ISSN 2776-5229

Karl Popper's Theory of Falsification and Its Implications for Contemporary Research Methodology

Nasrun[1*], Eva Dewi[2]
[1,2] Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau
*evadewi@uin-suska.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received April 24, 2026
Revisied May 16, 2026
Accepted Juni 20, 2026

Keywords: Falsification; Karl Popper; Epistemology; Demarcation; Research Methodology

ABSTRACT

This article critically examines Karl Raimund Popper's theory of falsification as one of the most significant epistemological contributions to the philosophy of science in the twentieth century. Despite extensive scholarship on Popperian philosophy, there remains a gap in the literature regarding its integrated methodological application, particularly in the context of contemporary scientific research and integrative Islamic scholarship. This study employs a qualitative library research approach, utilizing historical analysis, conceptual analysis, and critical synthesis as its analytical framework. Primary sources include Popper's foundational works, The Logic of Scientific Discovery (1959) and Conjectures and Refutations (1963), supplemented by relevant secondary and tertiary literature. The findings indicate that falsification emerged as a critical response to the Vienna Circle's verification principle, offering a more robust demarcation criterion that distinguishes empirical science from non-science based on a theory's falsifiability. Rather than serving merely as a logical procedure, falsification carries concrete methodological implications: a paradigmatic shift from inductive to hypothetico-deductive logic, the emergence of corroboration as a replacement for absolute confirmation, and a demand for critical rigor in hypothesis formulation. This article further argues that the epistemological limitations of falsification, including its susceptibility to auxiliary hypothesis manipulation as identified in the Duhem-Quine thesis, require engagement with post-Popperian frameworks such as Lakatos's research programmes. Ultimately, falsification remains an indispensable epistemological tool for maintaining methodological integrity in research that claims scientific status.

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of demarcation how to distinguish genuine science from pseudoscience and metaphysics stands as one of the most fundamental and enduring challenges in the philosophy of science. The Vienna Circle's verification principle, which held that a statement is meaningful only if it can be empirically verified, dominated early twentieth-century epistemology but harbored a critical flaw: universal scientific laws can never be conclusively verified through finite observation. It was precisely this problem that led Karl Raimund Popper to formulate his theory of falsification, offering an alternative criterion of demarcation grounded in refutability rather than confirmability (Popper, 1959). Despite the extensive scholarly attention Popper's falsification theory has received, a notable gap persists in the literature. Most existing studies treat falsification either as a purely historical-philosophical topic or as a general epistemological principle without systematically examining its specific methodological implications for contemporary research practice. Furthermore, the potential contribution of falsificationist thinking to integrative Islamic scholarship particularly in maintaining the boundary between empirical claims and theological ones remains underexplored. This article addresses these gaps by offering a critical and synthetic analysis of falsification that extends beyond exposition toward analytical engagement with its strengths, limitations, and contemporary relevance. This problem prompted Popper to formulate an alternative he called falsifiability. Instead of asking "can this theory be proven true?", Popper posed a different question: "can this theory be proven false?" This shift in perspective may appear simple, but it carries profoundly deep implications for

how we understand the nature of science and how scientists work. Through the concept of falsifiability, Popper not only offered a solution to the problem of demarcation, but also revolutionized the entire paradigm of scientific research methodology (Riski, 2021). The relevance of falsification for integrative Islamic scholarship is not peripheral but structural. In the development of increasingly integrative Islamic studies, researchers must rigorously distinguish between empirical claims that are open to scientific testing and theological or metaphysical claims that operate within a different epistemic domain. Without this clarity, Islamic scholarship risks either scientizing theological propositions or dismissing empirical findings on non-rational grounds. Falsification, properly understood, offers a principled epistemological framework for navigating this boundary (Misbahuddin, 2015). This article aims to: (1) analyze the historical and intellectual background that gave rise to Popper's theory of falsification, with emphasis on the verification problem and the demarcation problem; (2) critically examine the core principles of falsification and their epistemological implications, including engagement with post-Popperian critiques; and (3) identify the concrete methodological implications of falsification for contemporary scientific research and integrative Islamic scholarship. In so doing, this article seeks to contribute not merely a descriptive account but a critical and synthetic analysis of falsification's ongoing relevance.

2. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative approach using library research (studi kepustakaan) methods. Data were collected through a review of primary sources consisting of Popper's own works namely The Logic of Scientific Discovery (1959) and Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge (1963) as well as a number of secondary sources comprising relevant academic journals and philosophy books. The analytical technique employed consists of three complementary approaches. First, historical analysis is used to reconstruct the intellectual context in which falsification emerged, tracing the theoretical problems that motivated Popper's departure from logical positivism. Second, conceptual analysis is employed to examine the internal logic of key Popperian concepts falsifiability, corroboration, and demarcation and to clarify their precise epistemological meaning. Third, critical synthesis is applied to evaluate the strengths and limitations of falsification in light of subsequent philosophical critiques, including the Duhem-Quine thesis and Lakatos's research programme framework, and to assess their implications for contemporary research methodology. The unit of analysis consists of theoretical propositions and conceptual claims drawn from the primary and secondary sources identified above. This approach was chosen because it suits the philosophical and conceptual nature of this inquiry, wherein depth of textual and conceptual analysis is prioritized over the collection of field data. The research data sources can be classified as follows: Primary sources: Karl Popper's direct works (The Logic of Scientific Discovery and Conjectures and Refutations. Secondary sources: Scientific journal articles (Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia, Jurnal at-Taqaddum, Jurnal Komunike, Jurnal Ilmu Ushuluddin, Jurnal Penelitian dan Pemikiran Keislaman). Tertiary sources: Introductory books and commentaries on Popper's philosophy

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Historical and Intellectual Background of Falsification

The Vienna Circle (*Wiener Kreis*) was a group of philosophers and scientists who met regularly at the University of Vienna from 1924 onward under the leadership of Moritz Schlick (Popper, 1959). This group represented a pivotal milestone in the history of the philosophy of science, pioneering the Logical Positivism movement a program aimed at making the methods of the natural sciences the standard for all knowledge, including philosophy itself. Key members of the group

included Rudolf Carnap, Otto Neurath, and Hans Hahn, all of whom worked toward building a "Unified Science." The central principle of the Vienna Circle was verifiability: a statement was deemed meaningful and scientific only if its truth could be verified or confirmed through empirical experience. Consequently, metaphysical or theological statements that could not be empirically tested were considered entirely meaningless. This view appeared intellectually compelling, but it harbored a fundamental problem that Popper subsequently identified. Karl Raimund Popper was born in Vienna on July 28, 1902 (Komarudin, 2014). He grew up in an intellectually rich middle-class family; his father, a lawyer, maintained an extensive private library. Popper studied at the University of Vienna and received his doctorate in 1928. Although he moved in the same academic circles as members of the Vienna Circle and engaged in direct discussions with some of them, Popper never became an official part of the group. On the contrary, he became its sharpest critic. When the Nazis came to power and occupied Austria, Popper who was of Jewish descent was compelled to leave his homeland in 1937. He taught at Canterbury University College in Christchurch, New Zealand. After the end of World War II, in 1945 he moved to England and joined the London School of Economics, where he was subsequently appointed Professor of Logic and Scientific Method in 1949 (Lubis, 2014). It was there that he wrote and published most of his major works. The problem that drove Popper to develop his theory of falsification was what he called the *problem of demarcation* the question of how to distinguish genuine science from pseudoscience and metaphysics. Popper was dissatisfied with the answer provided by the Vienna Circle through its verification principle. In his view, the criterion of verification actually contained a paradox: even the most fundamental and useful natural laws such as "objects fall downward due to gravity" can never be conclusively verified, since we cannot possibly observe every event throughout the entire universe across all time (Misbahuddin, 2015).

