.91), this instrument can be categorized as a valid and reliable measurement tool. However, this study also emphasizes the need for further study to refine weak items and retest the instrument on a broader sample in various regions to enhance the generalizability of the results. Detailed findings from each stage are presented and discussed below. The instrument hypothesis to achieve validity and reliability if tcount > 0.381 is presented in table form for greater clarity.

Table 1 Results of the Validity Test of the Habituation Stage

No.	Aspect	Indicator	Question	Factor Loading	Results
1.	Literacy skills developed at the habituation stage.	Students are accustomed to reading and understanding texts.	Reading activities help students understand new information.	0.707	Valid
2.	Focus and principles of activities in the habituation stage.	Consistency and orientation towards strengthening literacy culture	Reading activities are carried out consistently every day.	0.586	Valid
			I ensure that the reading atmosphere is calm and enjoyable.	0.663	Valid
			I emphasize the	0.573	Valid

			importance of reading for the formation of students' character.		
			Literacy activities in my class emphasize process, not results.	0.528	Valid
3.	Principles of reading activities at the habituation stage	No pressure, fun, and participatory	Students read comfortably without the pressure of grades.	0.572	Valid
			Reading activities are carried out with a fun approach.	0.652	Valid
			I involve students in light discussions after reading.	0.555	Valid
			The classroom environment supports a relaxed reading atmosphere.	0.664	Valid
4.	Reading activities and creating a literacy-rich environment	Facilities, reading corners and book access are available	In the classroom there is a reading corner or attractive bookshelf.	0.752	Valid
			I regularly update the reading collection in class.	0.742	Valid
			Students have easy access to books in the classroom.	0.734	Valid
			I design a classroom environment that supports a reading culture.	0.714	Valid
			Reading books are arranged thematically and are interesting for students.	0.687	Valid

			Reading activities are supported by an adequate physical environment.	0.699	Valid
5.	Steps to read 15 minutes before class	Routine implementation of early morning reading activities	Students read 15 minutes before class starts every day.	0.628	Valid
			I start the lesson with reading activities without being prompted.	0.531	Valid
			This reading activity has become a habit in my class.	0.658	Valid
			I consistently set aside time for morning reading.	0.637	Valid
			Students welcomed the morning reading activity with enthusiasm.	0.711	Valid
			Morning reading activities have a positive impact on students' learning concentration.	0.764	Valid
6.	Arranging literacy-rich facilities and environments	Availability of interesting media and reading materials	I involve students in arranging the classroom reading corner.	0.541	Valid
			Reading materials in class are varied and appropriate for elementary school level.	0.692	Valid
			I organize reading books so that they are easily accessible and interesting.	0.758	Valid
			Visual media to support literacy are available in	0.840	Valid

			the classroom.		
			My classroom reflects an environment that encourages literacy.	0.770	Valid
			I received school support in providing literacy facilities.	0.804	Valid
7.	Creating a text-rich environment	Availability of texts in various corners of the classroom/school	In my class there are various texts (posters, slogans, poems, etc.).	0.784	Valid
			I display students' written work on the classroom wall.	0.575	Valid
			I encourage the use of texts in students' daily activities.	0.742	Valid
			I integrate reading texts in various subjects.	0.743	Valid
			The school environment supports a reading culture through visual media.	0.824	Valid
			Students are accustomed to reading writing in their surroundings.	0.711	Valid
8.	Choosing reading books in the library	Relevance and diversity of book content	I choose reading books that are appropriate to the students' age and interests.	0.810	Valid
			The reading books in my class support character building.	0.655	Valid
			I ensure that the books used are free from violent content.	0.518	Valid

			I use books from various sources, including local ones.	0.721	Valid
			I consider cultural diversity when choosing books.	0.652	Valid
			Students are involved in the process of selecting reading books.	0.872	Valid
9.	Public involvement	Parental and community involvement	I involve parents in supporting reading activities at home.	0.772	Valid
			The school invites community leaders to read stories.	0.558	Valid
			I collaborate with local libraries or reading communities.	0.577	Valid
			My school has a literacy program that involves the public.	0.657	Valid
			I maintain active communication with parents regarding literacy activities.	0.725	Valid

The results of the validity test at the habituation stage indicated that not all instrument items made a strong contribution to the constructs being measured. Several indicators related to the provision of literacy resources, such as the availability of reading corners, access to books, and updating the reading collection, received high factor loadings and were therefore deemed valid. Similarly, the practice of reading for 15 minutes at the beginning of class proved consistent and was considered a school routine.

