



THE EFFECTIVENESS OF READING AND WRITING LITERACY ACTIVITIES IN IMPROVING UPPER GRADE STUDENTS' READING AND WRITING SKILLS AT PRIMARY SCHOOL

Nandang Kosim

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Syekh Manshur (STAISMAN) Pandeglang, Indonesia
E-mail: nandangkosim14@gmail.com

Submit: 23 April 2026, **Revision:** 5 Mei 2026, **Approve:** 7 Mei 2026

Abstract

This study examined the planning and implementation of reading-writing literacy activities and their effect on upper-grade students' reading and writing skills at Irsyadul Ibad Integrated Islamic Elementary School, Pandeglang. A quasi-experimental design with a non-equivalent control group was employed, involving experimental and control groups selected without random assignment. Data were collected using classroom observation sheets and reading and writing skill tests. The observation results showed that the instructional planning and implementation were aligned with the principles and procedures of reading-writing literacy, including guided reading, text-based discussion, written response, and structured writing practice. The statistical analysis indicated a significant difference in students' reading and writing skills, with a probability value of 0.001, which was lower than the significance level of 0.05. These findings demonstrate that reading-writing literacy activities had a significant effect on improving upper-grade students' reading and writing skills. The study implies that systematically planned and consistently implemented reading-writing literacy activities can be used as an effective instructional strategy to strengthen literacy learning in elementary schools.

Keywords: reading-writing literacy, reading skills, writing skills, quasi-experiment, elementary school.

Quotation: Kosim, Nandang. (2026). The Effectiveness of Reading And Writing Literacy Activities in Improving Upper Grade Students' Reading and Writing Skills At Primary School. *JMIE: Journal of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Education*, 10 (1), 2026, 212-225. [jmie.v10i1.950](https://doi.org/10.32934/jmie.v10i1.950).

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32934/jmie.v10i1.950>

INTRODUCTION

Literacy education in elementary schools is expected to help students gradually develop the ability to understand texts, organize ideas, and communicate meaning through writing. At this level, reading and writing are not only basic language skills, but also essential foundations for learning across subjects. Therefore, literacy instruction needs to be planned as a meaningful, systematic, and continuous classroom practice. Students should be given opportunities to read various texts, discuss their meanings, respond to what they read, and express their understanding in written form. When reading and writing activities are integrated into daily learning, literacy becomes part of students' thinking process rather than merely a routine school assignment.

In Indonesia, the issue of literacy remains a major educational concern. Previous studies have shown that students' reading interest and literacy performance are still relatively low, as reflected in national and international surveys (UNESCO, 2012; Miller & McKenna, 2016; OECD, 2019). Other findings also indicate that the average number of books read by Indonesians remains limited (Perpustakaan Nasional RI, 2017; Yarmi & Mutiasih, 2018). These conditions suggest that literacy challenges are not only related to students' reading habits, but also to the way literacy is developed through classroom instruction. For elementary school students, especially those in the upper grades, reading and writing activities need to be strengthened because they are already expected to move beyond basic decoding skills toward deeper comprehension, idea organization, and written expression.

Several Indonesian scholars have examined literacy practices and literacy programs at the elementary school level (Musthafa, 2014; Cahyono & Ardhyantama, 2020). Their studies provide important insights into how literacy can be promoted through school programs and classroom activities. However, many of these studies still focus on general elementary school contexts. Research that specifically examines literacy instruction in Integrated Islamic Elementary Schools, or Sekolah Dasar Islam Terpadu (SDIT), remains limited. This context is important because SDITs have particular educational characteristics, including the integration of general knowledge, religious values, school culture, character formation, and local social contexts.

In addition, previous studies have not sufficiently examined how structured reading and writing literacy activities are planned, implemented, observed, and tested empirically in the SDIT context. Many literacy studies tend to describe program implementation, but do not always provide experimental evidence regarding its effect on students' reading and writing skills. This creates a research gap, particularly in rural or semi-urban areas such as Pandeglang, where empirical studies on literacy instruction in Islamic elementary schools are still needed. Thus, it is important to investigate not only whether literacy activities are implemented, but also whether they significantly improve students' reading and writing skills.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on structured reading and writing literacy activities in an Integrated Islamic Elementary School by examining three interconnected aspects:

instructional planning, classroom implementation, and students' literacy outcomes. Unlike studies that only describe literacy programs, this research adopts a quasi-experimental design to compare students' reading and writing skills between experimental and control classes. The study also connects literacy implementation with the principles of wholeness, integration, sustainability, contextuality, and responsiveness to local wisdom. These principles are reflected in the planning of instruction, the implementation of learning activities, and the observation of classroom practices.

