Repetition and Visual Media from the School Environment: Strengthening Reading Aloud Literacy in Elementary Students

Iva Nur Safiah Jamil[1], Teguh Suharto[2], Ermi Adriani Meikayanti[3]

[1,2,3] Universitas PGRI Madiun, Indonesia
e-mail: ivanur5784@gmail.com [1], suharto_teguh@unipma.ac.id [2], ermiadriani@unipma.ac.id [3]

Abstract: This classroom action research aimed to improve fifth-grade students' deep reading of scientific texts on soil degradation through repetition-based instruction supported by complementary strategies. The study involved eight students across two cycles following a pre-cycle assessment. In Cycle I, students practiced independent repeated reading. In Cycle II, instruction was revised by incorporating choral reading, peer tutoring, flowcharts in student worksheets, and concrete objects familiar to students, including gutters and drainage systems. The results showed that the mean score increased from 60.9 at pre-cycle to 67.9 in Cycle I and 79.6 in Cycle II. Classical mastery rates also increased from 37.5% to 50.0% and 87.5%, respectively. Independent repetition produced limited gains, whereas the combined strategies in Cycle II yielded greater and more varied improvements, particularly among students with lower initial abilities, whose gains reached 31.2 points. The score range narrowed from 43.8 to 31.2 points, although one student remained below the mastery threshold. The originality of this study lies in identifying a pattern in which enriching repetition with social interaction, visualization, and concrete objects may improve deep reading while reducing achievement disparities among students. These findings highlight the importance of multimodal, adaptive reading instruction and targeted support for students who have not achieved mastery.

Keywords: School Environment, Visual Media, Read-Aloud, Repetition Method, Classroom Action Research.

INTRODUCTION

Reading aloud is more than decoding print into sound: it integrates pronunciation, stress, intonation, and rhythm, and it is the public face of literacy in classrooms and communities (Tarigan, 2017). Children who read aloud confidently can take part in school discussions, family routines, and civic life, which makes oral reading a social competence as well as a cognitive one. Reading proficiency is also the main gateway to quality education and knowledge access (Arsyad, 2019). In Indonesian primary education, fluent and expressive reading is therefore expected to be consolidated by the upper grades, so that students can move from learning to read to reading to learn.

Research consistently shows that fluency develops through guided, repeated practice rather than a single exposure (Reed et al., 2019; Datchuk & Hier, 2019). Upper-primary students also remain in a transitional stage between concrete and abstract thinking, so instruction is most meaningful when it is anchored in objects students can see and touch (Sanjaya, 2022). An ideal reading-aloud lesson thus combines structured repetition with contextual, concrete stimuli, in an interactive setting where students are active participants.

The reality in the observed classroom is far from this ideal. Preliminary observation in Grade V at a public elementary school in Magetan Regency, Indonesia, showed that Indonesian-language achievement was lowest in reading (mean = 50), below listening (59.6), writing (62), and speaking (64.2), and far below the minimum mastery criterion (KKM) of 75. Because the data come from one class of eight students, they are descriptive evidence of a local problem, not a population estimate.

This pattern is not isolated. In PISA 2022, Indonesian 15-year-old students averaged 359 points in reading, far below the OECD average of 476 and 12 points lower than in 2018 (OECD, 2023). Among Southeast Asian participants, Indonesia ranked sixth, behind Singapore, Vietnam, Brunei, Malaysia, and Thailand. The 2025 cycle, reported in September 2026, shows a modest gain to 365 points (Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, as cited in RRI, 2026), which still leaves reading performance well below the 2022 OECD average. Although PISA assesses secondary-level students rather than Grade V pupils, these results indicate a nationally weak reading base, and comprehension difficulties of the kind observed in this class plausibly begin in the primary grades.

Observation indicated that students read monotonously, ignoring pronunciation, intonation, punctuation, and pauses. Many read in a barely

audible voice and read aloud only when instructed. Instruction was largely one-directional, with the teacher delivering content while students listened, and low motivation and attention accompanied weak oral performance. These conditions suggest that the problem lies partly in how reading practice is organized, not only in students' ability.