However, several other items showed low loadings, particularly those related to students' habit of reading non-textbooks, their ability to retell reading content, and independent reading activities. This indicates that while conceptually important, these indicators are not yet implemented consistently in practice by teachers and students. This means that the habituation stage still faces challenges in aspects that directly develop students' literacy skills. The validity of the development stage will be presented next, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Results of the Instrument Validity Test for the Development Stage

No.	Aspect	Indicator	Question	Factor Loading	Results
1.	Providing a Variety of Reading Experiences	Teachers Facilitate Varied Reading Activities.	I Provide Various Types of Reading Texts for Students.	0.779	Valid
			I use picture stories, articles and children's magazines for reading.	0.761	Valid
			I facilitate individual and group reading activities.	0.828	Valid
			I Provide Free Exploration Time For Reading.	0.837	Valid
			I invite students to read across disciplines (science, social, culture).	0.680	Valid
			I motivate students to try various types of reading (fiction, non-fiction, poetry).	0.636	Valid
2.	School Residents Love Reading	Schools Foster a Collective Reading Culture	Teachers and students are actively involved in reading activities together.	0.614	Valid
			Schools routinely hold literacy activities (Book Day, Silent Reading).	0.757	Valid
			Principal and Staff Participate in Reading Campaign.	0.598	Valid
			I am a role model for	0.663	Valid

			students in reading habits.		
			Students enjoy filling their free time by reading.	0.830	Valid
3.	School Residents Love Writing	Teachers Encourage Students' Writing Habits	I get students into the habit of writing reflections after reading.	0.694	Valid
			Student's written work is displayed in the classroom/school	0.659	Valid
			I encourage students to participate in writing competitions.	0.700	Valid
			I Provide Constructive Feedback on Student Writing.	0.586	Valid
4.	Choosing Fiction and Nonfiction Enrichment Books	Teachers are selective in providing reading materials	I choose fiction and non-fiction books that are appropriate for the students' ages.	0.779	Valid
			I Consider Character Education Themes When Selecting Books.	0.625	Valid
			I combine local and international reading materials.	0.525	Valid
			I Read a Book First Before Recommending It.	0.822	Valid
			I Analyze Cultural Values in the	0.810	Valid

			Readings Provided		
			I involve students in selecting enrichment books.	0.819	Valid
5.	Guided Reading	Teachers Guide Students to Understand Texts in a Directed Way	I guide students in reading by asking about the content of the reading.	0.723	Valid
			I Use Guided Reading Techniques In Class.	0.835	Valid
			I Explain New Vocabulary In Reading.	0.707	Valid
			I guide students to find the main idea of the text.	0.518	Valid
			I relate the content of the reading to my daily life.	0.663	Valid
			I direct students to draw conclusions from the reading.	0.575	Valid
6.	Reading Together	Teachers and Students Read Simultaneously and Interactively	I Read Aloud With Students In Class.	0.509	Valid
			I Use Big Books for Reading Together.	0.642	Valid
			I Instill Reading Expressions While Reading Together.	0.660	Valid
			Carry out reading activities with me regularly.	0.616	Valid
7.	Various Creative Works	Teachers Involve Students in Creating Visual Literacy Works	I guide students to make mini books (one-sheet books, flip-flop books).	0.631	Valid

