ZAHRA: Research And Tought Elementary School Of Islam Journal
Volume 7, Number 2, August 2026, pp. 198-213
P-ISSN: 2723-4932 E-ISSN: 2723-7893



Classroom Teacher Practices In Supporting Second-Grade Students With Early Reading Difficulties

Najwa Rahmatillah Bintiriyan[1], Budi Sunariyanto[2], Kuni Fatonah[3], Muh. Zaki Amrullah[4], Elyaum Farihah[5]
[1,2,3,5] STIT Muhammadiyah Tempurrejo Ngawi, Indonesia
[4,] STIT Muhammadiyah Bojonegoro, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received July 25, 2026
Revised August 09, 2026
Accepted August 27, 2026
Available online October 25, 2026

Kata Kunci:
Kesulitan Membaca; Membaca Permulaan; Strategi Guru; Madrasah Ibtidaiyah

Keywords:
Early Reading; Islamic Elementary School; Reading Difficulties; Teacher Strategies

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Program Studi Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi bentuk kesulitan membaca permulaan yang dialami siswa kelas II, menganalisis strategi pendampingan yang diterapkan guru, mengungkap faktor pendukung dan penghambat pelaksanaannya, serta mendeskripsikan perkembangan kemampuan membaca siswa. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif yang dilaksanakan di MI Muhammadiyah Kedunggudel pada 5 Januari–28 Februari 2026. Informan penelitian meliputi guru kelas II, kepala madrasah, tujuh siswa yang mengalami kesulitan membaca, dan orang tua mereka. Data dikumpulkan melalui observasi, wawancara semi-terstruktur, penilaian membaca sederhana, dan dokumentasi, kemudian dianalisis menggunakan model interaktif Miles et al. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tujuh dari 24 siswa (29,17%) memerlukan pendampingan tambahan dalam membaca permulaan. Kesulitan tersebut meliputi membaca tersendat, merangkai huruf menjadi suku kata, membedakan huruf yang mirip, menghilangkan atau menambahkan huruf, membaca kata berimbuhan, memahami teks sederhana, dan kurang percaya diri ketika membaca. Guru menerapkan delapan bentuk pendampingan, yaitu bimbingan individual, latihan suku kata, kartu huruf dan kata, membaca berulang, tutor sebaya, penguatan positif, kerja sama dengan orang tua, dan evaluasi berkala. Catatan individual menunjukkan adanya perkembangan yang beragam pada kemampuan mengenali huruf, membaca suku kata dan kata, kelancaran membaca kalimat, pemahaman teks, serta partisipasi siswa. Penelitian ini menegaskan pentingnya pendampingan membaca yang disesuaikan dengan kebutuhan individual siswa. Namun, karena penelitian terbatas pada satu kelas dan menggunakan penilaian tidak terstandar tanpa kelompok pembanding, perkembangan tersebut tidak dapat diartikan sebagai bukti kausal efektivitas strategi tertentu.

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the types of early reading difficulties experienced by Grade II students, examine the support strategies implemented by the classroom teacher, explore the factors facilitating and hindering their implementation, and describe students' documented reading development. A descriptive qualitative approach was employed at MI Muhammadiyah Kedunggudel from 5 January to 28 February 2026. The participants included the Grade II teacher, the head of the madrasah, seven students experiencing reading difficulties, and their parents. Data were collected through observations, semi-structured interviews, a simple reading assessment, and documentation, and were analysed using Miles et al.'s interactive model. The findings revealed that seven of the 24 students (29.17%) required additional support in early reading. Their difficulties included hesitant reading, challenges blending letters into syllables, confusion between similar-looking letters, omission or addition of letters, difficulty reading affixed words, limited comprehension of simple texts, and low confidence when reading. The teacher implemented eight forms of support: individual guidance, syllable-based exercises, letter and word cards, repeated reading, peer tutoring, positive reinforcement, parental collaboration, and periodic evaluation. Individual records indicated varied progress in letter recognition, syllable and word reading, sentence fluency, text comprehension, and student participation. This study highlights the importance of providing early reading support that responds to individual students' learning needs. However, because the research was limited to one classroom and employed a non-standardized assessment without a comparison group, the documented progress cannot be interpreted as causal evidence of the effectiveness of any particular strategy.

*Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: snajwarahma@gmail.com (Najwa Rahmatillah Bintiriyan)

INTRODUCTION

Early reading gives children access to classroom instructions, questions, and written learning materials. During the first years of schooling, students are expected to recognize print accurately, connect letters to their sounds, and read words and sentences with growing fluency. When these foundational processes are not secure, participation in activities that depend on written information can become difficult. Reading instruction therefore needs to support both accurate word recognition and the ability to make meaning from text (Adams, 1990; Snow et al., 1998).

Students do not all experience reading difficulties in the same way. Recognizing words depends on building reliable links between written forms and pronunciation (Ehri, 2005, 2020). Understanding a text, in turn, involves both word recognition and language comprehension, as described by the Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990). Duke and Cartwright (2021) extend this perspective by drawing attention to cognitive processes and reader engagement. Thus, being able to pronounce a word is not, by itself, evidence that a student understands the text.

In the classroom, a student may have trouble telling similar letters apart, combining sounds into syllables, reading words accurately or smoothly, or understanding a simple sentence. Omitting and inserting letters are also distinct patterns that warrant attention. Recognizing the particular pattern can help a teacher choose more suitable learning support. However, classroom observations by themselves are not sufficient to establish a clinical diagnosis (Castles et al., 2018; Wolf & Katzir-Cohen, 2001).

A child's classroom experience can also shape how they approach reading. Students who worry about making mistakes may avoid reading aloud or stay quiet, which can reduce their chances to practise. Stanovich (1986) noted that differences in reading experience can grow over time when children who read more fluently also encounter texts more often. Teachers can respond by giving clear, constructive feedback, making reading activities emotionally safe, and inviting participation step by step (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

Teachers can notice students' reading needs through routine classroom activities. What they learn from this process can guide the choice of materials, the amount of help provided, and the way progress is monitored. A child who is still unsure of letter names or forms needs a different starting point from a child who can read words but struggles to understand sentences. This kind of adjustment reflects differentiated instruction, which takes account of students' readiness and learning needs (Tomlinson, 2014).

The same issue appeared in Grade II at MI Muhammadiyah Kedunggudel. Initial classroom records showed that 17 of the 24 students (70.83%) could read at the expected grade level, while the remaining seven (29.17%) continued to need help with early reading. Their difficulties ranged from recognizing letters and reading hesitantly to understanding simple texts. These figures apply only to the class examined in this study and should not be treated as representative of other madrasahs.

The classroom teacher responded with individual guidance, syllable exercises, letter and word cards, repeated reading, peer tutoring, positive reinforcement, communication with parents, and periodic assessment. Using several forms of support raises practical questions about how the teacher matched them to students' different needs, which constraints affected their use, and what kinds of change were recorded during the support period.

Earlier research has addressed how children learn to read, reading fluency, foundational instruction, and the contribution of families (Castles et al., 2018; Foorman et al., 2016; Sénéchal & Young, 2008; Therrien, 2004). These studies help explain why different approaches may be useful. They do not, however, describe the precise way academic practice, emotional encouragement, and home reading were brought together for seven students with varied needs in this particular Grade II class. This study offers a context-specific account of the teacher's choices, the circumstances in which support was delivered, and the progress recorded for individual students. It does not propose a new theory or claim that the strategies have not been examined before.

The observed difficulties can serve as an initial guide for planning support. Confusion between letters or letter omissions may indicate a need to revisit visual distinctions and letter–sound links. Problems combining sounds may call for explicit demonstration followed by guided practice. Hesitant reading of connected text may require attention to accuracy and automaticity through supported repetition, while difficulty answering questions may point to vocabulary, sentence meaning, or recall. These are instructional possibilities to explore, not causal explanations proven by the present study.