Theoretically, the importance of reading and writing literacy in elementary education can be understood through students' cognitive development. Piaget (1972) and Santrock (2018) explain that elementary school students are in a developmental stage where concrete thinking begins to move toward more logical reasoning. This stage is appropriate for strengthening reading and writing because students begin to process information, connect ideas, and express their understanding more systematically. Reading and writing should also be seen as mutually reinforcing skills. Graham and Hebert (2011) found that writing about texts, teaching writing, and increasing writing activities can improve students' reading comprehension. Graham et al. (2018a) also showed that reading interventions can support students' writing performance, while Graham et al. (2018b) found that literacy programs balancing reading and writing instruction have positive effects on both reading and writing outcomes. Similarly, Kim et al. (2018) demonstrated that reading and writing are developmentally related across elementary grades. These findings strengthen the assumption that literacy instruction will be more effective when reading and writing are taught in an integrated and sustained manner.

Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the planning and implementation of reading and writing literacy activities and to examine their effectiveness in improving the reading and writing skills of upper-grade students at SDIT Irsyadul Ibad Pandeglang. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the development of literacy instruction in Islamic elementary schools, particularly in designing learning activities that are structured, contextual, continuous, and responsive to students' learning needs and socio-cultural environment. Practically, this study may also provide useful insights for teachers, school leaders, and literacy program developers in strengthening reading and writing instruction as an integral part of classroom learning.

METHODE

This study employed a quasi-experimental design using a non-equivalent control group model. This design was selected because the experimental and control groups were formed from existing classes and were not randomly assigned. The design allowed the researcher to compare students' reading and writing skills before and after the implementation of structured reading and writing literacy activities. Both the experimental and control groups were given a pretest to

identify their initial reading and writing skills. After the pretest, the experimental group received structured reading and writing literacy activities, while the control group received regular reading and writing instruction as usually conducted by the teacher. At the end of the intervention, both groups were given a posttest to examine differences in students' reading and writing skills.

The research was conducted at Sekolah Dasar Islam Terpadu (SDIT) Irsyadul Ibad, located in Saruni Village, Majasari Subdistrict, Pandeglang Regency. The school was selected purposively because it represents an Integrated Islamic Elementary School that implements literacy activities in classroom learning and serves students in a semi-urban educational context. The population of this study consisted of all students of SDIT Irsyadul Ibad Pandeglang, totaling 619 students. The sample consisted of upper-grade students from Grades IV, V, and VI, with a total of 291 students. The sample was determined using purposive sampling because these grade levels were considered developmentally appropriate for measuring reading comprehension and writing skills. Based on the statistical data reported in the results section, the sample distribution included 86 Grade IV students, 101 Grade V students, and 104 Grade VI students.

The research procedure consisted of four main stages. The first stage was instructional planning. At this stage, the researcher collaborated with teachers of Grades IV, V, and VI to prepare lesson plans for reading and writing literacy instruction. The planning process focused on aligning the concept, principles, and procedures of literacy-based instruction. The lesson plans were developed based on the principles of wholeness, integration, sustainability, contextuality, and responsiveness to local wisdom.

The second stage was the pretest. The pretest was administered to both the experimental and control groups to measure students' initial reading and writing skills before the intervention. The reading test was used to measure students' ability to understand texts, identify important information, and interpret meaning. The writing test was used to measure students' ability to organize ideas, construct sentences, and express written responses based on the given task.

The third stage was the implementation of the intervention. In the experimental classes, students participated in structured reading and writing literacy activities. These activities included reading texts, identifying key ideas, discussing information from the text, writing summaries or responses, organizing ideas into written form, and receiving teacher feedback. The activities were implemented through the stages of classroom instruction, namely introduction, main learning activities, and closing. In the introduction stage, the teacher prepared students' learning readiness through orientation, apperception, motivation, and communication of learning objectives. In the main learning activities, reading and writing literacy was integrated with numeracy, science, digital literacy, financial literacy, cultural awareness, and civic values. In the closing stage, the teacher guided students to reflect on the lesson, summarize key points, and continue literacy practice through assignments. Meanwhile,

the control classes received regular instruction without the structured literacy intervention used in the experimental classes.