Core Principles of Falsification

The essence of Popper's theory of falsification can be understood through three key interrelated concepts: *falsifiability*, *refutability*, and *testability*. Together, these concepts form the framework of Popper's critical rationalism an epistemology that is simultaneously empirical and rational. Falsification, in Popper's sense, is a logical procedure by which a theory is assessed against empirical evidence that has the potential to contradict it. This differs fundamentally from verification, which requires the accumulation of supporting evidence. The underlying asymmetry is logically significant: even though countless confirming observations can never "prove" a universal theory in an absolute sense, a well-established contradictory observation is in principle sufficient to demonstrate that the theory, in its current form, is false (Popper, 1963). This is what Popper illustrated with the black swan metaphor: a million white swans do not prove that "all swans are white," but a single confirmed black swan can overturn that claim. It is important to note, however, that in scientific practice the picture is more complex. As the Duhem-Quine thesis highlights, any test of a hypothesis involves a web of auxiliary assumptions, meaning that an anomalous result does not straightforwardly refute the target theory alone it may instead indicate a problem with one of these auxiliary assumptions. Popper himself acknowledged this complexity, arguing that scientists must exercise reasoned judgment and resist the temptation of ad hoc rescues that immunize a theory from genuine testing. Popper formulated four steps in falsificationist theory testing. First, logical comparisons are made among existing theories to test their internal consistency. Second, the logical validity of a theory is examined to determine whether it has an empirical character. Third, one theory is compared with others to assess whether the theory under scrutiny is superior or more robust. Fourth, the theory is applied empirically after all the preceding steps have been completed (Haryono, 2014). One of the most frequently cited concrete examples for explaining falsification concerns the properties of water. For centuries, physics held the theory that "all substances expand when heated." This theory had been

verified by thousands of experiments. Yet, within the Popperian paradigm, it cannot be regarded as absolute truth. And indeed, subsequent research found that water actually contracts (rather than expands) when heated from 0 to 4 degrees Celsius. This discovery of an anomaly directly falsified the universal expansion theory and compelled its revision to be more specific (Rahman, 2017). An important consequence of this principle is that scientific truth is tentative and never final. A theory that has successfully withstood various attempts at falsification is said to have a high degree of *corroboration*. However, high corroboration does not mean the theory has been proven absolutely true; it only indicates that, thus far, it has not been successfully overturned. This status may change at any time should new contradictory evidence emerge (Riski, 2021).

Table 1. Comparison of Verification and Falsification Principles

Aspect	Verification (Vienna Circle)	Falsification (Karl Popper)
Main Goal	To prove the truth of a theory	To refute/falsify a theory
Logic	Inductive	Hypothetico-Deductive
Scientific Criterion	Empirically verifiable	Falsifiable
Truth Status	Absolute/final if verified	Tentative/provisional
Scientific Progress	Accumulation of positive evidence	Elimination of errors (conjecture & refutation)

Source: Adapted from Popper (1959, 1963) and Misbahuddin (2015)

Falsification also has advantages and limitations that must be honestly acknowledged. On the positive side, this principle encourages researchers to think more critically, to develop hypotheses that are more specific and bold, and to prevent dogmatism in science. On the negative side, falsification faces an important epistemological limitation: the principle does not, by itself, tell researchers which component of a theoretical system is responsible when an anomaly arises, since any test involves a network of auxiliary assumptions (Duhem-Quine thesis). Furthermore, the process of formulating genuinely falsifiable hypotheses demands a level of theoretical precision that is not always achievable, particularly in the early stages of inquiry into complex phenomena (Mustansyir & Munir, 2011).

Demarcation Between Science and Non-Science

One of Popper's most important contributions is his resolution of the *problem of demarcation* the question of what criteria distinguish empirical science from mathematics, logic, metaphysics, or pseudoscience.[12] He proposed that falsifiability is the only valid criterion of demarcation. A theory or system of statements is properly called scientific only if it has the logical possibility of coming into conflict with the results of observation or experiment. Popper criticized the Vienna Circle's verification principle because it actually generates a greater problem: even the most useful scientific laws cannot be conclusively verified, meaning that under the principle of verification, such laws would have to be deemed "meaningless" an absurdity that cannot be accepted. By contrast, under the criterion of falsifiability, universal natural laws can be properly called scientific precisely because they make specific, risk-bearing predictions that could be proven false. Popper provided concrete examples to illustrate this distinction. Astronomy is a science because it makes highly specific and risk-bearing predictions: the position of star X on date Y at time Z. If this prediction proves wrong, the astronomical theory in question has been falsified. Astrology, by contrast, is not a science, because its prophecies are so vague and general that virtually no event in the world cannot be "matched" to an astrological prediction. The same applies to Freudian psychoanalysis: because it has an explanation for every human behavior under any conditions, no behavior can logically falsify its theory. It is important to understand that, in Popper's view, the status of "non-scientific" does not automatically mean useless or incorrect. Metaphysics, for instance, may have historical value and