The categories shown in Table 2 are not mutually exclusive: an individual student may experience several difficulties at once. The figures therefore indicate how many students had each difficulty recorded, rather than dividing the seven students into separate groups. For this reason, the combined category counts exceed seven. Clarifying this overlap prevents different learning needs from being mistaken for distinct diagnostic categories.

The study was guided by four questions: (1) What early reading difficulties did Grade II students at MI Muhammadiyah Kedunggudel experience? (2) How did the classroom teacher

put support strategies into practice? (3) Which conditions helped or limited that work? and (4) What reading development was documented after support? Accordingly, the study aimed to describe the difficulties, teaching strategies, facilitating and constraining factors, and recorded progress. The findings may inform teachers and the madrasah when planning more focused assistance.

RESEARCH METHOD

A qualitative design suited the study because the questions focused on the teacher's actions, participants' experiences, the context in which support took place, and the changes noted over time. Descriptive qualitative research seeks to present practices and experiences clearly within a particular setting. The numerical figures in this article describe the class and the patterns of difficulty; they are not inferential estimates and cannot establish the effectiveness of a specific strategy. For this study, early reading was considered a set of related skills rather than a single score. The analysis considered alphabet knowledge, letter–sound correspondence, blending, word-reading accuracy, fluency in connected text, basic comprehension, and participation in reading activities. This framework helped organize observations while recognizing that different difficulties may have different sources. It also avoided treating behaviours such as looking down or declining to read aloud as diagnostic indicators.

Research approach and setting

The study used a descriptive qualitative approach to examine students' reading difficulties, the teacher's responses, student reactions, and classroom circumstances in their natural context. Numerical data were used to describe the class, not to test a hypothesis. The design was not intended to compare strategies or demonstrate cause and effect. Data came from observations, interviews, a simple reading assessment, and documents (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

The research was conducted at MI Muhammadiyah Kedunggudel from 5 January to 28 February 2026. The recorded schedule included preparation and permission (5–9 January), initial observation (12–16 January), interviews with the classroom teacher and head of the madrasah (19–23 January), observations of support activities (26 January–20 February), interviews with students and parents (16–20 February), reading evaluation (23–25 February), and data checking and analysis (26–28 February). The activity log should be checked to

establish whether the support period itself lasted eight weeks, because the dates listed here cover the overall research process.

Including the teacher, head of the madrasah, students, and parents made it possible to compare perspectives from people with different roles. Their accounts naturally covered different areas: the teacher could explain classroom instruction, parents could describe practice at home, and students could share how they experienced reading tasks. These differences should be considered when judging whether information from different sources agrees.

The Grade II class comprised 24 students. Seven students who were recorded as needing additional early-reading support were examined as focal cases. The article uses the class total to describe the initial classroom profile; the seven focal students are not treated as a statistically representative sample.

Informants and research focus

Participants were selected purposively because they had direct experience of early-reading instruction in Grade II. They included the classroom teacher, the head of the madrasah, seven students identified as experiencing reading difficulties, and the students' parents. The students were assigned codes S-01 to S-07. The available manuscript does not specify a formal screening threshold for identifying the seven students; the authors should verify and add the actual criteria from the original research records.

Data were gathered through observations, semi-structured interviews, a simple reading assessment, and documentation. The available manuscript does not include the complete interview and observation instruments or transcripts. Therefore, no additional interview questions or direct quotations have been introduced in this revision.

The reading assessment was used descriptively to record letter recognition, syllable blending, word and sentence reading, and basic comprehension. The assessment was not standardized and was not intended to diagnose a clinical condition. The available records do not specify the complete task set, scoring rules, or time limits; these details should be confirmed from the original assessment sheet before submission.

The data-collection process included initial classroom observations, interviews with the teacher and head of the madrasah, observations of support activities, interviews with students and parents, a simple reading evaluation, and review of available documents. These sources were considered together when describing reading difficulties, teaching practices, implementation conditions, and recorded changes.

