| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Differentiated Instruction in Improving Senior High School Students' Reading Comprehension Level

M. Jufrianto[1] ✉ Rahyuni[2], Saiful Gaffar[3], Fitri Amaliah Akbal[4], Ahmad Putra Pratama[5], Ali Syahban Amir[6]

[12]*English Teacher of State Senior High School 3 Takalar, Takalar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia*
[3]*English Teacher of The One-Roof State Junior Secondary School 40 Lakeang, Maros, South Sulawesi, Indonesia*
[45]*Student of English Education Faculty, Doctoral Program, State University of Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia.*
[6]*Lecturer of Economic Development Department, Turatea Institute of Indonesia Jeneponto, South Sulawesi, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author: M. Jufrianto, **E-mail**: mjufrianto@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

This research investigated the effectiveness of using differentiated instruction (DI) on grade 11 senior high school students' reading comprehension throughout the academic year 2021–2022. It aims to identify the reading comprehension levels of the control and experimental groups in the pre-test, and post-test gained results, determine whether there is a significant difference in the reading comprehension levels gained from the control and experimental groups, and pinpoint the benefits and drawbacks of using this strategy. A quasi-experimental was used as a method to carry out the investigation. 142 senior high school students in Grade 11 from UPT SMA Negeri 3 Takalar served as the respondents. The results from the pre-test and post-test, an observation in the classroom, the survey, and the researcher's notes are used as the data sources. The basic method of understanding, synthesizing, interpreting, and re-analyzing was used to describe the qualitative data in order to decide common topics. Strengths and disadvantages of DI were identified based on observations made in the class, the survey, and the reflection. Statistical analysis showed a substantial difference between pre-test results and post-test results despite the observed and experienced difficulties.

1. Introduction

The English course is viewed as a foreign language by Indonesian students. From primary school up to the university level, English is introduced. Hence, in order to achieve the learning objectives set forth by the government, teachers should be able to adopt instructional methods based on the characteristics and requirements of the pupils. Primary, junior high, and senior high school levels all have distinct learning objectives. Students in senior high school have two learning goals: one is to be able to understand a text, and the other is to be able to communicate. Understanding and exchanging information, ideas, and sentiments while also advancing science, technology, and culture are all aspects of communication. In order for senior high school graduates to be able to communicate and engage in discourse in English at a particular literacy level, the English subject is focused on developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Reading proficiency usually takes precedence among these four English language abilities that have been incorporated into the curriculum. For people who want to thrive in the future or continue their studies to a higher degree, reading ability is crucial (Tuan, 2011). Students learn to comprehend and use the most recent knowledge through reading.

Many issues still exist in the daily teaching and learning process, in my opinion, and experience. Several students still have reading skills that are below average. Sometimes they are unable to identify the meaning of a text, which makes it difficult to comprehend

the material correctly. Of course, this presents a significant challenge for students all over the world to improve their comprehension of what they are reading. It is a necessary skill to make considerable academic advancement. The students should understand the passage's substance while reading the text. The emphasis is on reading to learn rather than learning to read; therefore, they must acquire this perusing skill (Alyousef, 2006). Reading comprehension is highly required during reading practice because it includes more than just the interaction between readers and reading texts (Pourhosein Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016). This indicates that children are not able to grasp the whole content of the story only from reading the materials provided in reading comprehension. It is a stage of the reading process where the meanings of the passage are discovered.

As Indonesians learn English as a foreign language (EFL), many students still struggle with reading comprehension in this country (Sulistiyo, 2016). English is mostly taught and learned in schools, not via regular conversation (Davoudi & Yousefi, 2015). According to research, Indonesian students' difficulties with EFL reading comprehension are caused by a lack of vocabulary bank in the students' schemata, a lack of grammar proficiency, and poor methods of reading they own (Setiyadi, 2016). According to a study conducted by Central Connecticut State University, in The World Most Literate Countries, Indonesia is ranked sixty-first on reading interest among the sixty-one Southeast Asian nations (Miller & McKenna, 2016). This problem reflects the fact that Indonesians' interest in reading is severely declining, particularly among students. When learning a language, reading comprehension is crucial. When reading English writings, Indonesian learners may have more difficulty understanding them than they would with texts in their native tongue (Setiyadi, 2016).

Due to their limited vocabulary knowledge, many EFL students struggle to understand English literature (Suryanto, 2017). In addition to a lack of vocabulary, their boredom with the teachers' traditional teaching methods lowers their motivation to learn to read (Pradana, 2017). Addressing this issue, the teaching-learning situation should be engaging to give students motivation to improve their level of reading ability. It is advised that teachers should use a certain method to improve the reading comprehension level of the students they teach (Sholeh et al., 2019).