may even serve as a source of inspiration for the emergence of scientific theories in the future. The problem arises only when a discipline claims to be a rigorous science while lacking any mechanism by which it could be falsified. The following table summarizes the position of various fields within Popper's demarcation framework.

Table 2. Demarcation of Science and Non-Science in Popper's Framework

Field	Status According to Popper	Reason
Physics/Astronomy	Scientific	Makes specific, testable, risk-bearing predictions
Astrology	Pseudoscience	Predictions are ambiguous and can always be to any fact
Freudian Psychoanalysis	Non-Scientific	Can explain all behavior; no condition can refute it
Metaphysics	Non-Scientific (but not always useless)	Has no potential for falsification, though it may inspire scientific theories

Source: Adapted from Popper (1963) and Komarudin (2014)

DISCUSSION

Methodological Implications of Falsification in Scientific Research

The application of Popper's falsification principle carries very concrete consequences for how scientific research is conducted. Whereas researchers previously tended to operate with inductive logic gathering supporting data to reinforce existing hypotheses the Popperian paradigm demands a fundamental shift toward hypothetico-deductive logic (Sahidah, 2018). The first and most fundamental implication is a change in how researchers formulate hypotheses. Within a falsificationist framework, hypotheses must not be stated ambiguously or too broadly. Instead, they must be formulated specifically and boldly (*bold conjecture*) meaning they must explicitly specify the conditions or types of data that would be capable of overturning them. Researchers are even expected to declare in advance: "I will consider this hypothesis refuted if finding X or Y emerges." This stance is what distinguishes intellectually honest research from research that merely seeks confirmation (Misbahuddin, 2017). The second implication concerns the relationship between falsificationist logic and the use of the null hypothesis in quantitative research. There is a structural parallel between the two: in inferential statistics, a researcher does not directly prove their alternative hypothesis; rather, they attempt to reject the null hypothesis (H0) through rigorous statistical testing, using data to challenge a baseline claim rather than to confirm a preferred one. This parallels the Popperian logic of attempting to falsify rather than verify. However, it is important to note that the parallel is not complete. Rejection of H0 in statistical testing is probabilistic, dependent on pre-set significance thresholds and sample characteristics, and does not carry the same logical force as a genuine Popperian falsification. Moreover, statistical significance does not equal theoretical refutation: a rejected H0 increases evidential support for the alternative hypothesis but does not constitute a decisive epistemological verdict in Popper's sense. Researchers should therefore treat null hypothesis rejection as raising corroboration increasing the degree to which the theory has withstood testing rather than as definitive proof or unqualified falsification. The third implication is the requirement for critical skepticism that must not be compromised by the researcher's personal interests. Popper firmly rejected what he called *ad hoc* hypotheses the addition of supplementary explanations whose sole purpose is to "save" a theory from the threat of falsification. When field data produce results that differ from a theory's predictions, the good researcher must be willing to declare that their theory has failed and needs to be modified or even abandoned altogether, rather than adding new assumptions that render the theory unfalsifiable.

Strengths and Limitations of Falsification as a Research Paradigm

As an epistemological theory, falsification has a number of significant strengths. First, it provides a clear and operational mechanism for assessing the quality of a theory something that the verification principle cannot do conclusively. Second, it prevents dogmatism in science by ensuring that no theory is exempt from the possibility of being tested. Third, it drives scientific progress through the process of conjectures and refutations: every theory that is overturned opens the way for a better and more accurate theory to emerge. Nevertheless, falsification also has a number of limitations that must be acknowledged. Psychologically, the demand to always maintain a critical stance toward theories one has developed oneself can be a heavy burden, particularly for less experienced researchers. Not infrequently, researchers become overly hesitant to draw any conclusions at all, fearing that their theory will soon be falsified. In addition, several philosophers of science have offered important critiques that require serious engagement. Thomas Kuhn, in The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962), challenged the Popperian picture by showing that in practice scientists rarely abandon a paradigm merely because of isolated anomalies. Scientific communities typically hold onto their paradigm and treat anomalies as puzzles to be solved within the existing framework, abandoning it only when a superior alternative paradigm is available. This suggests that falsification, as Popper conceived it, describes a normative ideal rather than a sociological reality of scientific practice. Imre Lakatos, responding to both Popper and Kuhn, developed the concept of "scientific research programmes," which distinguishes between a "hard core" of non-negotiable theoretical commitments and a "protective belt" of auxiliary hypotheses that absorb empirical anomalies. This framework is more nuanced than Popper's simple falsification because it explains how research communities can rationally persist with a theoretical programme even in the face of counterevidence, provided the programme continues to generate novel predictions. These critiques do not negate the value of Popper's foundational insight; rather, they demonstrate that falsification represents an indispensable starting point whose full implications require the richer frameworks that followed.

Relevance of Falsification in the Context of Integrative Scholarship

In the context of integrative Islamic scholarship, falsification's contribution extends beyond a simple methodological tool; it provides a principled epistemological framework for navigating the complex boundary between empirical inquiry and theological commitment. One of the most persistent challenges in contemporary Islamic studies is the tendency to conflate two fundamentally different types of claims: those that are empirical and scientifically testable, and those that are doctrinal or theological and operate within a different epistemic domain. When researchers fail to maintain this distinction, the consequences are significant. On one hand, theological propositions may be inappropriately subjected to empirical falsification tests, producing a reductive scientism that undermines the integrity of religious discourse. On the other hand, empirical claims may be insulated from critical testing by wrapping them in theological authority, a move that compromises the scientific validity of research. Popper's falsification criterion provides a clear and workable principle for avoiding both errors: it does not declare theological claims meaningless or false, but it does insist that claims aspiring to scientific status must be formulated in a falsifiable manner. For Islamic scholars engaged in empirical research whether in education, social science, or applied fields this principle demands that their research hypotheses be specific, testable, and genuinely open to disconfirmation. In this sense, falsification, rather than being a threat to Islamic scholarship, functions as a safeguard for its intellectual credibility. Popper himself did not claim that non-falsifiable theories are useless or meaningless. Metaphysics and theology have their own legitimate domains. What must be safeguarded is intellectual honesty in determining within which domain a particular claim belongs. Thus, falsification need not be understood as a threat to Islamic scholarship,

but rather as a useful tool for maintaining methodological integrity in research that claims scientific status.

4. CONCLUSION

Karl Raimund Popper's theory of falsification represents an epistemological revolution that fundamentally transformed the way humanity understands the nature of science and its progress. Falsification emerged from Popper's sharp critique of the Vienna Circle's verification principle, offering a logically more robust alternative: a theory merits the title "scientific" not because it can be proven true, but because it has the courage to risk being proven false. It is this intellectual courage that constitutes the lifeblood of scientific progress. Through the principle of falsifiability, Popper also succeeded in providing a solution to the problem of demarcation that distinguishes science from pseudoscience and metaphysics. Astronomy is scientific; astrology is not. Quantum physics is scientific; Freudian psychoanalysis lies outside the boundaries of science. These boundaries are determined not by the value or practical utility of a discipline, but by whether or not it possesses a mechanism that would allow its theories to be logically overturned by empirical data. The methodological implications of falsification are very concrete: researchers are required to formulate specific and falsifiable hypotheses, to employ hypothetico-deductive logic, and to maintain intellectual honesty when field data indicate that their theory needs revision. While null hypothesis testing in quantitative research shares a structural parallel with Popperian logic, it is not its direct equivalent — a distinction that researchers must observe carefully. Moreover, as the Duhem-Quine thesis and Lakatos's research programme framework demonstrate, the application of falsification in practice is necessarily more nuanced than its logical formulation suggests. In the context of integrative Islamic scholarship, falsification provides an epistemological framework that helps maintain methodological integrity in research that claims scientific status, while leaving intact the legitimacy of theological claims that genuinely operate within a different epistemic domain. Ultimately, falsification imparts a lesson that transcends the boundaries of technical philosophy: the true strength of science does not lie in the certainty it offers, but in its courage to be continually questioned and revised. It is this that makes science alive and ceaselessly advancing through the dynamics of conjectures and refutations.