Data collection and instruments

Four techniques were used to collect data. First, initial observations focused on letter recognition, syllable blending, word and sentence reading, and comprehension. Later observations recorded the teacher's assistance, learning materials, and students' responses during support activities. Second, semi-structured interviews explored the teacher's approach to identifying needs, selecting strategies, monitoring progress, and managing constraints; the head of the madrasah's views on institutional support; students' experiences; and family reading practices (Patton, 2015). Third, a simple reading assessment was used to describe initial skills and recorded changes. Fourth, documentation—including student lists, reading materials, and progress notes—provided supplementary information. The assessment was not designed to diagnose a clinical condition.

The researcher served as the main research instrument and used observation and interview guides, a reading-assessment sheet, field notes, and available documents. The manuscript does not provide a verified session-by-session record, the number of support sessions received by each student, or the duration of each student's participation. Such details should be added only if they can be confirmed from the original records.

Because the participants included children, the authors should verify and report the applicable school permission, parent or guardian consent, child assent where appropriate, and authorization to use any supporting records or photographs. The information available for this revision does not establish the status of these procedures; it must be confirmed by the authors before submission.

Credibility was addressed through source triangulation, method triangulation, and repeated observation. The analysis considered the teacher's account alongside students' experiences, parents' information, the head of the madrasah's perspective, observations, the simple reading assessment, and available documents. The manuscript does not include a complete audit trail showing every comparison across sources, so the findings are interpreted cautiously. The findings may help teachers consider how early-reading support can be matched to students' observed needs and monitored over time. However, this single-class descriptive study cannot determine which component of support contributed to the changes recorded.

Data analysis followed the interactive framework described by Miles et al. (2014): data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing with verification. Information relevant to

the four research questions was organized into summaries and tables covering reading difficulties, teaching strategies, implementation conditions, and individual progress. Because a detailed coding log was not available, no specific coding software or undocumented coding procedure is claimed.

Data analysis and trustworthiness

Data were analysed using the interactive framework described by Miles et al. (2014): data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing with verification. Material from observations, interviews, assessments, and documents was arranged around the four research questions. The sources were compared to examine consistency in accounts of reading difficulties, teaching practices, implementation conditions, and individual changes. Findings were then summarized in narrative form and tables. Because a detailed coding trail was not available, the article does not claim that a particular coding procedure or software was used.

Credibility was supported through source triangulation, method triangulation, and repeated observation. The teacher's account was considered alongside students' experiences, parents' information, and the head of the madrasah's perspective. Interview data were also compared with observations, the simple assessment, and available documents. These steps were intended to reduce dependence on a single source and align with qualitative credibility principles (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The manuscript did not contain complete documentation of school permission, parental or guardian consent, child assent, or permission to use supporting records. The status of these ethical procedures must be confirmed before submission.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Initial reading ability

Table 1. Initial Reading Ability of Grade II Students

Reading status	Number of students	Percentage
Reading at the expected grade level	17	70.83%
Experiencing early reading difficulties	7	29.17%
Total	24	100%

Initial records indicated that 17 students (70.83%) were considered able to read at the expected level for their grade, while seven students (29.17%) needed additional help with early reading. Both percentages were calculated from the full Grade II class of 24 students.

The figures describe one classroom only and should not be interpreted as the prevalence of reading difficulties across the wider madrasah population. The seven focal students also had different reading profiles and should not be treated as one uniform group.

Identifying the specific difficulties was an important step before choosing practice materials. Students who struggled to recognize letters needed opportunities to revisit letter forms and sounds; those who could not blend syllables needed gradual decoding exercises; and students who had trouble with comprehension needed support with vocabulary and meaning. This differentiated approach reflects the relationship between word recognition and language comprehension (Duke & Cartwright, 2021; Oakhill et al., 2015).