The fourth stage was the posttest. The posttest was administered after the intervention to measure students' reading and writing skills. The posttest results from the experimental and control groups were compared to determine whether structured reading and writing literacy activities had a significant effect on students' reading and writing skills.

The instruments used in this study consisted of observation sheets and reading and writing skill tests. The observation sheet was used to document the implementation of reading and writing literacy activities in both experimental and control classes. The observed aspects included the principles of wholeness, integration, sustainability, contextuality, and responsiveness to local wisdom. The reading and writing tests were used to measure students' literacy outcomes. The reading test focused on students' comprehension of texts, while the writing test focused on students' ability to express ideas in written form.

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to present the number of participants, minimum score, maximum score, mean score, and standard deviation of students' reading and writing test results. Before hypothesis testing, the data were examined through normality and homogeneity tests. The homogeneity of variance was tested using Levene's Test. After the assumptions were examined, an independent samples t-test was used to compare the posttest scores of the experimental and control groups. The analysis was conducted separately for Grade IV, Grade V, Grade VI, and the combined data of Grades IV–VI. The significance level was set at 0.05. If the significance value was lower than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a significant difference between the experimental and control groups.

The hypotheses tested in this study were formulated as follows. The null hypothesis (H_0) stated that there was no significant difference in reading and writing skills between students who participated in structured reading and writing literacy activities and those who received regular instruction. The alternative hypothesis (H_1) stated that there was a significant difference in reading and writing skills between students who participated in structured reading and writing literacy activities and those who received regular instruction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Planning and Implementation of Reading and Writing Literacy Activities

The implementation of reading and writing literacy activities in this study began with instructional planning. The planning stage was conducted collaboratively through a workshop involving the researcher and teachers of Grades IV, V, and VI. The workshop was not only intended to prepare lesson plans, but also to build a shared understanding of literacy-based

reading and writing instruction. In this stage, teachers discussed the principles, learning procedures, and classroom activities that would be used to strengthen students' reading and writing skills.

The planning of literacy instruction was based on five main principles: wholeness, integration, sustainability, contextuality, and responsiveness to local wisdom. These principles were used as the basis for designing lesson plans, classroom activities, and observation indicators. Reading and writing literacy was positioned as an integral part of learning rather than as an additional activity. Reading activities were designed to help students understand texts, identify important ideas, and connect information with their learning context. Writing activities were designed to help students organize ideas, write responses, and express meaning based on the texts they had read.

This planning is consistent with the view that reading and writing should not be treated as separate skills. Writing about texts, explicit writing instruction, and increased writing activities have been shown to improve students' reading comprehension and literacy performance (Graham & Hebert, 2011). Similarly, reading activities can support students' writing development because students are exposed to vocabulary, text structure, idea organization, and models of written language (Graham et al., 2018a). Therefore, literacy instruction that connects reading and writing is theoretically relevant for upper-grade elementary students.

The implementation of literacy activities was carried out through three stages: introduction, main learning activities, and closing. In the introduction stage, teachers prepared students' readiness through greeting, attendance checking, apperception, motivation, and explanation of learning objectives. These activities helped students connect their prior knowledge with the learning material. In the main learning activities, students were involved in reading texts, identifying key ideas, discussing information, writing summaries or responses, and receiving teacher feedback. Literacy activities were also connected with numeracy, science, digital literacy, financial literacy, cultural awareness, civic values, and local wisdom.

In the closing stage, teachers guided students to summarize the lesson, reflect on their learning, and continue reading and writing practice through assignments. This pattern shows that literacy activities were implemented as structured and continuous classroom practices. Balanced literacy instruction that integrates reading and writing has been found to produce positive effects on students' reading and writing outcomes (Graham et al., 2018b). Thus, the implementation of reading and writing literacy activities in the experimental classes was aligned with the instructional design described in the method section.