Repetition, defined as deliberate, repeated practice intended to consolidate association and make a skill permanent (Roestiyah, 2017), has a long empirical and theoretical basis, from Ebbinghaus's (1885/1913) work on memory retention to repeated-reading research showing gains in fluency and comprehension (Samuels, 1979; National Reading Panel, 2000). In Indonesian primary classrooms, Wulandari (2020) found that repetition significantly improved Grade V students' ability to extract information from fairy tales (experimental mean = 88.2 vs. control = 62.86), and Ufa (2021) reported improved reading-aloud scores in Grade II through two classroom action research cycles (Landreth & Young, 2021; Tavakoli et al., 2016).

Visual media support learning by presenting abstract content in concrete form, consistent with dual-coding theory (Dogomeo, 2022), and are especially suitable for concrete-operational learners (Arsyad, 2017). Place-based and environment-based learning extends this idea by using students' immediate surroundings as a learning resource, which strengthens relevance, motivation, and attachment to community (Demirhan et al., 2026; Mustikasari et al., 2022).

Three gaps emerge from this body of work. First, repetition studies in Indonesian primary classrooms tend to use conventional or text-based materials and rarely consider where the content comes from. Second, environment-based media studies mostly target motivation or conceptual understanding in science and social studies, not oral reading fluency. Third, little is known about how structured repetition and school-surrounding visual media work together in reading-aloud instruction in an under-resourced rural school. Wulandari (2020) relied on a quantitative design, and Ufa (2021) examined Grade II without environment-based media, so neither addresses this combination.

This study contributes in three ways. It integrates structured repetition with visual media drawn from students' own school surroundings (photographs of local objects, agricultural land, and community structures) as the content for reading-aloud practice. It targets Grade V, where students are transitioning toward abstract thinking, in a school with limited land and facilities. It also measures progress with a four-indicator performance rubric (pronunciation, intonation, fluency, and voice clarity) across pre-cycle and

two action cycles, together with teacher and student activity, rather than relying on a single test score.

The study is urgent for three reasons. Weak oral reading in primary school restricts later learning in every subject, so delay compounds over time. Schools in resource-limited rural areas need low-cost, contextual strategies that do not depend on commercial materials or large facilities, and the school surroundings are free and always available. In addition, community-rooted literacy practice fits the educational mission of strengthening social participation through basic literacy, so evidence from this setting can inform teachers and school leaders facing similar conditions.

This study therefore aims to describe (1) how repetition assisted by visual media from the school surroundings improves Grade V students' reading-aloud skills, and (2) the learning outcomes achieved after two action research cycles, including pronunciation, intonation, fluency, and voice clarity.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative approach. To achieve the research objectives, the researcher entered the field directly to collect data and analyzed them throughout the research process. The study was designed as classroom action research (CAR).

Time and Place

The study was conducted over five months, from February to June 2026, at SD Negeri Poncol 1, Poncol District, Magetan Regency.

Participants

The participants were eight Grade V students. They were selected because the researcher serves as the Grade V homeroom teacher at the research site.

Procedure

The CAR was implemented cyclically, with each cycle integrating the stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection. These stages were repeated continuously until the intended improvement was achieved. The study comprised a pre-cycle, Cycle I, and Cycle II.

Data, Instruments, and Data Collection Techniques

This study focused on improving the reading-aloud skills of Grade V students at SD Negeri Poncol 1, Poncol District, Magetan Regency, through the repetition method assisted by visual media from the school surroundings. The quality of learning activities was considered improved when: (1) *Student engagement*: at least 75% of students actively participated in observing the environment and in question-and-answer sessions during the repetition process; (2) *Enthusiasm*: students showed high interest (no visible boredom) during repeated practice because the media used were varied; and (3) *Independence*: students could identify visual information in the school environment without full assistance from the teacher.

Improvement in reading-aloud skills was not judged subjectively but was based on measurable performance indicators. Reading-aloud skills were considered improved when: (1) *Pronunciation*: students pronounced words clearly and correctly; (2) *Intonation*: students adjusted pitch in accordance with punctuation marks; (3) *Fluency*: students read the text without stammering or pausing frequently at inappropriate places; and (4) *Voice clarity*: students' voices were clearly audible to the entire audience in the classroom, delivered loudly and with confidence.