Forms of early reading difficulty

Table 2. Forms of Early Reading Difficulty Recorded

Difficulty	Number of students	Recorded example
Hesitant reading	7	Taking a long time to read a sentence
Difficulty blending letters into syllables	5	Spelling out ba, bi, bu separately
Limited comprehension of simple texts	5	Unable to answer questions about a text
Difficulty distinguishing similar letters	4	Confusing b and d; p and q
Difficulty reading words with affixes	4	Words such as bermain and membaca
Low confidence when reading	4	Speaking softly, looking down, or refusing to read
Omitting or adding letters	3	Reading “sekolah” as “sekola”

All seven focal students were recorded as reading hesitantly. Their reading included pauses, repeated sounds, and occasions when they needed the teacher’s help to complete a sentence. Fluency involves accuracy and automaticity, rather than speed alone (Rasinski, 2012). Since the study did not apply a standardized fluency measure, however, the amount of change in fluency could not be quantified.

Five students had difficulty blending letters into syllables, and four had trouble distinguishing letters with similar visual forms. These patterns relate to recognizing written symbols accurately and applying letter–sound knowledge when reading words. Structured practice should help students notice patterns that can be used with unfamiliar words, rather than relying only on memorizing individual cards (Ehri, 2020; Share, 1995). Three students were also recorded as omitting or adding letters while reading.

Four students struggled to read words with affixes, while five had difficulty understanding simple texts. These are related but different challenges. Difficulty decoding a

word can interrupt fluent reading, whereas comprehension may remain limited even when a student can pronounce the words. Teachers can support students in identifying base words and affixes, then ask questions about the people, actions, or events described in a text. This is consistent with the role of word knowledge in constructing meaning (Oakhill et al., 2015; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014).

Four students showed behaviours that may indicate discomfort in reading situations, including speaking quietly, looking down, or avoiding their turn. Such observations do not establish a particular psychological condition. For students who hesitate to read in front of the whole class, individual practice or a small-group setting may offer a gentler way to participate gradually. A student could be counted in more than one category, so the table should not be read as seven separate groups.

Overall, the recorded difficulties covered print recognition, sound blending, fluency, comprehension, and willingness to participate. The differences reinforce the need to plan support around each student's profile. The strategies discussed next are considered in relation to how the teacher responded to specific needs, not as evidence that one approach is suitable for every learner.

The implementation of support depends not only on the strategy selected but also on the match between the task and the student's current reading ability, the opportunities to practise, the feedback provided, and the availability of follow-up. The records describe some individual guidance and suggested home practice, but do not document the amount or consistency of each strategy well enough to compare students' exposure.

The teacher's reported choices were related to the reading challenges observed in individual students. For example, support included revisiting letter forms, practising syllable blending, and asking comprehension questions, depending on the student's needs. The available records do not provide a session-by-session decision log, so the consistency of these adjustments cannot be established.

Teacher strategies for addressing reading difficulties

Table 3. Strategies Reported by the Classroom Teacher

Strategy	Reported implementation
Individual support	Rotating individual guidance for approximately 10–15 minutes
Syllable-based practice	Progression from letters to syllables, words, and sentences
Letter and word cards	Arranging letters into syllables and words
Repeated reading	Reading the same short text several times
Peer tutoring	More fluent students assisting classmates

Positive reinforcement	Praising effort and small improvements
Parent collaboration	Encouraging 10–15 minutes of reading practice at home
Periodic evaluation	Recording fluency, accuracy, and comprehension

The teacher described rotating individual guidance sessions lasting about 10–15 minutes. The focus of the assistance depended on the student's needs: revisiting letter forms for those who did not recognize them consistently, practising syllable blending for those who still sounded out each letter, and asking comprehension questions of students who could already read a text aloud. This suggests that practice targets were differentiated. Because the frequency of sessions for each student was not recorded, the overall intensity of support cannot be calculated.

Practice moved step by step from letters to syllables, words, and simple sentences. This sequence gave students structured assistance and created opportunities to reduce support as they became more independent. The approach can be understood in relation to scaffolding in Vygotsky's (1978) work. Nevertheless, the available evidence cannot isolate the contribution of syllable-based practice to each student's progress.

Letter and word cards helped students arrange written units and notice differences between similar letter forms. The teacher also asked students to reread short texts. Previous studies indicate that repeated reading paired with feedback may support fluency development (Samuels, 1979; Therrien, 2004). Here, the evidence documents that the strategies were used, but no separate measure establishes how much change resulted from the cards or repeated reading.