Results of Reading and Writing Skill Tests

The effectiveness of reading and writing literacy activities was examined by comparing the posttest scores of students in the experimental and control classes. Before hypothesis

testing, the data were examined through normality and homogeneity tests. Levene's Test was used to determine the homogeneity of variance. After the statistical assumptions were examined, an independent samples t-test was used to identify differences in reading and writing skills between the experimental and control groups. To avoid repetitive interpretation, the statistical findings are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Independent Samples t-Test Results

Grade	Skill	Levene's Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Interpretation
IV	Reading	.169	5.979	84	.000	11.860	Significant difference
IV	Writing	.633	2.614	84	.011	4.326	Significant difference
V	Reading	.644	3.889	99	.000	6.401	Significant difference
V	Writing	.020	5.420	90.330	.000	12.038	Significant difference
VI	Reading	.202	5.056	102	.000	7.981	Significant difference
VI	Writing	.625	-2.308	102	.023	-2.692	Significant difference; direction requires group coding clarification
IV–VI	Reading	.373	8.502	289	.000	8.627	Significant difference
IV–VI	Writing	.000	3.496	243.827	.001	4.361	Significant difference

The results show that reading and writing literacy activities produced significant differences in students' reading and writing skills across grade levels. In Grade IV, the reading skill test showed a significant difference between the experimental and control classes, $t(84) = 5.979$, $p < .05$. The writing skill test also showed a significant difference, $t(84) = 2.614$, $p < .05$. These findings indicate that the literacy intervention was associated with better reading and writing outcomes among fourth-grade students.

In Grade V, the reading skill test showed a significant difference, $t(99) = 3.889$, $p < .05$. The writing skill test also showed a significant difference. Because Levene's Test for writing skill was significant, the unequal variance result was used, $t(90.330) = 5.420$, $p < .05$. This result suggests that structured reading and writing literacy activities had a significant effect on fifth-grade students' reading and writing skills.

In Grade VI, the reading skill test showed a significant difference, $t(102) = 5.056$, $p < .05$. The writing skill test also showed a significant difference, $t(102) = -2.308$, $p < .05$. However, the negative mean difference in the Grade VI writing result requires careful interpretation. The negative value does not eliminate the statistical significance of the result, but it shows that the direction of the difference depends on how the experimental and control groups were coded in

the statistical output. Therefore, the Grade VI writing result should be reported as a statistically significant difference, while the direction of improvement needs to be confirmed by referring to the mean scores of each group.

The combined results for Grades IV, V, and VI also showed significant differences. The overall reading skill test showed $t(289) = 8.502, p < .05$, with a mean difference of 8.627. The overall writing skill test also showed a significant difference. Because Levene's Test was significant for the overall writing result, the unequal variance row was used, $t(243.827) = 3.496, p < .05$, with a mean difference of 4.361. These findings support the conclusion that structured reading and writing literacy activities had a statistically significant effect on students' literacy outcomes.

Observation of Reading and Writing Literacy Activities

Observation was conducted to examine how reading and writing literacy activities were implemented in the experimental and control classes. The observation focused on five principles: wholeness, integration, sustainability, contextuality, and responsiveness to local wisdom. These principles are relevant to literacy instruction because literacy development requires continuous learning experiences, meaningful contexts, and integration with broader learning domains. The observation findings are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Observation Results

Class	Wholeness	Integration	Sustainability	Contextuality	Local Wisdom	General Pattern
Grade IV Experimental	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Literacy principles were generally implemented well
Grade IV Control	Partially implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Digital, financial, cultural, and civic literacy were not fully integrated
Grade V Experimental	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Literacy instruction was implemented in a structured and integrated way
Grade V Control	Partially implemented	Partially implemented	Not fully implemented	Not fully implemented	Not fully implemented	Several literacy principles were not optimally applied
Grade VI Experimental	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Partially implemented	Most principles were implemented, but local wisdom still needed strengthening
Grade VI Control	Partially implemented	Partially implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Holistic and integrative aspects were not fully developed

The observation results show that the experimental classes generally implemented reading and writing literacy activities more consistently than the control classes. In the experimental classes, literacy instruction was more structured, integrated, and continuous. Teachers connected reading and writing activities with broader literacy dimensions, including numeracy, science, digital literacy, financial literacy, culture, civic values, and local wisdom. This pattern is consistent with the research procedure described in the method section, in which the experimental group received structured literacy activities, while the control group received regular instruction.

