# At-Risk Students in Public Elementary Schools: An Exploration of Learning and Behavioral Challenges within a Response to Intervention (RTI) Framework in Central Jakarta

## Deden Mulyadi[1]

[1] Department of Inclusive Education, Politeknik Bentara Citra Bangsa,
Jl. Petojo Binatu II No.2, Jakarta Pusat, DKI Jakarta 10130, Indonesia.

Email: deden.mulyadi@bentaracampus.ac.id

***Abstract:***. *This study explores the characteristics and challenges of at-risk students who are beneficiaries of the Jakarta Smart Card (KJP) in two public primary schools in Central Jakarta, SDN Kebon Kosong 17 and SDN Petamburan 01, using a Response to Intervention (RTI) perspective. This study aimed to identify academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional difficulties among at-risk KJP recipient students, examine contributing factors, and analyze implications for context-based RTI implementation in Indonesian public primary schools. An exploratory qualitative design was employed. Data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with 18 teachers and school leaders, and document analysis involving students from Grades 1 to 6. Data analysis followed thematic procedures based on Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña's model. In SDN Kebon Kosong 17, behavioral problems dominated in both lower grades (52.5%) and upper grades (73.33%), while academic difficulties appeared more prominently in lower grades (12.5%) and decreased in upper grades (6.67%). Students with special educational needs were identified across grade levels (2.5% in Grades 1–3 and 6.67% in Grades 4–6). In SDN Petamburan 01, academic difficulties were more dominant in lower grades (45%), while behavioral problems increased in upper grades (62%). Students with special needs were also present at both levels (3% in lower grades and 4% in upper grades). Family factors, especially parental divorce and low parental involvement, emerged as the most dominant risk factors, followed by socio-economic pressure, uncontrolled digital media exposure, and weak school–parent communication. The study demonstrates that at-risk KJP recipient students experience multidimensional and developmentally shifting difficulties. Early academic and self-regulation problems tend to evolve into more complex behavioral issues if not addressed early. The findings support the need for a contextual, tiered RTI model tailored to the realities of Indonesian public primary schools serving low-income populations.*
***Keywords:*** *at-risk student, Response to Intervention, KJP Recepients.*

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini mengkaji karakteristik dan tantangan yang dihadapi siswa berisiko yang menjadi penerima Kartu Jakarta Pintar (KJP) di dua sekolah dasar negeri di Jakarta Pusat, yaitu SDN Kebon Kosong 17 dan SDN Petamburan 01, dengan menggunakan perspektif Response to Intervention (RTI). Penelitian ini bertujuan mengidentifikasi kesulitan akademik, perilaku, dan sosial-emosional pada siswa berisiko penerima KJP, menelaah faktor-faktor yang berkontribusi, serta menganalisis implikasi penerapan RTI berbasis konteks di sekolah dasar negeri Indonesia. Pendekatan kualitatif eksploratori digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Data dikumpulkan melalui observasi kelas, wawancara semi-terstruktur dengan 18 guru dan pimpinan sekolah, serta analisis dokumen yang melibatkan siswa dari kelas 1 hingga kelas 6. Analisis data mengikuti prosedur tematik berdasarkan model Miles, Huberman, dan Saldaña. Di SDN Kebon Kosong 17, masalah perilaku menjadi temuan paling dominan pada kelas rendah (52,5%) maupun kelas tinggi (73,33%), sementara kesulitan akademik lebih menonjol pada kelas rendah (12,5%) dan menurun pada kelas tinggi (6,67%). Siswa dengan kebutuhan pendidikan khusus ditemukan di semua tingkat kelas (2,5% pada kelas 1–3 dan 6,67% pada kelas 4–6). Di SDN Petamburan 01, kesulitan akademik lebih banyak ditemukan pada kelas rendah (45%), sedangkan masalah perilaku meningkat pada kelas tinggi (62%). Siswa berkebutuhan khusus juga ditemukan pada kedua jenjang (3% di kelas rendah dan 4% di kelas tinggi). Faktor keluarga, khususnya perceraian orang tua dan rendahnya keterlibatan orang tua, muncul sebagai faktor risiko paling dominan, diikuti tekanan sosial ekonomi, paparan media digital yang tidak terkontrol, serta lemahnya komunikasi sekolah–orang tua. Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa berisiko penerima KJP mengalami kesulitan yang bersifat multidimensional dan berubah seiring perkembangan. Masalah akademik dan regulasi diri pada tahap awal cenderung berkembang menjadi masalah perilaku yang lebih kompleks jika tidak ditangani sejak dini.