The data collection techniques used to measure the quality of learning activities are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Data Collection Framework for the Quality of Learning Activities

Aspect of Quality Measured	Data Collection Technique	Instrument
Student activity and engagement	Observation	Student observation sheet
Teacher's teaching ability	Observation	Teacher observation sheet
Students' responses and feelings	Interview / questionnaire	Interview guide / questionnaire
Evidence of implementation	Documentation	Photographs, videos, field notes

For the second research question, which focuses on learning outcomes, namely reading-aloud skills, the data collection technique had to measure students' fluency, accuracy, and intonation objectively. Therefore, a performance test was used. To maintain objectivity and minimize researcher bias, the performance test employed a reading-aloud assessment sheet (rubric) with the following indicators: (1) *Pronunciation*: does the student pronounce letters and words correctly? (2) *Intonation*: does the pitch rise and fall in accordance with punctuation? (3) *Fluency*: does the student read

smoothly or still hesitantly? and (4) *Voice clarity (volume)*: can the student's voice be heard clearly by the audience? To ensure the objectivity of the results, the same rubric was used in the pre-cycle, Cycle I, and Cycle II. However, the texts used in each test differed while maintaining equivalent readability, in order to avoid memorization effects. The rubric is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Framework of the Reading-Aloud Assessment Instrument

No.	Assessment Criterion	Score (1–4)	Observation Notes
1	Articulation/pronunciation		Clarity of consonant and vowel pronunciation
2	Intonation		Match between pitch and punctuation (. , ! ?)
3	Fluency		Reasonable reading pace (not halting)
4	Voice volume/expression		Students' expressiveness in conveying the text

Scoring key:

- Score 4: very clear / very accurate / very fluent
- Score 3: clear / accurate / fluent (with minor errors)
- Score 2: less clear / monotonous / hesitant
- Score 1: unclear / inaccurate / halting

Data Analysis

Data were collected through observation of teachers and students, student interviews, and documentation. Teacher and student activity data were obtained from observation sheets completed during the lessons and analyzed using percentage formulas to determine students' participation and the consistency between the lesson plan and its implementation. To assess the success of the actions taken by the teacher and students, the observation results were converted into a standard rating scale, with percentage intervals and rating categories for teacher and student observations adopted from Arikunto (2018: 281).

Interview data on the quality of learning activities could not be analyzed using numbers alone, so qualitative analysis was applied following Miles and Huberman's model (data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/ verification), carried out in the following steps:

1. *Data transcription.* The researcher converted the recorded interviews with

Grade V students at SD Negeri Poncol 1 into written transcripts. All students' responses were recorded verbatim to preserve the authenticity of their impressions of the repetition method and the environmental visual media.

2. *Data reduction.* Because interview data are typically extensive and repetitive, the researcher selected the data by (a) retaining responses relevant to the indicators of learning activity quality (e.g., engagement, enthusiasm, and understanding); (b) simplifying students' convoluted statements into core points; and (c) discarding information unrelated to the research focus.
3. *Data display.* After reduction, the data were presented systematically so that they were easy to read and understand, to help the researcher see the overall picture of the phenomenon, understand patterns of relationships among variables, and plan the next stage of drawing conclusions. The data were presented as (a) narrative text describing students' feelings and involvement while learning to read aloud, and (b) summary matrices/ tables comparing responses across students (e.g., higher- versus lower-ability students) regarding the effectiveness of the environmental visual media.
4. *Conclusion drawing and verification.* The researcher interpreted the displayed data. (a) If the interviews showed that most students felt more confident in reading aloud because they repeatedly practiced texts from the school environment, it was concluded that the quality of learning activities had improved. (b) This initial conclusion was verified against other data, such as the observation results, through triangulation.