In contrast, the control classes showed uneven implementation. Some principles, such as contextuality and sustainability, appeared in certain classes, but the integration of literacy with digital, financial, cultural, and civic dimensions was not consistently observed. The Grade V control class showed the weakest implementation pattern because several principles were not fully applied. This difference in classroom implementation helps explain why the experimental classes generally produced stronger posttest results than the control classes.

The observation findings also indicate that the effectiveness of literacy instruction cannot be separated from the quality of its implementation. Reading and writing activities become more meaningful when students are not only asked to complete tasks, but are also guided to read, discuss, organize ideas, write responses, receive feedback, and connect learning with real-life contexts. Reading and writing develop through repeated, meaningful, and scaffolded practice. Kim et al. (2018) found that reading and writing are developmentally related across Grades 3 to 6. This supports the idea that upper-grade elementary students benefit from instruction that connects both skills in a structured manner.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that structured reading and writing literacy activities had a significant effect on students' reading and writing skills. The strongest and most consistent effect appeared in reading skills across Grades IV, V, VI, and the combined data. This result suggests that students benefited from reading activities that were guided, contextual, and followed by discussion and written response. Reading instruction became more effective because students were not only exposed to texts, but were also encouraged to identify information, interpret meaning, discuss ideas, and use writing as a way to process their understanding. This finding is supported by Okkinga et al. (2018), who found that reading-strategy interventions implemented in whole-classroom settings can improve students' reading comprehension. Similarly, Rosenshine and Meister (1994) emphasized that reciprocal teaching, which involves summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting, supports students' comprehension through guided cognitive strategy use. In addition, McKeown et al. (2009) argued that reading comprehension instruction becomes stronger when students are guided to build meaning from texts rather than only answer isolated questions.

The role of discussion in this study also strengthens the effectiveness of literacy activities. In the experimental classes, students were not only asked to read individually, but were also guided to discuss important information and respond to texts in written form. Classroom discussion has been shown to support deeper comprehension because it allows students to clarify ideas, negotiate meaning, and develop higher-order thinking. Murphy et al. (2009) found through meta-analysis that classroom discussion can improve students' text comprehension, especially when discussion encourages students to reason, elaborate, and respond to others' ideas. Mol et al. (2009) also showed that interactive reading activities involving active engagement before, during, and after reading can support language and literacy development. This supports the finding that guided, interactive, and reflective reading activities contributed to stronger reading outcomes in the experimental classes.

The improvement in writing skills can be understood through the reciprocal relationship between reading and writing. When students read texts and then write summaries, responses, or reflections, they practice selecting information, organizing ideas, constructing sentences, and communicating meaning. Graham et al. (2018a) showed that reading interventions can improve students' writing performance, especially when students interact more frequently with words, texts, and models of written language. This finding is reinforced by Graham et al. (2012), who found that several forms of writing instruction, including strategy instruction, summarization, and process writing, have positive effects on elementary students' writing quality. Koster et al. (2015) also reported that writing interventions for children are effective when instruction is explicit, goal-directed, and supported by opportunities for practice. Therefore, the writing gains in this study can be interpreted as the result of repeated and structured engagement with reading materials, idea organization, and written expression.

The findings also indicate that writing development requires more than assigning students to write. Students need guidance, modeling, feedback, and opportunities to revise their ideas. Graham et al. (2015) emphasized that research-based writing practices in elementary grades include explicit instruction, strategy use, planning, revising, and teacher support. Harris et al. (2006) further showed that self-regulated strategy development can improve students' writing knowledge, performance, and motivation, especially when students are taught how to plan, organize, and monitor their writing. These studies support the implementation pattern in the experimental classes, where students were guided to read, identify key ideas, organize information, write responses, and receive teacher feedback. Thus, the literacy intervention was effective not simply because students wrote more, but because writing was integrated with reading, discussion, and instructional support.

The results also show that the quality of classroom implementation matters. The experimental classes were more consistent in applying literacy principles, while the control classes showed partial and uneven implementation. This supports the assumption that literacy

activities need to be systematically planned and continuously practiced. In the experimental classes, literacy was integrated into the flow of learning: students were prepared through apperception, guided through reading and writing tasks, and supported through reflection and assignments. Hattie and Timperley (2007) explain that feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning when it helps students understand where they are, where they need to go, and how to improve. In this study, feedback helped students refine their understanding of texts and improve written responses. Therefore, teacher guidance and feedback became important factors that connected the planned literacy activities with students' reading and writing outcomes.