			Students create creative works after reading books.	0.748	Valid
			I Introduce Various Media Such As Skill Sheets And Workbooks.	0.623	Valid
			Student work is exhibited in the classroom or school library.	0.602	Valid
			I Place Great Value On Creativity In Responding To Reading.	0.659	Valid
			Students are enthusiastic about making literacy products from their reading.	0.672	Valid
8.	Let's Discuss About Books	Teachers Encourage Reflection and Discussion After Reading	I held a group discussion about the contents of the book.	0.612	Valid
			I ask students for their personal opinions about the reading.	0.721	Valid
			I guide students to create questions from the contents of the book.	0.709	Valid
			Students exchange stories about books they have read.	0.615	Valid
			I provide space for students to argue	0.791	Valid

			about the content of the text.		
			I recorded the results of the discussion as evaluation material.	0.758	Valid
9.	Story Map Outline	Teacher Guides Visual Mapping of Text Content	I teach how to make a story map (plot, characters, conflict, message).	0.606	Valid
			Students make story maps from books they read.	0.739	Valid
			I Give an Example of a Story-Map with a Short Book.	0.578	Valid
			I Display Student Story Maps in the Classroom.	0.757	Valid
			Story Maps Help Students Understand Story Structure.	0.613	Valid
			I Guide Students to Restructure the Story Using an Outline.	0.706	Valid
10.	Development Stage Achievement Indicators	Teachers Monitor and Evaluate GLS Achievement	I record the development of students' literacy skills periodically.	0.744	Valid
			I Use Student Portfolios as Reflection Material.	0.798	Valid
			I identify students' obstacles in reading/writing.	0.795	Valid
			I Compile a Literacy Report Based on	0.764	Valid

		Student Activities.		
		I Involve Parents in Assessing Literacy Development.	0.712	Valid
		My school prepares GLS achievement indicators based on evaluation results.	0.773	Valid

In contrast to the habituation stage, the validity test results in the development stage were more stable. Most items assessing varied reading experiences, creative writing activities, book discussions, and the use of story maps were found to be valid, with relatively high factor loadings. This indicates that teachers are relatively consistent in developing richer and more varied literacy activities, beyond just reading routines. However, several items were still declared invalid. For example, statements regarding the provision of dedicated space or time for reading at school, as well as specific writing assignments such as poetry or journaling. The low validity of these items is likely due to differences in implementation across schools, as not all schools have the same formal policies or writing habits. In other words, although the literacy development aspect is quite strong, the instrument still requires revision of inconsistent items to more accurately reflect conditions on the ground.

Table 3 Results of the Validity Test of the Learning Stage Instrument

No.	Aspect	Indicator	Question	Factor Loading	Results
1.	Providing guided learning based on literacy	Teachers design learning that facilitates understanding of texts and literacy activities.	I create a lesson plan that integrates reading and writing skills.	0.806	Valid
			I provide critical reading guidance to students.	0.781	Valid
			I use guided reading strategies.	0.766	Valid
			I guide students to respond to reading through writing.	0.729	Valid
			I connect the reading to students' real	0.805	Valid

			experiences.		
			I develop comprehension questions based on the text the students read.	0.796	Valid
2.	Organizing literacy-based classes	Teachers create a classroom environment that supports literacy activities.	I arrange the classroom to support literacy activities.	0.858	Valid
			My class has a reading corner and a display of student work.	0.757	Valid
			I provide visual material that enriches vocabulary.	0.831	Valid
			I compile thematic texts in the classroom area.	0.906	Valid
			I display literacy graphs, charts, or concept maps.	0.875	Valid
			I arrange the classroom to facilitate interaction and discussion.	0.833	Valid
3.	Organizing materials	Teachers prepare and organize teaching materials that support literacy	I choose teaching materials that are relevant and meaningful in terms of literacy.	0.837	Valid
			I arrange reading materials according to the students' development level.	0.761	Valid
			I group the material	0.875	Valid

			according to themes and literacy skills.		
			I provide printed and digital teaching materials equally.	0.796	Valid
			I prepare worksheets that support reading comprehension.	0.872	Valid
			I keep my teaching materials organized so they are easy to access.	0.841	Valid
4.	Implementing integrated literacy according to themes and subjects	Teachers integrate literacy into various subject areas	I link literacy materials with thematic learning themes.	0.827	Valid
			I insert reading and writing activities in every lesson.	0.761	Valid
			I developed a literacy project that combined multiple subjects.	0.835	Valid
			I align reading with the school curriculum.	0.702	Valid
			I use informative and literary texts in various lesson contexts.	0.747	Valid
			My students are used to composing texts based on subject topics.	0.763	Valid
5.	Make a schedule	Teachers determine the time for	I schedule literacy activities regularly	0.712	Valid