5. REFERENCES

Alneyadi, S., Abulibdeh, E., & Wardat, Y. (2023). The Impact of Digital Environment vs. Traditional Method on Literacy Skills; Reading and Writing of Emirati Fourth Graders. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *15*(4), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043418

Alsubaie, M. A. (2024). *education sciences Exploring the Effects of Teachers ' Practices in the Early Childhood Literacy Classroom Environment on Children ' s Acquisition of Literacy Skills*.

Atmasari, Y., Merdiana, A. R., & Mutia, F. (2024). the Role of Community Reading Parks (Tbm) in Literacy Improvment: a Literature Study. *Bibliotika : Jurnal Kajian Perpustakaan Dan Informasi*, *8*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.17977/um008v8i12024p1-15

Ayaz, N., Ghafar, A., Idris, M., & Ayaz, S. (2023). Improving Classroom Learning Environment for Enhancing Reading Comprehension through Metacognitive Strategies. *Russian Law Journal*, *11*(5), 498–507. https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v11i5.2652

Bruggink, M., Swart, N., Lee, A. van der, & Segers, E. (2022). *Putting PIRLS to Use in Classrooms Across The Globe*. https://link.springer.com/bookseries/16856

Çiğdemir, S., & Akyol, H. (2022). The Relationship Between Environmental Factors and Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *18*(3), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2022.439.11

Connor, C. M. D. (2016). The cognitive development of reading and reading comprehension. In *The Cognitive Development of Reading and Reading Comprehension*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315694429

Dimitropoulou, P., Filippatou, D., Gkoutzourela, S., Griva, A., Pachiti, I., & Michaelides, M. (2025). The Synergy of School Climate, Motivation, and Academic Emotions: A Predictive Model for Learning Strategies and Reading Comprehension. *Behavioral Sciences*, *15*(4), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15040503

Durroh, L., Raharjo, T. J., Harianingsih, H., Sumbali, B., & Widiarti, N. (2025). Classroom Environment and Metacognitive Strategies to Support Beginning Reading Skills: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education*, *4*(3), 485–496. https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v4i3.1360

Freund, L., Kopak, R., & O'Brien, H. (2016). The effects of textual environment on reading comprehension: Implications for searching as learning. *Journal of Information Science*, *42*(1), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551515614472

Giacovazzi, L., Moonsamy, S., & Mophosho, M. (2021). Promoting emergent literacy in under-served preschools using environmental print. *South African Journal of Communication Disorders*, *68*(1), a809. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajcd.v68i1.809

Goertzen, M. (2017). Applying Quantitative Methods. *Applying Quantitative Methods to E-Book Collections*, *53*, 3–7.

Khosa, M. (2025a). The Effects of a Print-Rich Literacy Environment on Developing Early Reading Skills in the Foundation Phase Classroom. *Reading Psychology*, *46*(4), 331–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2024.2447243

Khosa, M. (2025b). The Effects of a Print-Rich Literacy Environment on Developing Early Reading Skills in the Foundation Phase Classroom The Effects of a Print-Rich Literacy Environment on Developing Early Reading Skills in the Foundation Phase Classroom. *Reading Psychology*, *46*(4), 331–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2024.2447243

Little, C. W., Hart, S. A., Phillips, B. M., Schatschneider, C., & Taylor, J. E. (2019). Exploring neighborhood environmental influences on reading comprehension. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *62*(February), 173–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2019.02.009

Losh, S. C. (2017). Dependent and Independent Variables. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118430873.est0622