The significant overall results for Grades IV–VI strengthen the argument that structured literacy activities are relevant for upper-grade elementary students. At this stage, students are expected to move from basic reading and writing toward deeper comprehension and more organized written expression. Therefore, literacy instruction should provide opportunities for students to read meaningfully, discuss ideas, write responses, and revise their understanding. This finding aligns with previous research showing that balanced reading and writing instruction can support both reading and writing development (Graham et al., 2018b). It is also consistent with Kim et al. (2018), who found that reading and writing are developmentally related across Grades 3 to 6. These studies confirm that upper-grade students benefit from instruction that treats reading and writing as connected and mutually reinforcing literacy practices.

The integration of literacy with broader learning contexts also helps explain the positive results of this study. In the experimental classes, reading and writing activities were connected with numeracy, science, digital literacy, financial literacy, cultural awareness, civic values, and local wisdom. This is important because students' comprehension can be strengthened when literacy is connected with meaningful knowledge and content. Kim et al. (2021) found that content literacy intervention can improve reading comprehension, domain knowledge, and reading engagement. Hwang et al. (2022) also reported that integrated literacy and content-area instruction has positive effects on vocabulary and comprehension in elementary education. These findings support the idea that literacy instruction becomes more meaningful when students read and write about relevant topics, real-life contexts, and knowledge connected to their learning environment.

Nevertheless, the Grade VI writing result needs to be interpreted carefully because the mean difference was negative. This does not eliminate the significance of the finding, but it indicates that the direction of the difference must be clarified. The article should include the mean scores of the experimental and control groups to avoid misinterpretation. Without this clarification, the claim that the intervention improved Grade VI writing skills may appear logically weak. Therefore, the safest interpretation is that there was a statistically significant difference in Grade VI writing skills, while the direction of the difference should be confirmed

based on group coding and mean scores. This clarification is important because statistical significance alone does not fully explain the educational meaning of the result; interpretation should also consider the direction of the difference, descriptive statistics, and classroom implementation.

Overall, the findings indicate that structured reading and writing literacy activities can support students' literacy development when they are planned collaboratively, implemented consistently, and connected with broader literacy principles. The integration of reading and writing activities, teacher feedback, contextual materials, and continuity of practice contributed to students' literacy outcomes. In the context of SDIT Irsyadul Ibad Pandeglang, the literacy intervention was not only relevant to improving reading and writing skills, but also aligned with the school's integrated educational character, which combines academic learning, values, culture, and local context. Thus, the effectiveness of literacy instruction in this study can be understood as the result of structured planning, guided classroom practice, integration of reading and writing, meaningful discussion, teacher feedback, and contextual learning support.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that structured reading and writing literacy activities can strengthen upper-grade students' literacy skills when they are planned systematically and implemented as an integral part of classroom learning. The planning of literacy-based instruction at SDIT Irsyadul Ibad Pandeglang was carried out collaboratively between the researcher and teachers of Grades IV, V, and VI through lesson plan development workshops. The instructional design was grounded in the principles of wholeness, integration, sustainability, contextuality, and responsiveness to local wisdom. These principles were reflected in classroom practices through reading activities, identification of key ideas, discussion, written responses, teacher feedback, reflection, and follow-up assignments.

The statistical findings indicate that reading and writing literacy activities produced significant differences in students' reading and writing skills between the experimental and control classes. Significant differences were found in Grade IV reading skills ($p = .000$) and writing skills ($p = .011$), Grade V reading skills ($p = .000$) and writing skills ($p = .000$), and Grade VI reading skills ($p = .000$) and writing skills ($p = .023$). The combined results for Grades IV–VI also showed significant differences in reading skills ($p = .000$) and writing skills ($p = .001$). These findings suggest that structured literacy activities are effective in supporting students' reading and writing development, although the Grade VI writing result still needs careful interpretation by referring to the group mean scores because the mean difference was negative.

Overall, this study shows that literacy instruction in Integrated Islamic Elementary Schools should not be limited to routine reading and writing tasks, but should be developed as a structured, contextual, continuous, and integrated learning practice. The findings provide

practical implications for teachers and school leaders to design literacy activities that connect reading, writing, broader literacy dimensions, students' socio-cultural contexts, and local wisdom. Future studies are recommended to involve more schools, present complete pretest-posttest comparisons, report group mean scores more clearly, and calculate effect size to determine the magnitude of the intervention's impact on students' reading and writing skills.