Data were collected through performance tests and checklists. Before the cycles began, an initial performance test was administered to measure students' reading-aloud ability and to identify where difficulties lay, whether in articulation, sentence segmentation, or other aspects. The initial test results were analyzed to map students' baseline abilities and then compared with the post-test results of each cycle using comparative descriptive analysis. The researcher calculated the class mean (M) and the percentage of mastery (P) to determine whether an upward trend emerged after the intervention. This analysis aimed to determine whether the reading-aloud learning outcomes of students improved using visual media from the school surroundings in Indonesian-language lessons.

To examine improvement in the performance test, the pre-cycle, Cycle I, and Cycle II results were reported in tabular form, and descriptive statistics were used to determine the magnitude of improvement in reading-aloud

skills. Data from the reading-aloud checklist were analyzed to examine changes in students' mean scores on each indicator (pronunciation, intonation, fluency, and punctuation) according to the established rubric. Each student's final score was then calculated using the following formula:

Score = (Obtained score / Maximum score) × 100%

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

No	Student Name	Pre-Cycle	Remarks	Cycle I	Remarks	Cycle II	Remarks	Final Result
1	S-1	87.5	Mastered	93.7	Mastered	93.7	Mastered	Mastered
2	S-2	50	Not yet mastered	56.2	Not yet mastered	68.7	Mastered	Mastered
3	S-3	62.5	Not yet mastered	68.7	Mastered	81.2	Mastered	Mastered
4	S-4	68.7	Mastered	75	Mastered	87.5	Mastered	Mastered
5	S-5	43.7	Not yet mastered	50	Not yet mastered	68.7	Mastered	Mastered
6	S-6	81.2	Mastered	87.5	Mastered	93.7	Mastered	Mastered
7	S-7	50	Not yet mastered	62.5	Not yet mastered	81.2	Mastered	Mastered
8	S-8	43.7	Not yet mastered	50	Not yet mastered	62.5	Not yet mastered	Not yet mastered

Table 4. Summary of Learning Outcomes across Cycles

No	Description	Pre-Cycle	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	Total Score	487.3	543.6	637.2
2	Mean Score	60.9	67.9	79.6
3	Number of Students Who Mastered the Material	3	4	7
4	Classical Mastery Percentage	37.5%	50.0%	87.5%

The quantitative data collected from the pre-cycle, Cycle I, and Cycle II stages show a substantial increase in students' learning outcomes and classical mastery in deep reading instruction using the repetition method. At the pre-cycle stage, students' initial ability was a serious concern: the mean score was only 60.9, below the mastery level, and classical mastery stood at 37.5%, with only 3 students reaching mastery.

After the intervention in Cycle I, students' academic performance began to rise, with the mean score increasing to 67.9 and classical mastery growing to 50.0% (4 students mastered the material). After the learning scenario

was revised in Cycle II, learning outcomes accelerated markedly. The class mean rose to 79.6, and classical mastery climbed to 87.5% (7 students mastered the material). This consistently upward trend provides empirical evidence that the interventions delivered from cycle-to-cycle raised students' learning outcomes steadily.

Decomposing the gains shows that progress was not evenly distributed across the two cycles. The class mean rose by 7.0 points from the pre-cycle to Cycle I and by a further 11.7 points from Cycle I to Cycle II, for a cumulative gain of 18.7 points, so the mean gain in Cycle II was about 1.7 times that of Cycle I. Classical mastery increased by 12.5 percentage points in Cycle I and by 37.5 percentage points in Cycle II, a combined gain of 50 percentage points. By the end of Cycle II, classical mastery exceeded the 75% benchmark commonly adopted in classroom action research, whereas Cycle I (50.0%) had fallen short of it.

The first unique finding concerns the form that improvement took in Cycle I. Seven of the eight students gained almost the same amount, between 6.2 and 6.3 points (S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, S-6, and S-8). Only S-7 gained more, at 12.5 points. Because this increment is consistent with a one-item difference on a 16-item instrument, the pattern suggests that repeated individual reading produced a small, almost uniform improvement rather than a differentiated one.

The second unique finding is that the gains became differentiated in Cycle II. S-1 did not change (0 points), and S-6 gained 6.2 points. S-2, S-3, S-4, and S-8 each gained 12.5 points, while S-5 and S-7 each gained 18.7 points. In other words, the revised scenario did not simply amplify the effect of Cycle I. It changed the distribution of gains, and the students who started lowest benefited most.

The third unique finding is that cumulative gains from the pre-cycle to Cycle II were broadly inverse to initial ability. S-7 (initial score 50) gained 31.2 points and S-5 (initial score 43.7) gained 25.0 points, the two largest gains in the class. S-2 and S-3 each gained 18.7 points, S-4 and S-8 each gained 18.8 points, S-6 gained 12.5 points, and S-1, the highest-scoring student at baseline, gained only 6.2 points. This pattern indicates a compensatory effect, in which the intervention benefited weaker readers more than stronger ones.

The fourth unique finding concerns the timing at which students crossed the mastery threshold. Four students changed status during the study, but they did so very unevenly: only one student (S-3) crossed in Cycle I, whereas three students (S-2, S-5, and S-7) crossed in Cycle II. S-3's crossing was

marginal, a one-item gain from 62.5 to 68.7. Notably, S-7 posted the largest gain of any student in Cycle I (12.5 points) yet still ended that cycle one item below the threshold. This shows that the size of a gain and a change in mastery status can be decoupled, and that the Cycle I design alone was not enough to move most of the lower-scoring students across the line.

The fifth unique finding is that one student, S-8, did not reach mastery despite steady progress (43.7, 50, then 62.5). The gains of 6.3 and 12.5 points were like those of S-8's peers, but the starting point was among the lowest in the class. The final score of 62.5 was one item short of 68.7, the lowest score classified as mastered in this data set. This indicates that the problem was a persistent gap rather than a lack of response to the intervention.

The sixth unique finding is a probable ceiling effect at the top of the distribution. S-1 scored 93.7 in both Cycle I and Cycle II, and S-6 reached the same score in Cycle II. With the two strongest readers at 93.7, which is likely one item below the maximum, the instrument had little room left to register further growth among high achievers. The flat trajectory of S-1 therefore reflects the limits of the instrument rather than the absence of learning.

The seventh unique finding is that the spread of scores narrowed. The lowest score in the class rose from 43.7 in the pre-cycle to 62.5 in Cycle II, a gain of 18.8 points, while the highest rose only from 87.5 to 93.7, a gain of 6.2 points. The range therefore shrank from 43.8 points to 31.2 points. Taken together, the results show three distinctive patterns: mastery gains that accelerated threefold in the second cycle, a compensatory benefit for low-achieving readers, and a narrowing of the gap between the strongest and weakest students.

Discussion

The improvement in learning outcomes in Cycle II was a direct result of the teacher's accurate evaluation and correction of the root problems in the earlier cycles. In the pre-cycle and Cycle I, low scores were caused by cognitive overload. The scientific text on "soil degradation" was too long and too abstract, and students became bored from repeating the reading alone. Students were also slow to find keywords because they had no visual aid for mapping environmental cause-and-effect relationships. These findings are consistent with cognitive load theory (Wang et al., 2026; Sweller & Chandler, 1994), which holds that learning falters when the demands of a task exceed the limited capacity of working memory, especially when the material is dense and its structure is not made explicit.

The jump in Cycle II (mean 79.6, mastery 87.5%) occurred because these barriers were removed through three main strategies: differentiated interaction, visualization of text logic, and concretization of the observed object. The strategies were not added in isolation. Each was designed to address a specific weakness identified in Cycle I, which reflects the reflective, iterative logic of classroom action research (Assingkily, 2021), in which each cycle's reflection becomes the next cycle's planning.

The first strategy, differentiated interaction, combined choral reading with peer tutoring in paired reading. It reduced the boredom of solitary repetition and helped students with below-average ability catch up with the support of their peers. This is consistent with Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development, in which a more capable peer helps a learner perform a task slightly beyond what the learner could manage alone. It also agrees with Silalahi (2019), who reported that structured peer tutoring in reading benefits tutees and tutors alike. The compensatory pattern found in this study, where S-7 and S-5 gained the most, fits this interpretation.

The second strategy was a flow-diagram visual added to the student worksheet (LKPD). It helped fifth-grade students find keywords and map cause-and-effect relationships logically using the conjunctions "because," "so," and "therefore." This corresponds to dual coding theory (Paivio, 1986) which holds that learners understand more deeply when verbal information is paired with a corresponding visual representation. The diagram externalized the causal structure of the text, so students no longer had to hold every relationship in working memory, which directly reduced the cognitive overload diagnosed earlier.

The third strategy was concretization. Shifting the focus of environmental observation from broad phenomena to concrete objects close to students' daily lives, namely gutters and drainage, made an abstract scientific text far easier to understand. In Kintsch's (2018) construction-integration model, comprehension is achieved when readers integrate the text base with prior knowledge to build a coherent situation model. Familiar objects supplied that prior knowledge. Once students' grasp of the concept was complete, their ability to answer the assessment items rose accordingly.

The modest and nearly uniform gains in Cycle I align with the classic literature on repeated reading. Bouguebs (2026) argued that repetition builds automaticity in decoding, which frees attentional resources for comprehension. Shahini (2025) operationalized this in the method of repeated readings, and the National Reading Panel later concluded that guided repeated oral reading improves fluency and comprehension. However, the

review by Wolf (2018) indicates that repeated reading is more effective when it includes feedback and modeling from another person. This helps explain why repetition alone produced roughly a one-item improvement for most students in Cycle I, with only one student crossing the mastery threshold, and why adding interaction and visual scaffolding in Cycle II produced a much larger jump in both mean score and mastery.

The strong gains of the weakest readers also support the argument that scaffolding works best when it targets the point of greatest need. Students such as S-5 and S-7 began with low scores, likely because their reading effort was absorbed by laborious processing and unstructured text, leaving little capacity for comprehension. When choral reading provided a fluent model, the diagram supplied structure, and familiar objects supplied meaning, the barriers that had constrained them were removed together. This explains why the same intervention yielded gains of 25.0 to 31.2 points for these students but only 6.2 points for S-1, and why three of the four status changes occurred only after the Cycle II revision.

The plateau among the strongest students, S-1 and S-6, can be interpreted in two ways. The first is the instrument ceiling noted in the Results, since both students had reached 93.7. The second is the expertise reversal effect described by Castro-Alonso et al. (2021) and Kalyuga et al. (1998), in which instructional supports that help novices become redundant, or even slightly burdensome, for learners who already process the material efficiently. For these students, the diagram and peer reading may have provided little additional benefit. The finding suggests that fixed scaffolds should be faded or replaced with extension tasks for advanced readers.

The persistence of S-8 below mastery is best understood through the Simple View of Reading (Castro-Alonso et al., 2021), which holds that comprehension is the product of decoding and language comprehension. A student who is still consolidating one or both components may need more cycles of support, or more targeted support, than the group-level design offers. The steady upward trajectory of S-8 suggests that the intervention was working, but the gap at the starting point was too large to close within two cycles. This finding cautions against interpreting a high classical mastery rate as success for every learner.

The narrowing of the score range also has theoretical significance. The intervention appears to have acted as an equalizer, raising the floor of the class more than the ceiling. This is consistent with the view that deep reading depends not only on fluency but also on the ability to build coherent causal representations from text (Kintsch, 2018). By making causal

connectives and relationships visible and concrete, the intervention gave weaker readers access to the same reasoning pathways that stronger readers already used. Overall, the findings suggest that repetition is effective for deep reading only when it is paired with social, visual, and concrete scaffolds: repetition offers the opportunity for automaticity, peer interaction supplies motivation and modeling, diagrams supply structure, and concrete objects supply meaning.

The findings have several practical implications. Teachers who use repeated reading for scientific texts should not rely on repetition alone, because Cycle I shows that solitary repetition yields only small and uniform gains. Reading instruction should instead combine repetition with collaborative formats such as choral reading and peer tutoring, visual organizers that reveal the causal structure of the text, and examples drawn from students' immediate environment. For schools, the compensatory pattern suggests that this approach is a promising option for classes with wide ability gaps, since it benefits the weakest readers the most. For curriculum designers, the study supports integrating cause-and-effect conjunctions and diagram-based worksheets into upper-primary science and language materials.

This study has several limitations. First, it was conducted with only eight students in one fifth-grade class, so the findings cannot be generalized to other populations, and each student accounts for 12.5 percentage points of classical mastery, making the percentages highly sensitive to individual results. Second, there was no control group, so the gains cannot be attributed solely to the intervention, as maturation, familiarity with the test, or practice effects may have contributed. Third, the evidence consists of test scores, and the observed ceiling effect indicates that the instrument could not capture further growth among high achievers. Fourth, the design bundled several strategies (choral reading, peer tutoring, flow-diagram visuals, and concrete objects) into one revision, so it is not possible to determine which strategy contributed most to the Cycle II gains. Finally, the study ran for only two cycles and did not measure retention after the intervention ended.

Future researchers are encouraged to use larger samples and quasi-experimental or experimental designs with control groups so that the effect of the intervention can be estimated more rigorously. They should also test the strategies separately, for example in factorial designs that isolate the contributions of peer tutoring, visual diagrams, and concretization, and administer delayed post-tests to examine retention. Instruments with more items or higher difficulty levels are recommended to avoid ceiling effects,

and qualitative data such as observations, interviews, and think-aloud protocols could clarify how students use the scaffolds. Teachers are advised to provide additional individualized support, for example targeted vocabulary or decoding work, for students like S-8 who need more than group-level instruction, and to fade scaffolds or add enrichment tasks for advanced readers.

CONCLUSION

This classroom action research shows that the repetition method for deep reading can raise fifth-grade students' learning outcomes substantially when it is complemented by differentiated interaction (choral reading and peer tutoring), flow-diagram visualization of cause-and-effect logic, and concrete, familiar objects (gutters and drainage). The mean score rose from 60.9 in the pre-cycle to 67.9 in Cycle I and 79.6 in Cycle II, while classical mastery increased from 37.5% to 50.0% and then 87.5%. The unique findings were that Cycle I produced modest, nearly uniform gains, that Cycle II tripled the mastery gain and produced differentiated gains that favored the weakest readers (up to 31.2 points), that the strongest readers plateaued near the instrument ceiling, and that the spread of scores narrowed from 43.8 to 31.2 points.

The implications are that repetition works best as one component of a scaffolded design rather than as a stand-alone technique, and that such a design can function as an equalizer in classes with wide ability gaps. We recommend that teachers combine repetition with collaborative reading formats, visual organizers, and examples from students' surroundings, provide additional targeted support for students who remain below mastery, and fade scaffolds for advanced readers. Future research should test these components separately with larger samples, control groups, and delayed measures of retention.

REFERENCES

Altrichter, Alipandie, I. (2016). *Didaktik Metodik*. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.

Arikunto, S. (2018). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Arsyad, A. (2017). *Media Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Arsyad, A. (2019). *Media Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada. (Referensi fundamental media visual).

Assingkily, M. S. (2021). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas: Membenahi Pendidikan dari*

Kelas. Medan: Pusdikra Mitra Jaya.

Bouguebs, R. (2026). From Decoding to Understanding: Applying Automaticity Theory to Develop Fluent University-Level EFL Readers. *Studies in Linguistics and Language Education*, *2*(1), 229-239. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/298795.

Castro-Alonso, J. C., De Koning, B. B., Fiorella, L., & Paas, F. (2021). Five strategies for optimizing instructional materials: Instructor-and learner-managed cognitive load. *Educational Psychology Review*, *33*(4), 1379-1407. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10648-021-09606-9.

Datchuk, S. M., & Hier, B. O. (2019). Fluency practice: Techniques for building automaticity in foundational knowledge and skills. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *51*(6), 424-435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059919847213.

Demirhan, E., Orhan, U., Mýsýr, M. E., & Beþoluk, Þ. (2026). Science Teachers' Perspectives on Locality and Place-Based Education. *Research in Science Education*, *56*(3), 815-838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-025-10297-3.

Djamarah, S. B. (2010). *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Dogomeo, J. (2022). Dual coding cognition in devising infographics for an enhanced students' scientific knowledge. *International Journal of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics*, *2*(4), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.53378/352926.

Ebbinghaus, H. (1885/1913). *Memory: A Contribution to Experimental Psychology*. (Terjemahan). New York: Teachers College

Fadillah, M. (2022). *Desain Pembelajaran Paud: Tinjauan Teoretik dan Praktik*. Jogjakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.

Fathurrohman & Sutikno. (2020). *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.

Tarigan, H. G. (2017). *Membaca nyaring Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.

Harun, M., dkk. (2017). *Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Universitas Syiah Kuala Banda Aceh: Bumi Aksara.

Iskandarwasid &Sunendar. (2009). *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Kalyuga, S., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1998). Levels of expertise and instructional design. *Human factors*, *40*(1), 1-17. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1518/001872098779480587.

Kintsch, W. (2018). Revisiting the Construction-Integration Model of Text Comprehension and its. *Theoretical models and processes of literacy*.

Landreth, S. J., & Young, C. (2021). Developing fluency and comprehension

with the secondary fluency routine. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *114*(3), 252-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2021.1910475.

Moleong, L. J. (2017). Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mulyasa. (2019). Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Revisi Dalam Era Revolusi. Industri 4.0. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Mustikasari, A., dkk. (2022). *Pemanfaatan Lingkungan Sekolah sebagai Media Pembelajaran untuk Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Siswa*. Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar. (Rujukan terbaru mengenai dampak psikologis media lingkungan).

Nata, A. (2021). *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Kencana.

Paivio, A. (1986). Dual coding theory: mental representation. *A Dual Coding Approach*. https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1574231874901563904.

Partowisastro, K. (2016). *Diagnosa dan Pemecahan Kesulitan Belajar*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Reed, D. K., Zimmermann, L. M., Reeger, A. J., & Aloe, A. M. (2019). The effects of varied practice on the oral reading fluency of fourth-grade students. *Journal of School Psychology*, *77*, 24-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.10.003.

Roestiyah, N. K. (2017). *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.

Rusman. (2020). *Model-Model Pembelajaran*. Jakarta : PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sadiman, A., dkk. (2019). *Media Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sanjaya, W. (2022). *Media Komunikasi Pembelajara.* Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.

Sanjaya, W. (2021). *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kencana.

Setyaningrum, W. (2021). *Rangkuman Materi Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Javalitera.

Shahini, A. (2025). Automaticity in Language Learning. In *Language Learning Theories: A Student's Guide* (pp. 121-138). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-92210-7_8.

Silalahi, R. M. (2019). Understanding Vygotsky's zone of proximal development for learning. *Polyglot: Jurnal Ilmiah*, *15*(2), 169-186. https://doi.org/10.19166/pji.v15i2.1544.

Sudjana, Nana. (2016). *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sundayana, R. (2020). *Media dan Alat Peraga dalam Pembelajaran Matematika*

(dan pembelajaran umum). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suryabrata, S. (2016). *Metode Penelitian*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Suwarna., dkk. (2019). *Metode Belajar Tingkat Dasar*. Semarang: Aksara.

Sweller, J., & Chandler, P. (1994). Why some material is difficult to learn. *Cognition and instruction*, *12*(3), 185-233. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1203_1.

Tavakoli, P., Campbell, C., & McCormack, J. (2016). Development of speech fluency over a short period of time: Effects of pedagogic intervention. *Tesol Quarterly*, *50*(2), 447-471. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.244.

Uno, H. B., dkk. (2019). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Bandung: MSQ Publishing.

Wang, P., Liu, H., Zou, L., & Paas, F. (2026). Overloaded minds and machines: A cognitive load framework for human-AI symbiosis. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, *59*(3), 109. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10462-026-11510-z.

Wolf, G. M. (2018). Developing reading automaticity and fluency: Revisiting what reading teachers know, putting confirmed research into current practice. *Creative Education*, *9*(6), 838-855. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2018.96062.