Peer tutoring gave students opportunities to practise with classmates who read more fluently. Such arrangements can create additional reading opportunities and support constructive interaction among peers (Fuchs et al., 1997; Topping, 2005). An earlier version of the manuscript contained a direct student quotation about feeling safer while reading with a friend. Since the original interview transcript was not available, that quotation has been omitted. The available evidence confirms the use of peer tutoring but does not show that every student felt more comfortable because of it.

The teacher used positive reinforcement when students made an effort or achieved a small step forward—for example, reading a word without spelling out each letter or joining a group activity. Feedback is particularly helpful when it tells learners what they have done well and what they should work on next (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). The record that S-07 became

willing to read in a small group is relevant to participation, but it cannot be explained by praise alone.

Parents were encouraged to read with their children for around 10–15 minutes a day, and the teacher communicated with families about students' learning needs. Family involvement can create more opportunities for reading, particularly when tasks and materials are clear (Sénéchal & Young, 2008). The teacher also reviewed accuracy, fluency, and comprehension periodically. Because records of home-practice consistency and scores from each session were incomplete, the contribution of each element cannot be separated.

The eight strategies documented here are best viewed as parts of a coordinated support approach rather than as independent interventions. The teacher combined foundational reading practice with repetition, social and emotional encouragement, family involvement, and progress monitoring. The descriptive design and incomplete information about intervention intensity do not allow the study to identify the most effective strategy or estimate the effect of any one activity.

Supporting and inhibiting factors

The factors reported to support implementation included the teacher's patience and attention, access to letter cards, word cards and storybooks, support from the head of the madrasah, parent participation, peer tutoring, and student motivation. These conditions helped make additional reading support possible, although the study did not test whether any one factor caused improvements.

Support from families and peers mattered because reading practice extended beyond the teacher's individual sessions. Its value should still be considered alongside the quality of materials, the regularity of practice, and how closely activities matched the learning goals. The findings describe the circumstances surrounding support; they do not rank the factors by their influence on progress.

The barriers recorded included differences in students' starting abilities, limited time for the teacher, irregular practice at home, reluctance to read aloud, distractibility, and a lack of graded reading materials. The teacher had to assist individual learners while continuing to manage the whole class. Short individual sessions or small-group scheduling may be practical possibilities, but this study did not test them as separate solutions.

Communication between the home and madrasah could focus on clear, achievable tasks—for example, reading a few words or sentences at the child's level and explaining what they mean. Reading materials should also be graded according to vocabulary, text length, and

word-pattern difficulty. These suggestions respond to the reported limitations in home practice and materials, but their implementation and outcomes would need to be evaluated.

Because the assessment was not standardized and the records do not provide verified criteria for classifying levels of progress, the findings are reported as descriptive changes in performance rather than as formal progress categories or evidence of intervention effectiveness.

Reading development following support

Table 4. Individual Reading Development Recorded

Student code	Condition before support	Reported development
S-01	Inconsistent letter recognition	Recognized all letters and read syllables
S-02	Confused b and d	Confusion occurred less frequently
S-03	Spelled out every letter	Read two-syllable words without spelling them out
S-04	Unable to blend syllables	Read simple words with light assistance
S-05	Very slow and hesitant reading	Read short sentences more fluently
S-06	Read without understanding the content	Began answering simple comprehension questions
S-07	Refused to read in front of the class	Became willing to read in a small group

The individual records describe different kinds of progress among the seven students. S-01 came to recognize all letters and read syllables; S-02 showed less frequent confusion between b and d; S-03 began reading two-syllable words without spelling out each letter; and S-04 could read simple words with a small amount of assistance. These are descriptions from the available records, not standardized estimates of the size of each student's improvement.

S-05 was reported to read short sentences more smoothly, while S-06 began responding to simple questions about a text. S-07, who had previously avoided reading in front of the class, became willing to read in a small group. In this last case, the record indicates participation in one setting and does not demonstrate confidence in every reading situation.

The available records describe changes in several areas: letter recognition, syllable blending, word reading, sentence fluency, basic comprehension, and willingness to read in a small group. These descriptions are based on the individual records summarized in Table 4. Since the manuscript does not establish verified criteria for the categories 'very good development', 'developing as expected', and 'beginning to develop', those categories are not used as outcome classifications.

CONCLUSION

This study found that seven out of 24 Grade II students (29.17%) at MI Muhammadiyah Kedunggudel required additional support in early reading. Their difficulties varied, encompassing hesitant reading, difficulty blending letters into syllables, confusion between similar-looking letters, omission or addition of letters, difficulty reading affixed words, limited comprehension of simple texts, and low confidence in reading activities. In response, the classroom teacher implemented a combination of individual guidance, syllable-based exercises, letter and word cards, repeated reading, peer tutoring, positive reinforcement, parental involvement, and periodic evaluation. The individual records indicated different forms of progress among the seven students, particularly in letter recognition, syllable blending, word reading, sentence fluency, comprehension, and willingness to participate in reading activities. These findings highlight the importance of identifying students' specific reading needs and providing differentiated support rather than applying uniform instructional strategies.

Theoretically, this study reinforces the relevance of differentiated instruction and scaffolding in understanding early reading support within primary madrasah education. The findings also illustrate that early reading development involves interconnected dimensions of foundational literacy, comprehension, and student participation. The contribution of this study lies in documenting how academic assistance, peer interaction, positive reinforcement, and parental involvement were brought together in a particular classroom context. Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted within the limitations of the research design. The study involved only seven focal students in one Grade II classroom, employed a non-standardized reading assessment, and had no comparison group. Furthermore, incomplete records of intervention frequency and home-reading consistency limit the ability to evaluate the contribution of individual strategies. Therefore, the observed progress cannot be interpreted as causal evidence of the effectiveness of the support provided.

Future research should involve multiple schools and larger groups of students to examine whether similar patterns of reading difficulties and support practices emerge across different educational contexts. Further studies could also employ standardized reading assessments, longitudinal designs, or quasi-experimental approaches to measure changes in reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension more systematically. In addition, research should investigate the specific contributions of individual instructional strategies, particularly structured syllable practice, repeated reading, peer tutoring, and parent-assisted reading. Examining how teacher capacity, instructional resources, and home literacy environments

interact may also provide a more comprehensive understanding of sustainable early reading support in primary madrasahs.

REFERENCE

Aisyah, R. A., & Wibowo, S. E. (2025). Efforts to improve early reading skills and learning motivation through digital flipbook media. Jurnal Prima Edukasia, 13(2), 350–360. https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v13i2.75663

Bahrudin, Rochyadi, E., Hufad, A., Susetyo, B., & Taboer, M. A. (2025). Evaluating early reading challenges and their influence on phonological and linguistic awareness in elementary students in DKI Jakarta. Journal of ICSAR, 9(2), 220–234. https://doi.org/10.17977/um005v9i22025p220-234

Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 19(1), 5–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271

Daniel, J. (2024). Multicomponent reading intervention: A practitioner's guide. The Reading Teacher, 77(4), 473–484. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2265

Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the Simple View of Reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 56(S1), S25–S44. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411

Ehri, L. C. (2005). Learning to read words: Theory, findings, and issues. Scientific Studies of Reading, 9(2), 167–188. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0902_4

Ehri, L. C. (2020). The science of learning to read words: A case for systematic phonics instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 55(S1), S45–S60. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.334

Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Stahl, S. A., & Willows, D. M. (2001). Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 71(3), 393–447. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543071003393

Erlin, E., & Saptono, B. (2025). Improving early reading skills in elementary students with the structural analytic synthetic method based on flashcards. Jurnal Prima Edukasia, 13(1), 98–110. https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v13i1.80980

Fatonah, N., Damaianti, V. S., & Syaodih, E. (2025). Analysis of early reading difficulties in second grade elementary school students. Jurnal Prima Edukasia, 13(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v13i1.69965