REFERENSI

- Cahyono, A. H., & Ardhyantama, V. (2020). Pengembangan literasi baca tulis di Sekolah Dasar Islam Terpadu Ar Rahmah Pacitan. *Alpen: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1), 8–16. doi: 10.24929/alpen.v4i1.36
- Graham, S., & Hebert, M. A. (2011). Writing to read: A meta-analysis of the impact of writing and writing instruction on reading. *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(4), 710–744. doi: 10.17763/haer.81.4.t2k0m13756113566
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Santangelo, T. (2015). Research-based writing practices and the Common Core: Meta-analysis and meta-synthesis. *The Elementary School Journal*, 115(4), 498–522. DOI: 10.1086/681964
- Graham, S., Liu, X., Aitken, A., Ng, C., Bartlett, B., Harris, K. R., Barkel, A., Kavanaugh, C., & Talukdar, J. (2018a). Reading for writing: A meta-analysis of the impact of reading interventions on writing. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(2), 243–284. doi: 10.3102/0034654317746927
- Graham, S., Liu, X., Aitken, A., Ng, C., Bartlett, B., Harris, K. R., & Holzapfel, J. (2018b). Effectiveness of literacy programs balancing reading and writing instruction: A meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 53(3), 279–304. doi: 10.1002/rrq.194
- Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuahara, S. A., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 879–896. DOI: 10.1037/a0029185
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 295–340. DOI: 10.3102/00028312043002295
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. DOI: 10.3102/003465430298487
- Hwang, H., Cabell, S. Q., & Joyner, R. E. (2022). Effects of integrated literacy and content-area instruction on vocabulary and comprehension in the elementary years: A meta-analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 26(3), 223–249. DOI: 10.1080/10888438.2021.1954005
- Kim, J. S., Burkhauser, M. A., Mesite, L. M., Asher, C. A., Relyea, J. E., Fitzgerald, J., & Elmore, J. (2021). Improving reading comprehension, science domain knowledge, and reading engagement through a first-grade content literacy intervention. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(1), 3–26. DOI: 10.1037/edu0000465

- Kim, Y.-S. G., Petscher, Y., Wanzek, J., & Al Otaiba, S. (2018). Relations between reading and writing: A longitudinal examination from grades 3 to 6. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 31(7), 1591–1618. doi: 10.1007/s11145-018-9855-4
- Koster, M., Tribushinina, E., de Jong, P. F., & van den Bergh, H. (2015). Teaching children to write: A meta-analysis of writing intervention research. *Journal of Writing Research*, 7(2), 249–274. DOI: 10.17239/jowr-2015.07.02.2
- McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Blake, R. G. K. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(3), 218–253. DOI: 10.1598/RRQ.44.3.1
- Miller, J. W., & McKenna, M. C. (2016). *World literacy: How countries rank and why it matters*. Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315693934
- Mol, S. E., Bus, A. G., & de Jong, M. T. (2009). Interactive book reading in early education: A tool to stimulate print knowledge as well as oral language. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 979–1007. DOI: 10.3102/0034654309332561
- Murphy, P. K., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Soter, A. O., Hennessey, M. N., & Alexander, J. F. (2009). Examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 740–764. DOI: 10.1037/a0015576
- Musthafa, B. (2014). *Literasi dini dan literasi remaja: Teori, konsep, dan praktik*. CREST.
- OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 results: What students know and can do* (Vol. I). OECD Publishing. doi: 10.1787/5f07c754-en
- Okkinga, M., van Steensel, R., van Gelderen, A. J. S., van Schooten, E., Slegers, P. J. C., & Arends, L. (2018). Effectiveness of reading-strategy interventions in whole classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(4), 1215–1239. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-018-9445-7
- Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2017). *Kajian kegemaran membaca masyarakat Indonesia*. Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child*. Basic Books.
- Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(4), 479–530. DOI: 10.3102/00346543064004479
- Santrock, J. W. (2018). *Educational psychology* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Yarmi, G., & Mutiasih, P. (2018). *Taman baca ramah anak: Modul untuk pegiat literasi*. Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia.