Improving Elementary Students' Reading Comprehension through Guided Reading in TaRL Instruction

Yuyun Dwi Suryandari[1*], Nunung Suryati[2], Ahmad Heki Sujiatmoko[3]
[1-3]Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author's e-mail : *yuyun.dwi.2402218@students.um.ac.id*

ARMADA
JURNAL PENELITIAN MULTIDISIPLIN

e-ISSN: 2964-2981

ARMADA : Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin

https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/armada

Vol. 04, No. 07 Juli, 2026

Page: 2690-2699

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.55681/armada.v4i7.2992

Article History:

Received: Mei 20, 2026

Revised: Juni 09, 2026

Accepted: Juli 17, 2026

Abstract : The objective of the research was to improve elementary school students' reading comprehension skills through the implementation of the Guided Reading strategy in TaRL instructional framework. Adopting a Classroom Action Research (CAR) design, executed through a singular cycle, of four teaching sessions incorporating all eight sequential stages of the Guided Reading approach. Participants were stratified into Group A and Group B according to baseline reading proficiency levels. Quantitative data were subjected to analysis via descriptive statistics and one-sample t-test, utilizing the Minimum Mastery Criterion (KKM) set at 85. The findings of the study reveal a notable enhancement in reading comprehension skills among both groups. In Group A, students met the Minimum Mastery Criterion increased from 0/12 in the initial test to 12/12 in Cycle I, and Group B, from 3/15. These outcomes indicate that the application of the Guided Reading methodology within the TaRL framework significantly contributes to the improvement of reading comprehension skills among students with initially stronger abilities.

Keywords : Guided Reading, TaRL, Reading Comprehension, CAR

Abstrak : *Tujuan penelitian ini adalah meningkatkan keterampilan pemahaman membaca siswa sekolah dasar melalui penerapan strategi Guided Reading dalam kerangka pembelajaran TaRL. Penelitian menggunakan desain Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (PTK) yang dilaksanakan dalam satu siklus, terdiri atas empat sesi pembelajaran dengan menerapkan seluruh delapan tahapan berurutan pendekatan Guided Reading. Peserta dibagi menjadi Kelompok A dan Kelompok B berdasarkan tingkat kemahiran membaca awal untuk mendukung penyusunan pembelajaran yang sesuai dengan kebutuhan dan kemampuan awal setiap peserta didik. Data kuantitatif dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif dan uji t satu sampel, dengan Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM) sebesar 85. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya peningkatan yang nyata dalam keterampilan pemahaman membaca pada kedua kelompok. Pada Kelompok A, jumlah siswa yang mencapai Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal meningkat dari 0/12 pada tes awal menjadi 12/12 pada Siklus I, sedangkan pada Kelompok B meningkat dari 3/15. Hasil tersebut menunjukkan bahwa penerapan metode Guided Reading dalam kerangka TaRL secara signifikan berkontribusi terhadap peningkatan keterampilan pemahaman membaca siswa yang pada awalnya memiliki kemampuan lebih kuat.*

Kata Kunci : *Guided Reading, TaRL, Pemahaman Membaca, PTK*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is an essential skill in English language teaching and learning because it facilitates language comprehension and supports vocabulary development. In the case of English as a foreign language (EFL) learning for children, building sound reading capabilities is crucial not only for cognitive growth but also for social and emotional growth because it exposes students to new vocabulary and some of the uses of the language. Hermanudin (2019) finds reading comprehension as the process of reconstructing the reader's knowledge, which leads the reader to interpret and analyze each part of the text in a critical manner so as to gain an understanding of the real reading material. Empirical studies, especially in L1 contexts but increasingly in EFL settings as well report that Guided Reading has the potential to support improvements in fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and comprehension, especially when teachers systematically record student progress and use those records to adjust grouping and lesson focus. The approach is also compatible with sociocultural theory, because comprehension is co-constructed through interaction between teacher and learners within each learner's zone of proximal development.

However, the majority of students who study in a regular classroom usually experience reading comprehension challenges due to difficulty in learning vocabulary as well as lack of reading habit (Rawian, 2021; Meilani et al., 2020). Students also find it difficult to comprehend the main idea of the text as well as its meaning. In addition, it should be noted that students do not exhibit any level of participation and confidence in reading activities. Thus, appropriate instructional strategies should be employed in order to facilitate students' reading comprehension.