		implementing literacy systematically	throughout the week.		
			I insert reading time into the lesson schedule.	0.773	Valid
			I set a time for student journal writing or reflection.	0.760	Valid
			I schedule time for regular book discussions.	0.808	Valid
			I adjust my schedule so that literacy activities are not disrupted.	0.784	Valid
			I monitor the implementation of the literacy activity schedule in my class.	0.811	Valid
6.	Assessment and evaluation	Teachers evaluate students' literacy skills periodically and constructively.	I evaluate students' reading comprehension through reflective questions.	0.843	Valid
			I use an assessment rubric to assess students' writing.	0.756	Valid
			I utilize literacy portfolios to assess student progress.	0.822	Valid
			I provide feedback on students' literacy results individually.	0.797	Valid
			I conduct literacy-based formative and summative assessments.	0.627	Valid

			I record students' literacy progress in the monitoring sheet.	0.641	Valid
7.	School community literacy conference	Schools hold forums to share literacy best practices.	My school held a forum for sharing literacy practices between teachers.	0.591	Valid
			I participate in school literacy conferences or workshops.	0.591	Valid
			I convey the results of literacy learning in school meetings.	0.714	Valid
			The school provides space for discussion and evaluation between teachers regarding literacy.	0.679	Valid
			Literacy conferences are a regular agenda in the school calendar.	0.617	Valid
			Schools involve all citizens in strengthening literacy through formal forums.	0.691	Valid

At the learning stage, the validity test results showed the most robust findings. All instrument items were declared valid, with many having high factor loadings. This demonstrates that the indicators assessing literacy-based learning planning, supportive classroom layout, use of relevant teaching materials, literacy schedule development, and text-based assessments are fully aligned with teacher practice. These findings indicate that the learning dimension is the strongest component of the teacher readiness instrument. It not only aligns with theory but is also supported by consistent practice in schools. Therefore, the instrument at this stage can be considered ready for use without significant revision. This also demonstrates that teachers have been quite successful in integrating literacy into the daily learning process.

Discussion

The analysis results at the habituation stage revealed a fairly diverse or heterogeneous pattern. Some indicators and statement items achieved high factor loading values and were therefore considered representative of the constructs being measured, while several others demonstrated relatively weak contributions and therefore did not meet validity criteria. Items related to the arrangement of the literacy environment—for example, the availability of reading corners, updating reading collections, easy student access to literacy resources, and classroom design that supports a reading atmosphere—generally achieved factor loading values above 0.70 and were deemed valid. Furthermore, the indicator regarding the strategy of reading 15 minutes before class also consistently produced adequate results, indicating that this practice has become a fairly ingrained habit in the implementation of the School Literacy Movement (Kurniaman et al., 2024). Conversely, several items showed low loading values and were deemed invalid. This is particularly true for indicators measuring literacy skills developed through habituation, such as statements about the habit of reading non-textbooks, students' ability to retell reading content, the provision of dedicated time for independent reading, and the perception that reading is carried out without coercion (Rigianti, 2023). The low validity of these items may be due to variations in implementation in the field, where not all schools consistently practice non-textbook reading or provide space for students to reflect on their reading (Haq et al., 2022). Interestingly, only one item in this dimension proved valid, namely the statement that reading helps students understand new information, which obtained a significant loading value.

These findings indicate that during the habituation phase, although some technical aspects, such as the provision of facilities and the implementation of early-day reading strategies, were effective, the dimensions that emphasize the development of students' literacy skills were still inconsistently implemented by teachers (Prabowo et al., 2023). Therefore, improvements and adjustments to problematic items are needed so that the instrument can more accurately reflect teachers' readiness in the literacy habituation aspect (Kurniaman et al., 2025). This is in line with research by Karira et al., (2023) who developed a science literacy test instrument and found that not all theoretically designed items were empirically valid. Some items needed to be removed or refined after limited trials. These findings align with literature emphasizing that instrument items need to be re-examined if there are indications of contextual incompatibility or low empirical performance. This supports the need for refinement of item wording, adjustments to the implementation context, and extensive field trials before finalizing the instrument (Mirizon et al., 2021).

During the development phase, the analysis results showed a fairly solid trend, with most items meeting validity criteria, with factor loading values generally in the medium to high range (0.60–0.80). This indicates that indicators related to providing diverse reading experiences, creative writing activities, selecting relevant reading materials, implementing targeted reading guidance, and reflective activities such as book discussions and story map creation successfully illustrated the constructs being measured (Luyten, 2022). Thus, it can be concluded that teachers are relatively consistent in developing more varied and structured literacy activities beyond mere routine habits (Kurniaman et al., 2022). However, not all items make an equally strong contribution. A small number of statements actually showed low validity values, for example, items related to providing a dedicated space or time for reading at school, as well as several items concerning specific writing habits such as assignments to write stories, poems, or journals. The low validity of these indicators is likely due to variations in practice across schools, with not all institutions having formal policies

to provide dedicated reading spaces or regularly encourage students to write specific works (Razak et al., 2022). Furthermore, several items in the shared reading dimension, such as taking turns reading texts and asking questions during the activity, were also found to be problematic. This situation indicates differences in implementation in the field, with shared reading strategies not always applied uniformly by teachers (Kargin et al., 2023). Overall, although some items needed revision or elimination, the results from the development phase still showed that the majority of indicators had been empirically tested. This suggests that the literacy development aspect has a strong foundation in the instrument, but still requires refinement to reflect more comprehensive literacy practices appropriate to the elementary school context (Abdullah et al., 2022).

At the learning stage, the analysis results showed that all items in the instrument were declared valid, with loading factor values consistently in the high category. This finding reflects that the aspects measured—from literacy-based learning planning, classroom arrangements that support reading and writing activities, to literacy assessments—have successfully represented the intended constructs. In fact, several indicators recorded very strong loading values, for example, the item assessing the preparation of thematic texts in the classroom area, which received the highest score among the other item groups. This strong validity not only demonstrates the instrument's alignment with the underlying theory but also indicates that teachers have consistently integrated literacy practices into their learning routines. Thus, the learning dimension can be considered the strongest pillar in the instrument, as each item is able to describe teachers' readiness to organize the learning environment, manage teaching materials, establish literacy schedules, and conduct systematic assessments. Consistent validity in this dimension also ensures that the instrument can be used to more accurately measure teacher readiness in the context of GLS implementation. This aligns with research conducted by Syahwela et al. (2024), which showed that through CFA and statistical analysis, well-formulated dimensions and items can produce instruments with high measurement power and internal consistency. This is relevant in the context of literacy learning, which also requires a valid and reliable construct structure.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms that the instrument developed to measure teacher readiness to implement GLS has been proven valid and reliable. Of the 156 items tested, 141 met the validity criteria, while the reliability test produced a coefficient of 0.91, which is included in the very high category. These results provide assurance that the instrument is not only capable of representing the construct being measured but also has strong internal consistency, making it suitable for use as an evaluation tool for teacher readiness to support GLS in elementary schools.

The implications of this research are significant, both practically and academically. For policymakers, the instrument's measurement results can serve as a basis for designing teacher capacity-building programs, such as literacy training, reading media development workshops, and ongoing mentoring that is more targeted to real-world needs. Thus, this instrument serves not only as an evaluation tool but also as a policy map that can encourage the development of more contextual and effective school literacy strategies.

From an academic perspective, this research opens up opportunities for the development of similar instruments at other levels of education, particularly secondary education, which faces different literacy challenges than elementary schools. Furthermore, the scope of the research could be expanded by adding new variables, such as teacher intrinsic motivation, school institutional support, or the availability of digital literacy resources, so that future instruments could provide a

more holistic picture of the factors influencing the success of GLS. With this approach, this instrument has the potential to become an important reference in efforts to improve the quality of literacy education nationally and as a reference for further relevant research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research received a grant from the University of Riau's superior research scheme with the 2025 budget year with contract number: 29047/UN19.5.1.3/AL.04/2025. Thanks to the Rector of the University of Riau, the Dean of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, the Pekanbaru City Education Office, and elementary school teachers who were willing to be respondents and research members who contributed to this research.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M. N. L. Y., Omar, A. F., Ping, T. A., & Chun, T. C. (2022). Validity and reliability of the postgraduate self-determined learning questionnaire (PSLQ). Asian Journal of University Education (AJUE), 18(1), 91–105.

Boylu, E., Karagöl, E., & Çevik, A. (2024). Academic reading in graduate students: interpretative phenomenological analysis. Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, 37, 64–92. https://doi.org/10.14689/enad.37.1754.

Condie, C., & Pomerantz, F. (2020). Elementary students' literacy opportunities in an age of accountability and standards: Implications for teacher educators. Journal: Teaching and Teacher Education, 10(3), 20–50. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103058.

Damaianti, V. S., Abidin, Y., & Rahma, R. (2020). Higher order thinking skills-based reading literacy assessment instrument: An Indonesian context. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10(2), 513–525. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28600.

Febliza, A., & Okatariani, O. (2020). Pengembangan Instrumen Literasi Digital Sekolah, Siswa Dan Guru. Jurnal Pendidikan Kimia Universitas Riau, 5(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.33578/jpk-unri.v5i1.7776.

Hanin, N. H., & Islamy, M. I. (2020). Reading Literacy Movement in Elementary School. AL-MUDARRIS : Journal of Education, 3(1), 93–104. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.32478/al-mudarris.v3i1.418.

Haq, M. S., Samani, M., Karwanto, K., & Hariyati, N. (2022). Android-Based Digital Library Application Development. IJIM, 16(11), 224–237. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v16i11.32055.

Kargin, T., Güldenoğlu, İ. B., & Gengec, H. (2023). The Role of Early Literacy Skills in Beginning to Read in Turkish: Longitudinal Findings from First Graders. Participatory Educational Research (PER), 10(2), 26–42. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.23.27.10.2.

Karira, N. F., Sunarti, T., Jauhariyah, M. N. R., & Setyarsih, W. (2023). Validitas Instrumen Tes Berbasis Literasi Sains untuk Mengukur Keterampilan Berpikir Kritis Siswa SMA pada Materi Energi Terbarukan. IPF: Inovasi Pendidikan Fisika, 12(2), 118–125. https://doi.org/10.26740/ipf.v12n2.p118-125.

Kemendikbud. (2017). Gerakan Literasi Nasional.

Kurniaman, O., Firdaus, L. N., Hadriana, H., & Sumarno, S. (2022). The Use Of Technology In Learning To Read: A Literature Review. Primary: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar, 11(5), 1407–1419. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33578/jpfkip.v11i5.9047.

Kurniaman, O., Hadriana:, Islami, N., Putra, Z. H., & Zufriady. (2024). The Impact of Online Learning

on Digital Literacy Skills in Higher Education : Survey Methods and Test Analysis. Jurnal PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran), 8(6), 649–657. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v8i6.10215.

Kurniaman, O., Hidayat, M. L., Noviana, E., & ... (2020). The Validation of LIAA (Linguistic Intelligence Assessment Android) Development In Elementary School. Profesi Pendidikan …. https://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/ppd/article/view/12696.

Kurniaman, O., Islami, N., & Putra, Z. H. (2025). Students ' perceptions of information and communication technology (ICT) -based literacy learning needs in higher education. Journal of Turkish Science Education, 22(3), 419–435. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36681/.

Kurniaman, O., Noviana, E., & Munjiatun, M. (2020). The Ability of Critical Thinking of Elementary School Students Using a Graphic Organizer Instrument. JMIE (Journal of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Education), 4(2), 206–216. https://doi.org/10.32934/jmie.v4i2.166.

Listanto, V., & Firmansyah, N. (2022). The Trend of Library Development in Indonesia and the Effects on Literacy Skills in Schools. Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Dan Kajian Kepustakaan Di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran Dan Pembelajaran, 8(3), 508–520. https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v8i3.5643.

Luyten, H. (2022). The global rise of online chatting and its adverse effect on reading literacy. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 72(101101), 1–7. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101101.

Mirizon, S., Vianty, M., Rosmalina, I., & Erlina, E. (2021). Secondary school students' English literacy achievement based on PISA reading literacy test 2009. Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 9(1), 165–182. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i1.10492.

OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do. In OECD Publishing: Vol. I.

Prabowo, A., Suparman, S., Li, C. S., Janan, D., & Damayanti, T. D. (2023). The effect of reading literacy to mathematics comprehension of elementary school students in Indonesia and Malaysia. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 12(1), 546–554. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i1.25714.

Pradana, F. A. P. (2020). Pengaruh Budya Literasi Sekolah Melalui Pemanfaatan Sudut Baca Terhadap Minat Membaca Siswa Di Sekolah Dasar. Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Konseling, 2(1), 81–85.

Putro, N. H. P. S., Damio, S. M., Sukarno, S., & Purnawan, A. (2022). Pre-Service Teachers Literacy of Assessment for Learning. Asian Journal of University Education (AJUE), 18(3), 792–802.

Razak, H. M., Razak, N. A., & Krish, P. (2022). Enhancing students' digital literacy at EFL classroom: Strategies of teachers and school administrators. Cakrawala Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 41(3), 653–664. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v41i3.43107.

Reddy, P., Chaudhary, K., & Hussein, S. (2023). A digital literacy model to narrow the digital literacy skills gap. Heliyon, 9(e14878), 1–16. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e14878.

Ria, R. F. R. A. (2023). Implementasi Gerakan Literasi Sekolah (Gls) Di Sdn Kendalrejo 01 Kecamatan Talun Kabupaten Blitar. Inventa, 7(2), 178–191. https://doi.org/10.36456/inventa.7.2.a7993.

Rigianti, H. A. (2023). The Concept Of Differentiated Learning: Elementary School Learning Diversity Solution. Jurnal PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran), 7(2), 285–298. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v7i2.8992.

Rochmah, Z., & Bakar, M. Y. A. (2021). Studi Kebijakan Mengenai Gerakan Literasi Sekolah. Asatiza: Jurnal Pendidikan, 2(2), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.46963/asatiza.v2i2.288.

Safrizal, S., Sudarmono, S., & Yulia, R. (2022). Developing Students Science Literacy in Adiwiyata School: Case Study in Padang City, Indonesia. Journal of Turkish Science Education, 19(4), 1192–1205. https://doi.org/10.36681/tused.2022.169.

Sajidan, S., Atmojo, I. R. W., Desstya, A., Parmin, P., Saputri, D. Y., & Salimi, M. (2023). The level of digital literacy ability of elementary school students. World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues, 12(1), 59–71. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18844/wjet.v15i1.8192.

Sugiono, S. (2019). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Kuantitatif, KUalitatif, Kombinasi, R&D, dan Penelitian Pendidikan. Alfabeta.

Supriadi, U., Supriyadi, T., & Abdussalam, A. (2022). Al-Qur'an Literacy: A Strategy and Learning Steps in Improving Al-Qur'an Reading Skills through Action Research. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 21(1), 323–339. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.1.18.

Švajger, J. (2022). The Inclusion of Differentiation in Literacy Lessons in the First and Second Grades of Slovenian Primary School. C e p s Journal, 12(3), 13–32. https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1042.

Syahwela, M., Ndoluanak, Y., Sarifah, I., & Margono, G. (2024). Validitas dan Reliabilitas Instrumen Literasi Digital Mahasiswa dengan Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Sulawesi Tenggara Educational Journal, 4(3), 173–180. https://doi.org/10.54297/seduj.v4i3.830.

Ulfatin, N., Putra, A. B. N. R., Heong, Y. M., Zahro, A., & Rahmawati, A. D. (2022). Disruptive Learning Media Integrated E-Generator Practice System to Advance Self-Efficacy Learners Levels in Era of Education 4.0. IJIM, 16(4), 4–16. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v16i04.28993.

Ulumudin, I. (2019). Penguatan Gerakan Literasi Sekolah. Jurnal Penelitian Kebijakan Pendidikan, 10(3), 141–155. https://doi.org/10.24832/jpkp.v10i3.241.