M, A., Asdam, M., & Asdar, A. (2024). Investigating Students' Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension Through Digital Literacy Environment. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *16*(3), 3370–3379. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v16i3.5510

Majdi, Z., Khalili Sabet, M., & Mahdavi-Zafarghandi, A. (2025). Exploring the effect of using active learning strategies on Iranian intermediate female EFL learners reading comprehension: a mixed methods study. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*(May). https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1539722

McLean, L., Sparapani, N., Toste, J. R., & Connor, C. M. D. (2016). Classroom quality as a predictor of first graders' time in non-instructional activities and literacy achievement. *Journal of School Psychology*, *56*, 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2016.03.004

Nguyen, V. L., & Dang, T. T. K. (2022). Engaging EFL Learners in Reading : A Text-Driven Approach to Improve Reading Performance. *Tesl-Ej*, *26*(2), 1–18.

Noori, A. (2025). Enhancing EFL Reading Instruction with Digital Tools: Effects on Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Engagement. *Journal of Social Sciences - Kabul University*, *7*(4), 289–313. https://doi.org/10.62810/jss.v7i4.264

Ortlieb, E., Sargent, S., & Moreland, M. (2014). Evaluating the Efficacy of Using a Digital Reading Environment to Improve Reading Comprehension within a Reading Clinic. *Reading Psychology*, *35*(5), 397–421. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2012.683236

Parra, L. A., & Hastings, P. D. (2018). Integrating the neurobiology of minority stress with an intersectionality framework for lgbtq-latinx populations. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *2018*(161), 31–49. https://doi.org/10.1002/cad

Rance, G., Dowell, R. C., & Tomlin, D. (2023). The effect of classroom environment on literacy development. *Npj Science of Learning*, *8*, 9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-023-00157-y

Rehman, A. (2019). *The Effect of Print Rich Environment on the Development of Students' Skills at Primary Level*. Government Elementary College of Education (W) Hyderabad. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3756374

Sacher, P. (2021). Role of school environment in developing Reading comprehension and Language creativity Among Adolescents. *Vidhyayana*, *6*(6), 1–8. www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org

Sarshogh, M., Rezvani, E., & Karimi, F. (2024). Effects of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) on EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension, Reading Motivation, and Metacognitive Awareness. *Innovare Journal of Education*, *12*(1), 34–40. https://doi.org/10.22159/ijoe.2024v12i1.50053

Suleiman, I. B., Okunade, O. A., Dada, E. G., & Ezeanya, U. C. (2024). Key factors influencing students' academic performance. *Journal of Electrical Systems and Information Technology*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43067-024-00166-w

Taylor, J., Erbeli, F., Hart, S. A., & Johnson, W. (2020). Early classroom reading gains moderate shared environmental influences on reading comprehension in adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *61*(6), 689–698. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13134

Tong, Y., & Singh, B. S. M. (2025). The Interaction between Learning Engagement and Academic Achievement in Second Language Acquisition: A Multivariate Analysis. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, *7*(7), 386–401. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i7.10142

van Rijk, Y., de Mey, L., de Haan, D., van Oers, B., & Volman, M. (2017). Reading for meaning: the effects of Developmental Education on motivation and achievement in reading informative texts in primary school. *Research Papers in Education*, *32*(3), 333–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1225789

Westerveld, M. F., Armstrong, R. M., & Barton, G. M. (2020). Reading Success in the Primary Years. In *Reading Success in the Primary Years*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-3492-8

Whatley, M. (2022). *Introduction to Quantitative Analysis for International Educators*. Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-93831-4

Woolley, G. (2011). *Reading Comprehension BT - Reading Comprehension: Assisting Children with Learning Difficulties* (pp. 15–34). Springer Science+Business Media B.V. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1174-7_2

Yang, Q., Zimmermann, K., Bartholomew, C. P., Purtell, K. M., & Ansari, A. (2024). Preschool Classroom Age Composition and Physical Literacy Environment: Influence on Children's Emergent Literacy Outcomes. *Early Education and Development*, *35*(7), 1483–1500. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2023.2247953