Guided Reading is one of such instructional strategies, which has been extensively used in order to overcome the problem in question. Guided Reading refers to the strategy whereby teachers work with a small group of students at a time depending on their reading level. Moreover, Guided Reading motivates students to participate in reading activities and discussions, and this can boost up students' confidence and reading skills. Differentiated instruction can be conducted among students of different reading proficiency levels by means of Guided Reading strategy as well as fluency and comprehension will be developed due to explicit vocabulary teaching and interactive reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017). Research by Hudson and Walker (2017) indicates that Guided Reading instruction becomes effective through systematic record-keeping of the learning process, clear goal selection, and development of teaching points, all of which contribute to its efficacy in the classroom. Sya'ban (2023) states that Guided Reading facilitates the learner in understanding content of the text based on their needs, a sign of its learner-centered practice. Guided reading, according to Fadly (2022), is about how to guide the students towards better comprehension in reading text. Furthermore, Sitepu et al. (2023) state that Guided Reading improves reading comprehension by helping students interpret text meaning and practice reading fluency.

The Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) approach which was developed by the Pratham organization in India is a differentiated instruction approach based on the concept of matching teaching to the level of learners (Pratham, 2014). It includes constant testing to group students depending on their abilities and provides specialized instruction to teach learners critical foundation skills such as reading comprehension. The previous research studies proved the efficiency of TaRL approach in improving literacy achievement among diverse learners in under-resourced and multilingual settings (J-PAL, 2022, Rahmawati et al. 2024). In addition, TaRL approach is a good complement for Guided Reading since learners will get instruction according to their level of learning.

According to the previous studies, Guided Reading improves students' reading comprehension. Hudson and Walker (2017) focused on the role of systematic instructional planning in Guided Reading implementation. Sya'ban (2023) identified that Guided Reading promotes learner-centered reading instruction, and Sitepu et al. (2023) found that this approach improves students' comprehension. Furthermore, TaRL approach studies revealed that learners' ability grouping increases the efficiency of instruction (Pratham, 2014). Still, there are some research gaps in the current literature. Many studies discuss Guided Reading as a strategy for

improving comprehension without specifically examining its implementation in TaRL approach. In addition, although a great amount of literature supports the implementation of guided reading in an L1 educational setting, limited studies investigate such implementation in EFL environments of primary education, particularly in the Indonesian context. Therefore, this study attempts to address these gaps by investigating the implementation of Guided Reading in TaRL approach through Classroom Action Research in a grade 2 Indonesian EFL classroom.

This study investigated reading understanding as the capacity of students to grasp the comprehension of written material. This includes identifying the main idea, locating particular details, understanding the meaning of words in context, understanding the content of the text, and drawing conclusions. These components are the basic reading comprehension skills expected of primary students. The study also examined how Guided Reading in TaRL supports students' active participation, confidence during reading activities. The study was directed by the following two research questions: How does Guided Reading in Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) approach improve second-grade EFL students' reading comprehension?

METHOD

This study employed a Classroom Action Research (CAR) design based on the Kemmis and McTaggart model, comprising the stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection. The research was conducted at Sabilillah Elementary School, Malang, during the 2025/2026 academic year over a two-week period. It consisted of one cycle involving four 60-minute teaching sessions. The participants were 27 Year 2 pupils from Class IIA, who were grouped according to their reading proficiency through a diagnostic assessment based on the Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) framework. Group A comprised 12 pupils at the word/paragraph reading level, whilst Group B consisted of 15 pupils at the story reading level. The intervention implemented the Guided Reading strategy through text introduction, guided reading, discussion of the text, vocabulary development, comprehension checks, and lesson reflection. The level of questioning, instructional support, and scaffolding was adapted to the reading abilities of each group. Data were collected through reading comprehension tests, pupil response questionnaires, observation sheets, running records, teacher journals, and anecdotal notes. The reading comprehension tests assessed pupils' ability to identify main ideas, understand vocabulary, locate explicit information, sequence events, make inferences, and interpret texts. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and a one-sample t-test in SPSS version 27.0 to compare pupils' achievement with the Minimum Mastery Criterion of 85. Questionnaire data were analysed using frequencies and percentages, whilst data obtained from classroom observations, running records, and anecdotal notes were analysed narratively to describe the implementation of the instructional strategy, pupils' participation, reading accuracy and fluency, word recognition, and self-correction skills.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The improvement in students' reading comprehension was measured by examining the percentage of students who achieved the expected reading comprehension level across the reading comprehension initial test, final test, and Cycle I test. The findings derived from these assessments indicated a significant improvement in students' reading comprehension performance.