Foorman, B. R., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade. Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 1204–1240. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316677029

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Simmons, D. C. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. American Educational Research Journal, 34(1), 174–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312034001174

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D. L. (2012). Smart RTI: A next-generation approach to multilevel prevention. Exceptional Children, 78(3), 263–279. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291207800301

Gildorea, P. J. E., Aryanto, S., Suharjuddin, Denatara, E. T., & Awiria. (2025). Effective reading intervention strategies for primary grade students in Indonesia: A systematic review. Cogent Education, 12(1), Article 2482470. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2482470

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. Remedial and Special Education, 7(1), 6–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193258600700104

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Herlina, H., Mayui, N., Fasli, M., & Aras, N. F. (2024). Identification of beginning reading difficulties in class II primary school students. Indonesian Journal of Educational Development, 5(2), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.59672/ijed.v5i2.3838

Hoover, W. A., & Gough, P. B. (1990). The simple view of reading. Reading and Writing, 2, 127–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00401799

Hulme, C., Shapiro, L. R., & Taylor, J. S. H. (2022). Do family learning phonics courses improve parents' reading-related skills and ability to support their children's reading? Journal of Research in Reading, 45(3), 258–276. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12377

Mardhotillah, P., Habudin, & Juhji. (2026). Enhancing early reading skills through syllable card media: A quasi-experimental study among first-grade elementary students in Indonesia. Al-Adzka: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, 16(1). https://doi.org/10.18592/aladzkapgmi.v16i1.20241

McArthur, G., et al. (2018). Phonics training for English-speaking poor readers. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(11), CD009115. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009115.pub3

Nichols, W. D., Rupley, W. H., & Rasinski, T. (2008). Fluency in learning to read for meaning: Going beyond repeated readings. Literacy Research and Instruction, 48(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388070802161906

Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. Scientific Studies of Reading, 18(1), 22–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2013.827687

Petscher, Y., Cabell, S. Q., Catts, H. W., Compton, D. L., Foorman, B. R., Hart, S. A., Lonigan, C. J., Phillips, B. M., Schatschneider, C., Steacy, L. M., Terry, N. P., & Wagner, R. K. (2020). How the science of reading informs 21st-century education. Reading Research Quarterly, 55(S1), S267–S282. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.352

Pratiwi, A. D. (2026). Analisis problematika dan strategi dalam pembelajaran membaca permulaan di sekolah dasar: Systematic literature review. Jurnal Binagogik, 13(2). https://doi.org/10.61290/pgsd.v13i1.1885

Ramadhani, N. R. R., Rizal, R., Aqil, M., & Wilade, S. (2026). Teachers' intervention strategies for reading difficulties among second-grade students: A qualitative case study in primary education. Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education, 5(1), 325–337. https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v5i1.2768

Rasinski, T. V. (2012). Why reading fluency should be hot! The Reading Teacher, 65(8), 516–522. https://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01077

Share, D. L. (1995). Phonological recoding and self-teaching: Sine qua non of reading acquisition. Cognition, 55(2), 151–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(94)00645-2

Snowling, M. J., Hulme, C., & Nation, K. (2020). Defining and understanding dyslexia: Past, present and future. Oxford Review of Education, 46(4), 501–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2020.1765756

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21(4), 360–407. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.21.4.1

Sénéchal, M., & Young, L. (2008). The effect of family literacy interventions on children's acquisition of reading from kindergarten to grade 3: A meta-analytic review. Review of Educational Research, 78(4), 880–907. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308320319

Therrien, W. J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. Remedial and Special Education, 25(4), 252–261. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325040250040801

Therrien, W. J., & Kubina, R. M. (2006). Developing reading fluency with repeated reading. Intervention in School and Clinic, 41(3), 156–160. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512060410030501

Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. Educational Psychology, 25(6), 631–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500345172

Triadi, R. B., Syihabuddin, Mulyati, Y., & Damaianti, V. S. (2023). Effect of family and peer tutoring programs on reading comprehension skills. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v18i1.8211