Temuan ini menguatkan perlunya model RTI bertingkat yang kontekstual dan disesuaikan dengan realitas sekolah dasar negeri yang melayani populasi berpenghasilan rendah di Indonesia.
**Kata kunci:** siswa berisiko, Response to Intervention, penerima KJP.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Primary education plays a crucial role in shaping children's academic, social, and emotional development. Beyond teaching basic literacy and numeracy, primary schools are responsible for supporting students' character formation, self-regulation, and social skills. Ideally, schools should be able to accommodate all learners, including those with learning difficulties, behavioral challenges, and socio-emotional risks.

However, many public primary schools in Indonesia still face challenges in identifying and supporting students who are at risk of learning and developmental difficulties, particularly those from low socioeconomic backgrounds. A significant group within this population is students who receive the Jakarta Smart Card Plus (KJP Plus). In Phase I of 2025, more than 707,000 students were recorded as KJP Plus recipients, including 338,971 at the primary school level, indicating a large number of children potentially at risk due to economic hardship and limited learning support at home.

At-risk children refer to those who are vulnerable to experiencing academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional difficulties due to environmental and personal risk factors (Mangunsong, 2009). Unlike students with formally identified special needs, at-risk students often exhibit less visible symptoms, although they face high risks of academic failure, low motivation, poor self-regulation, and behavioral challenges.

Previous studies have shown that low socioeconomic status is strongly associated with lower academic achievement, weaker self-regulation, and limited school readiness (Harris, 2023). Prolonged exposure to economic hardship may also affect early literacy and numeracy development, particularly during the early primary years (PubMed, 2020; Abdurrahman, 2008). Despite this, limited research has explored the multidimensional profiles of at-risk students among KJP recipients in Indonesian public primary schools, especially in relation to the Response to Intervention (RTI) framework.

RTI is an evidence-based, tiered support system that emphasizes early identification, differentiated interventions, and continuous progress monitoring (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). However, its implementation requires contextual understanding of school realities, teacher capacity, and student needs. Therefore, this study aims to explore the academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional challenges of at-risk KJP recipient students in public primary schools and analyze the implications for developing a context-based RTI model for Indonesian education settings.

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Research Design

This study employed an exploratory qualitative design to obtain an in-depth understanding of the academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional challenges of at-risk students from low socioeconomic backgrounds in public primary schools. This approach was chosen to capture naturally emerging patterns in real classroom contexts without relying on predetermined hypotheses (Creswell, 2014; Flick, 2018).

### 2.2. Research Site and Period

The study was conducted in two public primary schools in Central Jakarta: SDN Kebon Kosong 17 and SDN Petamburan 01. Both schools were selected after preliminary involvement in the YIPABK mobile psychological assessment program revealed that more than 90% of their students were recipients of the Jakarta Smart Card (KJP). Data collection was carried out between July and August 2025.

### 2.3. Participants

Participants were selected using purposive sampling, consisting of 18 teachers (Grades 1–6 and subject teachers), school principals and vice principals, and students observed during classroom activities. Key informants were classroom teachers and grade coordinators who had direct and continuous interaction with at-risk students. Inclusion criteria included teachers working with high

proportions of KJP recipients and those capable of providing rich descriptions of students' learning and behavioral conditions.

### *2.4. Data Collection*

Data were collected through naturalistic classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Each class was observed once for approximately four hours, with the researcher positioned at the back of the classroom to minimize disruption. Observations focused on students' literacy and numeracy skills, attention, behavior, social interactions, and instructional strategies.

Interviews were conducted with teachers, selected students, and school leaders, lasting 15–30 minutes each, and focused on academic difficulties, behavioral challenges, and home-related factors. Relevant documents such as KJP recipient lists, teacher notes, and school records were also collected.

### *2.5. Research Instruments*

The main research instrument was the researcher (human instrument). Supporting instruments included unstructured observation guidelines, semi-structured interview prompts, field notes, audio recordings, and official school documents, all aligned with the RTI framework and indicators of learning difficulties.

### *2.6. Data Analysis*

Data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data analysis was conducted concurrently with data collection to capture emerging themes.

### *2.7. Trustworthiness*

Trustworthiness was ensured through source triangulation (observations, interviews, and documents) and member checking to enhance credibility. An audit trail supported dependability, while reflective notes ensured confirmability. Rich contextual descriptions were provided to support transferability.

## 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### *3.1. Result*

This study explores the characteristics and problems of *at-risk* students who are beneficiaries of the Jakarta Smart Card (KJP) in two public primary schools, namely SDN Kebon Kosong 17 and SDN Petamburan 01, using classroom observations and teacher interviews.

### *3.1.1. SDN Kebon Kosong 17*
### a. Observation Results

**Table 1.** Observation Result Grade 1-6 Kebon Kosong

| Obsevation Grade 1-3 | | | | Observation Grade 4-6 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Files | References | Presentase | Name | Files | References | Presentase |
| **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 1 | **2,5%** | **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 2 | **6,67%** |
| **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 21 | **52,5%** | **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 22 | **73,33%** |
| verbally aggressive | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | verbally aggressive | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| speaking inappropriately | 1 | 4 | 10% | speaking inappropriately | 1 | 2 | 6,67% |
| sexually suggestive behavior | 1 | 3 | 7,5% | sexually suggestive behavior | 1 | 2 | 6,67% |
| not obeying the rules | 1 | 5 | 12,5% | not obeying the rules | 1 | 12 | 40% |
| impolite | 1 | 2 | 5,0% | impolite | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| imitating social media performance | 1 | 2 | 5,0% | imitating social media performance | 1 | 2 | 6,67% |
| difficulty managing emotion | 1 | 4 | 10% | difficulty managing emotion | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| physically aggressive | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | frequently absent from school | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| not ready for toilet training | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | | | | |
| disorganized lifestyle | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | | | | |
| **Academic Problems** | 1 | 5 | **12,5%** | **Academic Problems** | 1 | 2 | **6,67%** |
| inattention | 1 | 4 | 10% | inattention | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| difficult to understand study | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | difficulty to understand study | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| reading difficulties | 1 | 4 | 10% | | | | |
| lack of independence in learning | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | | | | |
| **Positive Behavior** | 1 | 4 | **10%** | **Positive Behavior** | 1 | 3 | **10%** |
| social skill | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | indepencence in learning | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| respect to elders | 1 | 2 | 5% | focus to the tasks | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| happy to help | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | active in class | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |
| reporting to the teacher | 1 | 1 | 2,5% | reporting to the teacher | 1 | 1 | 3,33% |

A shift in problem patterns was identified between lower grades (Grades 1–3) and upper grades (Grades 4–6). In the lower grades, behavioral problems dominated (52.5%), accompanied by basic academic difficulties such as reading and attention problems (12.5%), which were related to immature self-regulation. In the upper grades, behavioral problems increased significantly (73.33%), particularly rule violations (40%), while academic problems decreased (6.67%) and tended to be less visible.Students with special educational needs (SEN) were found across all grade levels (Grades 1–3: 2.5%; Grades 4–6: 6.67%).

## b. Interview Results

**Table 2.** Interview Result Grade 1-6 Kebon Kosong

| Interview Grade 1-3 | | | | Interview Grade 4-6 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Files | References | Percentage | Name | Files | References | Percentage |
| **Teacher-Parent Relationship** | 1 | 3 | **4%** | **Teacher-Parent Relationship** | 1 | 6 | **11%** |
| teamwork teacher and parent | 1 | 2 | 3% | teamwork teacher and parent | 1 | 4 | 7% |
| whatsapp group | 1 | 1 | 1% | homevisit | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| | | | | communication with parents | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| **Teacher Strategy** | 1 | 15 | **20%** | **Teacher Strategy** | 1 | 9 | **17%** |
| behavior strategy | 1 | 6 | 8% | strategy for student with special education needs | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| Academic Strategy | 1 | 9 | 12% | problem mapping | 1 | 5 | 9% |
| **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 4 | **5%** | **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 3 | **6%** |
| **Student health problems** | 1 | 1 | **1%** | **Student health problems** | 1 | 2 | **4%** |
| Physical Health | 1 | 1 | 1% | Mental health issues due to parental divorce | 1 | 2 | 4% |
| **Factors Influencing Student Problems** | 1 | 10 | **13%** | **Factors Influencing Student Problems** | 1 | 16 | **30%** |
| Poor parental involvement | 1 | 6 | 8% | Poor parental involvement | 1 | 4 | 7% |
| parents speaking rudely | 1 | 2 | 3% | parents' divorce | 1 | 3 | 6% |
| parent denial of child's condition | 1 | 1 | 1% | parents concentrating on financial pursuits | 1 | 3 | 6% |
| family background | 1 | 1 | 1% | lack of parental tutoring | 1 | 2 | 4% |
| | | | | gadget | 1 | 2 | 4% |
| | | | | education is not a priority for parents | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| | | | | disorganized lifestyle | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 13 | **17%** | **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 9 | **17%** |
| speaking inappropriately | 1 | 2 | 3% | speaking inappropriately | 1 | 3 | 6% |
| physically aggressive | 1 | 1 | 1% | physically aggressive | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| not obeying the rules | 1 | 1 | 1% | not obeying the rules | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| Student lying | 1 | 1 | 1% | verbally aggressive | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| passive student | 1 | 1 | 1% | frequently absent from school | 1 | 3 | 6% |
| not ready for toilet training | 1 | 1 | 1% | | | | |
| not independent | 1 | 3 | 4% | | | | |
| frequent crying | 1 | 2 | 3% | | | | |
| difficulty managing emotion | 1 | 1 | 1% | | | | |
| **Academic Problems** | 1 | 21 | **28%** | **Academic Problems** | 1 | 11 | **20%** |
| inattention | 1 | 4 | 5% | inattention | 1 | 6 | 11% |
| difficult to understand study | 1 | 1 | 1% | difficult to understand study | 1 | 2 | 4% |
| Struggles with pencil grip | 1 | 1 | 1% | hasn't memorized multiplication facts | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| reading difficulties | 1 | 9 | 12% | disfluent reading | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| gap in students | 1 | 4 | 5% | difficulty understanding long texts | 1 | 1 | 2% |
| counting difficulties | 1 | 2 | 3% | | | | |
| **Academic** | 1 | 1 | **1%** | **Positive Behavior** | 1 | 1 | **2%** |
| Counting ability | 1 | 1 | 1% | independent in learning | 1 | 1 | 2% |

e

Teachers perceived that in the lower grades, academic problems were more dominant (28%), particularly reading difficulties, inattention, fine motor difficulties, and emotional regulation problems. In the upper grades, the focus shifted toward external factors (30%) such as parental divorce, lack of learning support at home, excessive gadget use, and unfavorable family conditions, accompanied by behavioral problems (17%). Students with special educational needs were identified at both levels, although in small proportions.

## c. Comparison of Observation and Interview Findings

Classroom observations revealed the dominance of behavioral problems, especially in upper grades, whereas interviews highlighted deeper underlying causes, particularly family-related and social contextual factors. Both data sources consistently indicated the presence of students with special educational needs across all grade levels, as well as a shift from predominantly academic problems to behavioral problems as students progressed through grade levels.

### 3.1.2 SDN Petamburan 01
### a. Observation Results

**Table 3.** Observation Result Grade 1-6 Petamburan

| Obsevation Grade 1-3 | | | | Obsevation Grade 4-6 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Files | References | Percentage | Name | Files | References | Percentage |
| **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 1 | **3%** | **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 1 | **4%** |
| **Positive Behavior** | 1 | 7 | **18%** | **Positive Behavior** | 1 | 6 | **23%** |
| active in class | 1 | 6 | 16% | active in class | 1 | 3 | 12% |
| reporting to the teacher | 1 | 1 | 3% | Independent learner | 1 | 1 | 4% |
| | | | | confidence | 1 | 2 | 8% |
| **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 13 | **34%** | **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 16 | **62%** |
| speaking inappropriately | 1 | 2 | 5% | speaking inappropriately | 1 | 4 | 15% |
| not obeying the rules | 1 | 3 | 8% | not obeying the rules | 1 | 6 | 23% |
| not confident | 1 | 1 | 3% | not confident | 1 | 1 | 4% |
| impolite | 1 | 2 | 5% | impolite | 1 | 2 | 8% |
| imitating social media performance | 1 | 3 | 8% | verbally aggressive | 1 | 2 | 8% |
| difficulty managing emotion | 1 | 1 | 3% | physically aggressive | 1 | 1 | 4% |
| over-talkative | 1 | 1 | 3% | | | | |
| **Academic Problems** | 1 | 17 | **45%** | **Academic Problems** | 1 | 3 | **12%** |
| inattention | 1 | 5 | 13% | inattention | 1 | 3 | 12% |
| reading difficulties | 1 | 4 | 11% | | | | |
| inattention | 1 | 5 | 13% | | | | |
| not enthusiastic about learning | 1 | 2 | 5% | | | | |
| no study schedule at home | 1 | 1 | 3% | | | | |

In the lower grades, academic problems were dominant (45%), particularly reading difficulties, lack of attention, and low learning support at home, accompanied by behavioral problems (34%). In the upper grades, dominance shifted to behavioral problems (62%), such as rule violations, verbal and physical aggression, and impulsivity. Students with special educational needs were also found at both levels (Grades 1–3: 3%; Grades 4–6: 4%), along with some positive behaviors, such as increased independence among certain upper-grade students.

### b. Interview Results

**Table 4.** Interview Result Grade 1-6 Petamburan

| Interview Grade 1-3 | | | | Interview Grade 4-6 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Files | References | Percentage | Name | Files | References | Percentage |
| **Teacher-Parent Relationship** | 1 | 4 | **8%** | **Teacher-Parent Relationship** | 1 | 4 | **11%** |
| communication with parents | 1 | 4 | 8% | communication with parents | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| | | | | cooperative parents | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| **Teacher Strategy** | 1 | 10 | **19%** | **Teacher Strategy** | 1 | 16 | **44%** |
| ice breaking | 1 | 2 | 4% | ice breaking | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| teach student can't read | 1 | 3 | 6% | strategy for student with special education needs | 1 | 4 | 11% |
| reinforcement prositive behavior | 1 | 1 | 2% | positive punishment | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| punishment for negative behavior | 1 | 1 | 2% | peer tutoring | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| creating class agreements | 1 | 1 | 2% | memorizing together | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| building positive habits | 1 | 1 | 2% | grouping based on skill level | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| additional learning | 1 | 1 | 2% | communication with passive students | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| | | | | attractive teaching | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 1 | **2%** | **Student with Special Education Needs** | 1 | 3 | **8%** |
| **Student health problems** | 1 | 20 | **38%** | | | | |
| Mental health issues due to parental divorce | 1 | 2 | 4% | | | | |
| **Factors Influencing Student Problems** | 1 | 9 | **17%** | **Factors Influencing Student Problems** | 1 | 6 | **17%** |
| parents' divorce | 1 | 2 | 4% | parents' divorce | 1 | 3 | 8% |
| bad environment | 1 | 1 | 2% | bad environment | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| Poor parental involvement | 1 | 1 | 2% | not supported parents | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| parents concentrating on financial pursuits | 1 | 1 | 2% | | | | |
| low economy level | 1 | 1 | 2% | | | | |
| lack of parental tutoring | 1 | 3 | 6% | | | | |
| **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 13 | **25%** | **Behavioral Problems** | 1 | 12 | **33%** |
| not confident | 1 | 3 | 6% | not confident | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| shows little responsibility | 1 | 1 | 2% | verbally aggressive | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| seeking attention | 1 | 2 | 4% | temprament students | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| to the teacher | 1 | 1 | 2% | speaking inappropriately | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| to a friends | 1 | 1 | 2% | quiet student | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| not confident | 1 | 3 | 6% | not confident | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| frequently absent from school | 1 | 2 | 4% | hyperactive | 1 | 1 | 3% |
| **Academic Problems** | 1 | 13 | **25%** | **Academic Problems** | 1 | 2 | **6%** |
| difficult to understand study | 1 | 1 | 2% | difficult to understand study | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| struggles with pencil grip | 1 | 2 | 4% | | | | |
| reading difficulties | 1 | 6 | 12% | | | | |
| No regular study schedule | 1 | 1 | 2% | | | | |
| lacks basic skills for elementary school | 1 | 1 | 2% | | | | |
| inattention | 1 | 1 | 2% | | | | |
| difficult to understand study | 1 | 1 | 2% | | | | |

Lower-grade teachers emphasized academic and behavioral problems in relatively balanced proportions (25% each), as well as students' physical and mental health factors (38%), including the impact of parental divorce. In the upper grades, the primary focus shifted to teacher strategies (44%) and behavioral problems (33%), such as aggression, hyperactivity, and chronic absenteeism.

### c. Comparison of Observation and Interview Findings

Observations indicated the dominance of academic problems in lower grades and behavioral problems in upper grades, which was reinforced by interview findings. Interviews further added important dimensions related to students' mental health conditions, family dynamics, and teachers' pedagogical responses, which were not always visible during direct classroom observations.

## 3.2. Discussion

### 3.2.1. Characteristics of At-Risk Students' Difficulties

The findings indicate that students' difficulties are multidimensional, encompassing academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional aspects. In lower grades, difficulties are dominated by basic academic problems and immature self-regulation. This is consistent with Diamond (2016) and Blair & Raver (2015), who argue that in early primary school years, executive functions (inhibitory control, working memory, and cognitive flexibility) are still developing and are highly influenced by exposure to environmental stress. Deficits in these functions are closely associated with attentional difficulties, early literacy problems, and maladaptive classroom behaviors.

In upper grades, problems shift toward more complex behavioral issues, such as rule violations and verbal aggression. This shift can be explained by Eisenberg et al. (2019) and Veenstra et al. (2021), who showed that failure to address self-regulation difficulties at early stages increases the risk of externalizing problems in later developmental phases, particularly when academic and social demands become more complex.

### 3.2.2. Factors Influencing Students' Difficulties

Students' difficulties are influenced by the interaction of individual and environmental factors, which can be explained through the ecological systems theory as further developed in contemporary educational contexts (Tudge et al., 2016; Neal & Neal, 2015) and the contemporary family stress model (Conger & Donnellan, 2017).

**a. Family factors**

Parental divorce, low parental involvement, and unsupportive parenting styles are associated with increased risks of children's emotional and behavioral problems. Longitudinal studies indicate that family disruption is linked to poorer emotional regulation, reduced school engagement, and lower academic achievement (Amato, 2015; Lansford, 2018).

**b. Socio-economic factors**

Economic pressure and chronic poverty contribute to increased stress levels and underdevelopment of executive functions. Neurocognitive and educational studies show that prolonged poverty is associated with attention deficits, impulsivity, and low academic achievement (Hair et al., 2015; Ursache & Noble, 2016; Cuartas et al., 2022).

**c. Digital and social environmental factors**

Unsupervised exposure to digital content is linked to increased aggressive behavior, reduced empathy, and impaired self-regulation. Contemporary studies indicate that intensive digital media exposure influences emotional control and social behavior in school-aged children (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2019; Twenge et al., 2021).

**d. School–parent relationships**

Reactive and unstructured communication between schools and parents weakens the effectiveness of academic and behavioral interventions. Recent studies have shown that strong and collaborative home–

school partnerships are significantly associated with improved self-regulation and student engagement (Garbacz et al., 2019; Wilder, 2018).

### 3.2.3. Implications for RTI

The findings confirm that the implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI) should be context-specific for each school.

**a. RTI Mapping at SDN Kebon Kosong 17**

**Tier 1 (Universal Support)**
1. Inattention during learning
2. Basic reading difficulties in lower grades
3. Inappropriate verbal behavior
4. Minor rule violations
5. Immature emotional regulation

**Tier 2 (Targeted Group Support)**
1. Significant academic achievement gaps
2. Recurrent learning difficulties
3. Difficulties in emotional regulation
4. Imitative behaviors influenced by social media
5. Low learning independence

**Tier 3 (Intensive Individual Support)**
1. Students with special educational needs
2. Students with recurrent stealing behavior
3. Students affected by parental divorce with emotional disturbances and high absenteeism
4. Students with severe aggressive behaviors

**b. RTI Mapping at SDN Petamburan 01**

**Tier 1 (Universal Support)**
1. Inattention in learning
2. Early reading difficulties
3. Low learning motivation
4. Minor rule violations
5. Low self-confidence

**Tier 2 (Targeted Group Support)**
1. Severe academic achievement gaps
2. Advanced reading difficulties
3. Mild verbal aggression
4. Passive students with low classroom participation

**Tier 3 (Intensive Individual Support)**
1. Students with mental health problems due to parental divorce
2. Students with chronic absenteeism
3. Students with severe aggressive behavior
4. Students with special educational needs

### 4. CONCLUSION

This study shows that *at-risk* students who receive KJP experience interconnected academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional difficulties that develop across grade levels. Lower grades are dominated by academic problems and self-regulation difficulties, whereas upper grades are dominated by more complex behavioral problems.

Family factors emerge as the most prominent risk factor, followed by socio-economic conditions, the digital environment, and school–parent relationships.

Although this study does not provide individual student placement within each RTI tier, it offers a conceptual foundation for the development of context-based RTI implementation in Indonesian public primary schools.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1. For Schools

Schools should develop early screening systems for *at-risk* students covering academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional aspects, and implement context-sensitive RTI frameworks.

### 5.2. For Teachers

Teachers need professional training in differentiated instruction, positive behavior management, and RTI-based interventions.

### 5.3. For Parents

Parental involvement should be strengthened through parenting education programs and consistent school–home communication.

### 5.4. For Government and Education Authorities

Education authorities should support RTI implementation through teacher professional development, provision of specialized personnel, and the development of national screening instruments for *at-risk* students.

### 5.5. For Future Researchers

Future studies should conduct longitudinal research and develop validated RTI-based screening instruments suitable for the Indonesian educational context.

## REFERENCES

Amato, P. R. (2015). The consequences of divorce for adults and children: An update. *Drustvena Istrazivanja*, 23(1), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.5559/di.23.1.01

Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2015). School readiness and self-regulation: A developmental psychobiological approach. *Annual Review of Psychology, 66*, 711–731. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015221

Bappeda DKI Jakarta. (2023). *Laporan pelaksanaan Kartu Jakarta Pintar (KJP) Plus tahun 2023*. Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah DKI Jakarta.

Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. A. (2013). *Response to intervention implementation in elementary and secondary schools: Procedures and challenges*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203133903

Conger, R. D., & Donnellan, M. B. (2017). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 68*, 273–299. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033537

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cuartas, J., Weissman, D. G., Sheridan, M., Lengua, L., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2022). Poverty and children's executive functions: Developmental pathways. *Developmental Cognitive*

*Neuroscience, 54*, 101071. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2022.101071

Diamond, A. (2016). Why improving and assessing executive functions early in life is critical. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, 18*, 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2015.12.001

Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Eggum-Wilkens, N. D. (2019). Emotion-related self-regulation and its relation to children's maladjustment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 16*, 495–525. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-071018-025607

Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006). Introduction to response to intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(1), 93–99. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.1.4

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Compton, D. L., Bryant, J., Hamlett, C., & Seethaler, P. (2012). First-grade cognitive abilities and responsiveness to intervention. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(2), 394–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027408

Garbacz, S. A., Herman, K. C., Thompson, A. M., & Reinke, W. M. (2019). Family engagement in education. *School Psychology Review, 48*(4), 316–332. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2019-0038.V48-4

Greenwood, C. R., Bradfield, T., Kaminski, R. A., Linas, M., Carta, J. J., & Nylander, D. (2011). The Response to Intervention (RTI) approach in early childhood. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 43*(9), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.17161/fec.v43i9.6912

Hair, N. L., Hanson, J. L., Wolfe, B. L., & Pollak, S. D. (2015). Association of child poverty, brain development, and academic achievement. *JAMA Pediatrics, 169*(9), 822–829. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1475

Kristiani, R., Lunanta, L. P., Sondakh, R. R., Kiswanto, G. S., & Vanya, E. (2022). Rights-based approach to improving capacity of Companion of Children at Risk. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Ilmu Keguruan dan Pendidikan, 5*(2), 63–73.

Lansford, J. E. (2018). Parental divorce and children's adjustment. *Future of Children, 28*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2018.0001

Mangunsong, F. (2009). *Psikologi perkembangan anak dan remaja*. Refika Aditama.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Przybylski, A. K., & Weinstein, N. (2019). Digital screen time and mental health: Evidence from large-scale data. *Psychological Science, 30*(7), 1021–1036. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619830329

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Defining and describing schoolwide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Behavior Support* (pp. 307–326). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09632-2_13

Susilo, A. (2019). Analisis kebutuhan peserta didik penerima KJP dalam konteks sekolah inklusif. *Jurnal Pendidikan Inklusi, 5*(2), 113–127.

Tudge, J. R. H., Mokrova, I., Hatfield, B. E., & Karnik, R. B. (2016). Uses and misuses of Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 8*(4), 427–445. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12165

Twenge, J. M., Martin, G. N., & Campbell, W. K. (2021). Decreases in psychological well-being among adolescents after 2012. *Emotion, 18*(6), 765–780. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000403

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Munniksma, A., & Dijkstra, J. K. (2021). The complex relationships

between antisocial behavior and social status. *Developmental Psychology, 57*(10), 1660–1675. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001230

Wilder, S. (2018). Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement. *Educational Review, 70*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2017.1305079