Reading Comprehension Initial test

The students' score distribution in reading comprehension of Group A and B can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. The Students' Score Distribution Of Initial Test In Reading Comprehension

Score Interval	Category	Number		Percentage	
		Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
95 – 100	Excellent	0	0	0%	0%
90 – 94,99	Very Good	0	3	0%	20%
85 – 89,99	Good	0	0	0%	0%

< = 84,99	Fair	12	12	100%	80%

Based on the results presented in Table 3.1., the performance of the students in Group A was reasonable. A total of 12 students (100%) scored lower than 85. None of the students scored higher than the passing grade of 85 in the initial test on reading comprehension. Conversely, in group B, 12 (80%) students scored lower than the passing grade of 85. None of the students scored in the good category. The remaining 3 (20%) students scored higher than the passing grade, with very good category.

Table 2. Test Value = 85

	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			One-Sided p	Two-Sided p		Lower	Upper
Initial Test A	-6.304	11	<,001	<,001	-28.333	-38.23	-18.44
Initial Test B	-4.065	14	<,001	.001	-13.667	-20.88	-6.46

As it follows from Table 3.2, the output of the one-sample t-test performed for Group A proves that there were significant differences between the mean score of the students in the initial test and the test value of 85. In the course of the statistics, the t=-6.304, where df = 11 and the significance levels (both one-sided and two-sided) of p<.001 have been found. It appears that the mean difference between the scores of the students and the test value equals -28.333; consequently, the average score of the students is lower than the minimum mastery criterion (KKM = 85) by 28.333. The 95% confidence interval for the difference equals from -38.23 to -18.44; thus, the zero value is not included into the interval. Therefore, the results prove statistically that the initial test scores of the group under investigation differ significantly from the required value.

Group B also shows that the mean score of the initial test significantly differed from the test value of 85. In the output of the one-sample t-test, the t-value is equal to -4.065 where df=14 and the significance levels are p<.001 (one-tailed) and p=.001 (two-tailed). The mean difference is -13.667, which means that the average score of the students was 13.667 points less than the KKM. The 95% confidence interval of -20.88 to -6.46 also does not pass through zero. These results state that the initial test scores for Group B are below the KKM, but the difference between the students' average score and the test value is relatively small compared to Group A's.

Reading Comprehension Final test

The reading comprehension final test was done after implementing Guided Reading in order to measure the students' reading comprehension. Based on the score distribution and results of the one-sample t-test (see Table 3.3 and 3.4) using the Minimum Mastery Criterion (KKM) = 85 as the reference value, a difference was found between Group A and Group B.

Table 3. The students' score distribution of final test in reading comprehension

Score Interval	Category	Number		Percentage	
		Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
95 – 100	Excellent	0	4	0%	27%
90 – 94,99	Very Good	0	3	0%	20%
85 – 89,99	Good	0	0	0%	0%
< = 84,99	Fair	12	8	100%	53%

Table 4. Test Value = 85

	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			One-Sided p	Two-Sided p		Lower	Upper
Final Test A	-7.000	11	<,001	<,001	-17.500	-23.00	-12.00
Final Test B	-.276	14	.393	.787	-1.000	-8.78	6.78

Table 4. shows the results of final test scores of students in Group A show that all twelve students (100%) are in the "Fair" category (≤84.99). There are no students categorized under Good (85-89.99), Very Good (90-94.99), and Excellent (95-100). This indicates that all students were unable to achieve the Minimum Mastery Criterion (KKM=85). Moreover, the result of one sample t-test displayed in Table 3.4 indicates that the t value is equal to -7.000 with df=11 and significance level of p<.001 (one-tailed and two-tailed). It means that the mean difference is -17.500 and therefore the score of the students is 17.500 lower than the KKM. The 95% confidence interval for the difference is between -23.00 and -12.00 and does not include zero. In other words, the difference between the mean of the score of students and test value is constant.

Final test scores in Group B are varied more widely. There are 4 (27%) students who have been rated as Excellent (95-100) and 3 (20%) as Very Good (90-94.99). On the other hand, there are no students (0%) who have been rated as Good (85-89.99). However, 8 students (53%) are classified as Fair (≤84.99). It means that some students in Group B have scored higher than KKM and others – lower. The results of one-sample t-test are presented in Table 3.4. In accordance with them, t-value equals -0.276 (df = 14). The significance value for the two-tailed test was p = .787, and it was p = .393 for one-tailed test. The mean difference between the scores was -1.000, thus the average score was somewhat less than the KKM. The 95% confidence interval ranged from -8.78 to 6.78 and contained zero.

Reading Comprehension Cycle I Test

In this cycle, it was found that there was a significant improvement in the scores of both group A and B students compared to the initial test and final test scores, as depicted in Table 5.

Table 5. The students' score distribution of Cycle I in reading comprehension

Score Interval	Category	Number		Percentage	
		Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
95 – 100	Excellent	4	5	33%	63%
90 – 94,99	Very Good	8	3	67%	37%
85 – 89,99	Good	0	0	0%	0%
< = 84,99	Fair	0	0	0%	0%

Table 6. Test Value = 85

	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			One-Sided p	Two-Sided p		Lower	Upper
Cycle1_A	5.863	11	<,001	<,001	8.333	5.20	11.46
Cycle1_B	6.148	7	<,001	<,001	11.250	6.92	15.58

According to Table 6. the frequency distribution of the scores of students in Group A reveals that all the students scored above 90 marks. As a result, there are 8 students (67%) who belong to the Very Good category (90 – 94.99), whereas 4 students (33%) fall in the Excellent range (95 – 100). None of the students in Group A belong to Good (85 – 89.99) or Fair (≤ 84.99) categories. Hence, all the students in Group A have exceeded the scores beyond the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM = 85). Moreover, the outcomes of one-sample t-test depicted in Table 3.6 reveal a t-statistic value of 5.863 with df = 11, while the significance level at one-tailed and two-tailed levels is less than .001. The mean difference is 8.333, showing that the score of students is above the KKM by 8.333. In addition, the lower limit of the confidence interval is 5.20, whereas the upper limit is 11.46.

It is also clear from Table 6. that the performance of the students in Group B is excellent. There are 8 students out of 11, which accounts for 63% of the students falling into the Excellent (95-100) category while there are 3 other students (37%) that fall into the Very Good (90-94.99) category. From the table, it is important to note that there are no students who fall into the Good or Fair category. This means that all the students in Group B have obtained marks above the KKM. From the table below, we can see that the t-value is 6.148 with df = 7. The significance level is $p < .001$ for both one-sided and two-sided hypotheses. The mean difference of 11.250 points indicates that the mean score of the students in Group B is 11.250 points higher than the test value. The 95% confidence interval range is between 6.92 and 15.58, and zero is not included. From the above discussion, it can therefore be concluded that there is improvement in the students' reading comprehension from the initial test, final test and cycle 1. Here, the analysis is based on the comparison of the students' performances before and after the implementation of the strategy to show how the students improved in their reading comprehension. By doing this, it is expected that this part of the thesis clearly shows how the teaching strategy helped improve the students' reading comprehension. See Table 7. for more detail.

Table 7. The students' performance of reading comprehension test

Group	Number of Students		
	Initial test	Final test	Cycle I
Group A	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (100%)
Group B	3 (20%)	7 (47%)	8 (100%)

Table 7. shows the number of students who reached Minimum Mastery Criterion (≥ 85) for three different assessments, namely initial test, final test, and Cycle I test. The number of students who reached KKM in Group A was zero (0) both for initial test and final test. Nevertheless, in Cycle I test, the number of students who reached KKM increased to 12 students, which means all the students in Group A reached KKM in this assessment phase. The number of students who reached KKM in Group B also increased progressively throughout the three testing phases. In initial test, there were 3 students who reached KKM. The number of students who reached KKM increased to 7 for final test out of 15. Meanwhile, in Cycle I test, the number of the students increased further to 8 students, meaning all the students in Group B reached KKM in this phase.

Generally speaking, the number of students who reached KKM increased progressively from the early phase to late phase for both groups. Even though there were zero (0) students who reached KKM in Group A during the two initial phases, full achievement of KKM can be seen in Cycle I test. On the other hand, progressive increases can be observed for Group B throughout all testing phases. The enhancement in the students' reading comprehension abilities of the students is clearly illustrated by the rise in average scores from initial test to the final test and Cycle I test, using the KKM score of 85 as the standard in determining the learning achievement. The following table presents the mean score for the purpose of providing a more concrete representation of the progress made by the students in reading comprehension based on their results in the initial test, final test, and Cycle I test with the KKM 85 as the criterion of success. See Table 8.

Table 8. The development of students' achievement in reading comprehension

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Initial Test A	12	56.67	15.570	4.495
Final Test A		67.50	8.660	2.500
Cycle 1 A		93.33	4.924	1.421
Initial Test B	15	71.33	13.020	3.362
Final Test B		84.00	14.041	3.625
Cycle 1 B	8	96.25	5.175	1.830

Mean score for the first test in Group A was 56.67. This implies that the reading comprehension skills among the students were very poor and did not reach the expected minimum passing grade known as KKM (Knowledge Competence Mastery) that is 85. In the final test after the implementation of the treatment, the mean score increased to 67.50, which did not reach the KKM, but remarkably improved to 93.33 in Cycle I. Group B registered impressive improvements. The mean score obtained by the students during the initial test was 71.33, which was better than Group A but still below the KKM. Nevertheless, the mean score obtained by the students during the final test was 84.00 and greatly improved to 96.25, much more than the KKM. Remarkably, the mean score for the students in Cycle I was more than the KKM (≥85), thus, meaning that the students in this group mastered the topic. The following questionnaire is designed to assess students' feedback on the introduction of guided reading in TaRL approach. The questionnaire items were rated using dichotomy where yes responses were assigned value 1 while no responses were given 0. The total scores obtained were then calculated and transformed to percentage form in order to get their mean values. See table 9.

Table 9. The results of students' responses

Group		Percentage of Questionnaire Result								Mean
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	
A	YES	92	92	100	83	92	92	92	75	90
	NO	8	8	0	17	8	8	8	25	10
B	YES	60	87	100	100	80	93	93	93	88
	NO	27	13	0	0	13	7	7	7	9

As can be observed from Table 9. it is clear that for group A, the "Yes" responses in percentage terms ranged between 75%-100% whereas the "No" responses in percentage terms ranged between 0%-25%. In addition, the maximum "Yes" responses were recorded in Q3 which was 100%, while the minimum "Yes" responses were recorded in Q8 which was 75%. On average, the "Yes" responses in group A were 90% whereas the "No" responses were 10%. Similarly, for Group B, "Yes" responses ranged from 60%-100% while the "No" responses ranged between 0%-27%. The maximum "Yes" responses were recorded in Q3 and Q4 which was 100%, while the minimum ones were in Q1 which were 60%. The average "Yes" responses for Group B were 88% while "No" responses were 9%. On average, both groups showed more "Yes" responses than "No" responses in all the questions of the questionnaire. From the analysis of the questionnaire data, it is evident that the reading skills of the students improved by the guidance of the teachers who helped them predict the story, read it and analyze its contents as well as learn difficult words in the text. Results from the study were also identical with the findings made by Hermanudin, Suhartono, Suryadi, and Noermanzah (2019). The authors showed that interactive learning processes led to the improvement of reading comprehension ability since it was actively developed during the learning process by interacting with the text. In the current research, the active participation of the students occurred during group discussion, vocabulary development, guided questioning, and collaborative reading.

The findings acquired from this study revealed that the use of Guided Reading in Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) has resulted in the improvement of reading comprehension competence

among the learners since the strategy provided systematic teacher support through small group teaching, guided questioning activities, and discussion activities. Throughout the process, the students were involved in activities that involved predicting, discussing, finding words which are hard to comprehend, and answering comprehension questions. Through these activities, the students were able to construct the meaning of the text with the help of scaffolding by the teacher. The improvement experienced in this study conforms to the theory presented by Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnel, who state that Guided Reading promotes comprehension development through responsive instruction. The positive results acquired in this study conform to the theoretical framework presented by Heinemann (2023). According to the theory, Guided Reading facilitates the ability of the learner to become fluent readers, acquire vocabulary knowledge, enhance their comprehension, and apply appropriate reading strategies. Additionally, the use of Guided Reading enables teachers to conduct instructions based on the reading level and needs of the learners.

It is important to mention that group B exhibited better improvement than group A in terms of achieving optimal progress. It was because of the students' different levels of reading competency. Before intervention, students from group B possessed better reading competencies and could do higher-level reading, including story interpretation, inferencing, and getting the contextual meanings. On the contrary, the students of group A still needed to be supported in decoding, word recognition, and comprehending. The findings are consistent with the study done by Muammar et al. (2023). Differentiated instruction depending on the ability level of the students leads to better literacy outcomes among elementary school learners.

Besides, the implementation of Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) enhanced differentiated instruction while conducting guided reading lessons. Due to TaRL, students were classified based on their reading competency levels, and thus, the teacher provided students with instructions according to their needs and levels of comprehension. Such findings are aligned with the study performed by Muammar et al. (2023), stating that TaRL improves literacy skills among students by means of flexible grouping and level-based instruction. Similarly, Najah N., Jabu B., and Basri M. (2024) explain that the application of TaRL approach promotes adaptability and learner-centricity in the instructional context. The current study found that the learners exhibited positive reactions towards the application of Guided Reading in TaRL approach, as shown in the questionnaire outcomes. Learners gave positive feedback about the learning activities, implying that the instruction promoted engagement and participation in the reading sessions.

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and analysis of this study, it can be concluded that the implementation of Guided Reading strategy in Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) approach improved students' reading comprehension ability, as reflected in the increasing number of students who achieved the Minimum Mastery Criterion across the assignment stages. This improvement was ireflected in the increased number of students' score above the Minimum Mastery Criterion (≥ 85) across the initial test, final test, and Cycle I test. The number of students who reached the Minimum Mastery Criterion (KKM) in Group A was zero (0%) for both the initial test and final test. Nevertheless, in the Cycle I test, the number of students who reached the KKM increased to 12 students (100%), meaning that all students in Group A reached the KKM in this assessment phase.

The number of students who reached KKM in Group B also increased progressively throughout the three testing phases. In initial test, there were 3 students (20%) who reached KKM. The number of students who reached KKM increased to 7 (47%) for final test out of 15. Meanwhile, in Cycle I test, the number of the students who did not attain the KKM in the final test (8 students), increased further to 8 students (100%), meaning all the students in Group B reached KKM in this phase. Students also indicated that the guided reading strategy provided them with opportunities to increase in the mean scores from 56.67 to 93.33, which is a big improvement, though it did not achieve the Minimum Mastery Criterion (KKM) of 85. For Group B, the results show a better level of mastery, with an increase in the mean scores from 71.33 to 96.25, which is more than the KKM.

According to the analysis of data from the questionnaire, the students were positively influenced by the introduction of Guided Reading in the TaRL approach because most of them noted that the strategy helped them enhance their comprehension skills and motivated them to take an

active part in reading sessions. In other words, the positive feedback of the students was in line with the results of the quantitative analysis that revealed improvement in students' comprehension skills during the implementation of the strategy. In conclusion, researcher found out that implementing the strategy of Guided Reading in TaRL approach is rather effective and helps students enhance their comprehension skills and become active learners of reading. Thus, it is recommended for the teachers to use the strategy of Guided Reading in the Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) approach to improve students' comprehension skills. Grouping learners according to their reading level allows providing them with more individual lessons. Teachers should provide well-planned reading practices for their students and scaffold them in order to develop their comprehension skills. It is recommended that students become active participants in Guided Reading practices such as reading texts, answering questions, and participating in discussions. Through active participation in Guided Reading practices, students will be able to enhance their comprehension skills and build confidence when dealing with texts. Students should also ensure that they read regularly and improve their comprehension skills.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express our gratitude to our lecturers and also the teachers of Sabilillah Elementary School of Malang 2 for their insights and assistance.

REFERENCES

Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL). (2022). *Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) program evaluation report*. https://www.povertyactionlab.org

Astiantih, S., Hamid, M. I., Yetty., Sofyan, W. N. P. (2022). *Improving Reading Comprehension by using Experience Text Relationship (ETR)*. ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, *5*(2), 271-276. Retrieved May 15, 2024

Allen, Jennifer Van. (2016). *Developing Digital Literacy Skills Through Guided Reading Instruction.* The Florida Reading Journal – Vol 5, No.1

Brandon, D. (2021). *The Importance of Reading Comprehension*. Alabama A&M and Auburn University

David, M., & Sulaiman, N. A. (2021). *The Functions of Visualization in Assisting Reading Comprehension among Young Learners*. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences

El Ouazzani-Hlaoua, M. (2020). *Innovative and Effective Strategies in Developing English Reading Comprehension Performance for EFL Students*

Erlika, D. (2017). *The Influence Of Using Guided Reading Procedure (Grp) Strategies Towards Students'reading Comprehension On Descriptive Text At The First Semester Of The Eighth Grade At Mts Negeri 1 Tulang Bawang In The Academic Year Of 2017/2018* (Doctoral Dissertation, Uin Raden Intan Lampung).

Fadli, A., Damiri, A., Febriyanti. (2022). *Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Through Guided Reading Strategy.* Journal of English Education Students.

Fountas, Irene C. | Pinnell, Gay Su. (2019). *What is Guided Reading?* Fountas & Pinnel Blog.

Fountas, Irene C. | Pinnell, Gay Su. (2016). Guided Reading: responsive teaching across the grades. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Fountas, Irene C. | Pinnell, Gay Su. (2017). The Literacy Quick Guide. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G.S. (2022). Guided Reading: Responsive Teaching Across the Grades. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781138609877-REE227-1

Heinemann. (2023). *What are the benefits of guided reading for students in grades K6.* Heinemann Blog.

Hermanudin, Suhartono, Suryadi, & Noermanzah. (2019). *Improvement of Reading Comprehension Ability by Using Core Models of Class VII Students of SMP Negeri 10 Bengkulu Tengah*. International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research, 8(12), 647.

Hudson, Alida K., Walker, Melissa. *Supporting Effective Guided Reading Instruction for All Students*. Texas Association for Literacy Education Yearbook: Literacy Alive and Well! Supporting Effective Literacy Instruction for All Learners.

Johns, J. L., & Lenski, S. D. (1997). *Improving reading: A handbook of strategies*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 4050 Westmark Drive, PO Box 1840, Dubuque, Iowa 52004-1840.

Kolić-Vehovec, S., Bajšanski, I. Metacognitive strategies and reading comprehension in elementary-school students. *Eur J Psychol Educ* 21, 439–451 (2006). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173513

Muammar, et al. (2023). *Implementing The Teaching at The Right Level (TaRL) Approach to Improve Elementary Students' Initial Reading Skills.* JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching.

Najah, N., Jabu, B., & Basri, M. (2024). The Implementation of Teaching at the Right Level (TARL) Approach in Teaching Reading at Senior High School. *International Journal of Language, Education, and Literature*, *1*(2), 95-101

Nordquist, R. (2020). English as a foreign language (EFL). ThoughtCo, thoughtco. com/english-as-a-foreign-language-efl-1690597..

Pratham. (2014). *TaRL approach: Instructional guide*. Pratham Education Foundation.

Rahmasari, A., Hafifah, G. N., & Afifah, N. (2025). Implementation of Teaching at The Right Level (TaRL) Approach on Enhancing Students' Writing Ability in 8th Grade of Junior High School. PROCEEDING UMSURABAYA.

Rahmawati, I., Widyastuti, T. A., Sentosa, E. A., Wulandari, D. A., & Nugraini, D. (2025). Improving Student Learning Outcomes with The Tarl Approach to Science Subjects In Elementary Schools. *El Midad: Jurnal Jurusan PGMI*, *17*(1).

Ramsa, N. I. B., & Rawian, R. M. (2021). *A Review on Systematic Guided Reading Strategies and Its Implication on Reading Comprehension.* International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences.

Richardson, Nicole, "Guided Reading Strategies for Reading Comprehension" (2010). Education Masters. Paper 19.

Saputra N., et al. (2024). *Correlation of The Application of Teaching At The Right Level (Tarl) With Students' Basic Literacy Outcomes*. IJE Interdiciplinary Journal of Education.

Sari, M. H., Susetyo., Nurmanzah., Wardhana, D. E. C., Kusumaningsih, D. (2020). *Understanding The Level of Students' Reading Comprehension Ability.* Universal Journal of Educational Research.

Sitepu, R. Y., Siahaan, S., & Hutauruk, B. S. (2023). *The Effect of Guided Reading Strategy to the Reading Comprehension of Grade IX Students at SMP Negeri 12 Pematang Siantar on a Narrative Text.*

Sya'ban, W., & Reflinda, R. (2021, March). Guided Reading Approach to Reach Students' Reading Comprehension: A Descriptive Qualitative Research. In *Proceedings of the 2nd EAI Bukittinggi International Conference on Education, BICED 2020, 14 September, 2020, Bukititinggi, West Sumatera, Indonesia*.

Young, C. (2018). Increased frequency and planning: A more effective approach to guided reading in Grade 2. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *112*(1), 121–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2018.1451814