Because reading is a skill highly valued at higher levels of academic study, these results present a concerning situation for all secondary instructors as well as elementary teachers. In UPT SMA Negeri 3 Takalar, South Sulawesi, this issue is real. The children in this school have trouble comprehending the story of the text.

The ineffective parental support system for the students and the absence of dynamics in the teachers' teaching strategies were two of the main contributing causes. It was suggested that teachers provide the instruction for reading after first taking into account each student's needs and abilities; that they emphasize collaboration with students in activities in reading; and that they take into account the variations in students' interests, learning profiles, and, readiness, and levels. Meanwhile, The foundation for comprehending, taking up on, and recalling the concepts in the text, according to Anderson (1984), is the reader's organized knowledge of life and the world. It is the organization of knowledge about the reader's life and world.

This was done to illustrate the significance of the relationship between reading and learners' lives. He argued that readers infer meanings from the text and understand it based on their prior knowledge, experiences, and experiences, as well as the text. When a text's concepts are logically connected to the learner's prior knowledge, comprehension and meaningful learning occur. As a result, teachers must make sure to include their students' prior knowledge in the texts they assign them to read. Students will struggle to read if these problems are not resolved, and the right intervention is not given, which may make it more difficult for them to pick up other skills and perform well in school. In a similar way to a domino effect, this could make things more difficult as they move up the educational ladder.

The researcher started this research about the efficacy of implementing differentiated instruction in increasing the students' reading levels in grade 11 as a result of the aforementioned circumstance. It was revealed that students' reading comprehension might be enhanced by differentiated education, which adds dynamism to instructional pedagogies centered on teacher-student interaction while taking into consideration the students' interests and personalities. It is based on a curriculum that puts students first, where there is evidence of student participation and where teachers serve more as learning facilitators. This research sought to evaluate the efficacy of differentiated instruction in addressing the reading difficulties that teachers and students encountered by using activities, exercises, and assessments that were tailored to the individual.

1.1 Objective of the Study
In an effort to narrow the reading achievement gaps encountered by teachers and students, the study looked at how well-diversified instruction affected students' reading comprehension levels. As a result, the study focused on identifying the advantages and disadvantages of employing tailored instruction to raise the reading comprehension level of students. In essence, the findings of this research may help teachers and students improve their students' reading comprehension by providing engaging and effective reading teaching strategies in reading.

2. Methods
2.1 Research Design
The first two study objectives were addressed using a quasi-experimental design, which was part of the study's mixed-method approach. The pre-test and post-test scores were compared using the t-test for independent samples, and improvements in reading comprehension between the control and experimental groups were examined using the paired t-test. Methodological triangulation was utilized to address the purpose of identifying the benefits and drawbacks of employing differentiated education. The notes and writings of the teacher-reflective researcher were examined along with the opinions of the students, three observers from English, and the students themselves. The basic method of understanding, synthesizing, interpreting, and re-analyzing was used to analyze these qualitative data in order to decide on common topics and integrate thematic elements.

2.2 Respondents of the Study
The 142 Senior High School students in Grade 11 who studied in UPT SMA Negeri 3 Takalar in the academic year 2021–2022 served as the study's respondents. It is divided into four sections; the experimental sections have two groups with a total of 35 students each, while the control portions have two groups with a total of 36 students. According to their academic performance in their English score previously during the first semester of the academic year 2021–2022, the equivalent groups were categorized.

2.3 Research Instruments
The reading comprehension exam created by teachers and scaled for academic level is the main component of the research tools. It comprises 50 questions that cover the material from a senior high school core course. The researcher's reading comprehension scale served as the foundation for the five levels of reading comprehension. Advanced level students received scores between 41 and 50; Proficient level students received scores between 31 and 40; Approaching level students received scores between 21 and 30; Developing level students received scores between 11 and 20; and Beginning level students received scores only between 1 and 10.

The researcher also created two sets of learning modules. When the control group adopted the traditional strategy, the experimental group received modules designed after DI. The two sets were designed using the same format. This format was borrowed from Carol Ann Tomlinson (2001) in her suggested framework. A few changes were made to meet the research study's environment. Although those modules had the same structure, the content, as well as how the courses were presented and delivered to the two groups, varied. Nonetheless, the learning objectives, learning abilities, and reading materials are the same for both modules. This was done on purpose to demonstrate that, despite differences in presentation and delivery, the goals and competencies that had to be met were the same. The study also made use of survey questions and classroom observation questionnaires. Three English teachers were asked to fill out observation forms to evaluate how the teachers used DI to conduct their lessons. In the same way, survey questions were distributed to students to get their opinions on how DI was used to teach them. Last but not least, the teacher-researcher also recorded his own reflections on DI's advantages and disadvantages as he used it.

2.4 Research Procedure
First and foremost, the researcher asked permission to perform the study from the principal of UPT SMA Negeri 3 Takalar and the head of the regional ministry of education, Jeneponto-Takalar. The respondents obtained prior and informed consent in order to uphold ethical norms. The researcher then created the teacher-made test that was utilized in the study, along with the learning modules, and requested validations. In the preliminary phase of the study, the pre-test was administered to both groups in order to gauge their reading comprehension skills. After that, lessons were conducted for the experimental group utilizing DI and for the control group using the traditional method. The training had 24 contact hours, or six weeks, of instruction across approximately two months. A follow-up test was given to gauge the kids' growth and improvement. A T-test (for independent samples) was used to evaluate the efficacy of the experimental and control groups before and after the study's implementation, and a paired T-test was used to assess both the control and experimental groups' pre- and post-test findings (for dependent samples). In order to evaluate the efficacy of DI in reading, three senior English teachers also observed classes. Students who were taught using DI were also given a survey questionnaire with an extended response question, and the teacher-researcher personally journaled about his complete experience using DI. This led to discussions that included both the virtues and weaknesses of DI.

2.5 Data Analysis
To determine the frequency and rate owned by the students in relation to the level of their reading comprehension, descriptive statistics like frequency and percent were used. The results of the student survey and the teacher-led classroom observation were quantified using a weighted mean. The performance of the control group as well as the experimental group, both before and after using the DI, was analyzed by using a T-test (for independent samples), and the results of the pre-test and post-test of both the control and experimental groups were examined by using a paired T-test (dependent sample t-test).

3. Results and Discussion

The following section presents the findings and the interpretation of the study.

Table 1. Percentage and Frequency of Levels of Students' Reading Comprehension

The level of Reading Comprehension	Traditional Approach as the control group (n = 72)				Group with Differentiated Instruction or Experimental Group (n = 70)			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Advanced (41-50)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11
Proficient (31-40)	8	11	12	17	8	11	18	26
Approaching (21-30)	30	42	40	55	39	56	33	47
Developing (11-20)	34	47	20	28	23	33	11	16
Beginning (1-10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**72**	**100**	**72**	**100**	**70**	**100**	**70**	**100**

According to Table 1, there were noticeable differences between the experimental group's pre-test and post-test results and those of the control group. None of the students in either group scored at the beginning level on the pre-test; instead, 23 students (33%) scored as developing; 39 students (56%) scored as approaching; 8 students (11%) scored as proficient; and no student scored at the advanced level. The results in the post-test, on the other hand, revealed that none of the students in either group was at the Beginning level; students in the Developing level dropped to 11 (16%); 33 students (47%) were Approaching; Proficient level students significantly increased to 18 (26%); and 8 students (11%) achieved the Advanced level.

Table 2. Reading Comprehension Level, Standard Deviations, Mean Scores, and Group Mean Scores taken from the Results of Students' Pre-test and Post-test

The Level of Reading Comprehension	Conventional Approach (Control Group) n = 72				Differentiated Instruction (Experimental Group) n = 70			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Advanced (41-50)	0	0	0	0	0	0	42.87	0.99
Proficient (31-40)	33.37	1.85	34.25	1.86	33.5	1.19	36.33	1.28
Approaching (21-30)	23.67	2.09	24.7	2.21	23.67	1.85	25.94	1.67
Developing (11-20)	12.62	1.48	12.7	0.80	13.48	1.34	13.33	1.78
Beginning (1-10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Group Mean Score	**19.5**	**7.4**	**22.9**	**7.5**	**21.4**	**6.6**	**28.6**	**8.9**

The researcher calculated and analyzed mean scores gained by the students from the pre-test and post-test findings to evaluate their degree of reading comprehension. Using independent sample t-tests, Table 2 displays group mean scores, student mean scores, and standard deviations before and after the study.

Table 2's pre-test results showed the mean score from the control group (19.5, SD= 7.4) and the mean score gained by the students from the experimental group (21.4, SD= 6.6), both of which ranged between 11 and 30 on the reading comprehension scale. This showed that prior to instruction, the control group was performing at a developing level, while the experimental group was performing at an approaching level. The post-test findings revealed that the control group had improved after the entire instruction period, with mean scores of 22.9 (up from 19.5 previously) and SD of 7.5. Although both groups' mean scores increased (22.9 over 19.5 for the control group and 28.6 over 21.4 for the experimental group), both groups' reading comprehension still fell into the category of Approaching level, which is in the range of 21–30 on the scale of reading comprehension. This was also a notable improvement.

The outcome shows that although there were individual score gains, there was not enough of an improvement for the performance of the group to be reported. The findings of this research suggested that one of the key components of differentiated instruction must be content differentiation. D.I. exclusively paid attention to the differentiation of processes and outputs when conducting the current investigation. Because the researcher was required to adhere to the lesson content outlined in the curriculum for senior high school, no distinction of content was made; as a result, the researcher provided identical information to the control group as well as the experimental ones. The outcome also suggested that D.I. needs more time to evaluate its efficacy in comparison to the skill under investigation. The outcome also suggested that a longer period of time is needed to evaluate D.I.'s effectiveness in connection to the skill or competency under investigation. This was consistent with the teacher-private researcher's notes on the difficulties he had using D.I.

> "... It takes a long time to put my lesson into practice. Even though I really planned and chose the exercises and assessments that I included in my learning materials, I didn't really have the luxury of time during the discussion. The various activities went off without a hitch..."

The opinions of several teacher observers and the outcomes of the student poll were in agreement. According to the findings of the classroom observation, the teacher-use researcher's and delivery of D.I had various flaws, including the time provided for activities and the constrained amount of time to work on students' outputs. Time restrictions still became the most challenging issue that students faced when completing their chores and activities, according to the survey's expanded replies from the students.

The findings of Humes (2017) about the analysis of the efficiency of implementing differentiated instruction in teaching reading to the students of high schools supported the findings of the current study. His study revealed that after applying D.I. for a number of months, students who received the supplied intervention received greater results than those who received conventional instruction. Their ultimate average score on the provided reading exam, nevertheless, is still on average level. As a result, he proposed that the success and efficient application of differentiated instruction depended on three factors. The teacher's knowledge and skills in differentiating the teaching-learning process's content, process, and products come first; the time factor for lesson planning and execution comes second; and the ongoing assessment used to learn more about students' readiness, interests, and learning preferences comes last. He underlined that the performance of students in reading could be greatly aided by DI if teachers implement this strategy to modify the learning circumstances, instruction, evaluation, and assessment.

Table 3. T-test of Difference between Pre-test and Post-test Results

Types of Test	Traditional Approach or Control Group (n = 72)			Differentiated Instruction or Experimental Group (n = 70)			T	P
	Mean	SD	Reading Comprehension Level	Mean	SD	Reading Comprehension Level		
Pre-test	19.5	7.4	Developing	21.4	6.6	Approaching	1.62	.106
Post-test	22.9	7.5	Approaching	28.6	8.9	Approaching	4.11	.000
Df = 140								

The information in Table 3 demonstrated that there was a significant difference between the pre-test scores of the experimental group taught using DI and the control group taught using the conventional approach (M=21.4, SD=6.6), with a t (142) = -.1.62, p= .106 Students' reading comprehension levels are therefore equal after the intervention has been implemented. After finishing the course, scores gained by the students in the experimental group after the post-test (M=28.4, SD=8.9 were significantly increasing higher than the students from the control group (M=22.9, SD=7.5), with traditional instruction (t(142) = -4.11, p= .000). This is indicating that implementing differentiated instruction was more successful than traditional instruction in enhancing the students' reading comprehension level.

Table 4 describes the paired t-test between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the control and experimental groups through Traditional Instruction and Differentiated Instruction.

Table 4. Paired T-Test between the Results of Pre-test and Post-test

Students Groups	Mean (SD)		Degree of Freedom	t-Value	P-value
	Pres-test	Post-test			
Control Group (N = 72)	19.5	22.9	142	-2.76	.007
Experimental Group (N = 70)	21.4	28.6	138	-5.43	.000

The results show that the students who were taught using the usual approach had considerably higher post-test scores (M=22.9, SD=7.5) than their pre-test scores (M=19.5, SD=7.40), with a t (142) = -2.76, p=.007. This suggested that the reading comprehension skills of the control group that received traditional instruction had increased. When compared to the mean scores from the experimental group, this change was also significant. The experimental group received differentiated instruction, and the scores of their post-test (M=28.6, SD=8.93) were considerably higher than the scores of their pre-test (M=21.4, SD=6.58), according to t (138) = - 5.41, p=.000. This indicates that students who received instruction utilizing DI had better reading comprehension skills. As a result, it can be said that both the traditional instructional style and DI improved the students' reading comprehension. Yet, as shown by the gain scores attained by both groups, Differentiated Instruction was superior to the traditional strategy.

Table 5. T-test of Difference between the Gain Scores from the Control Group and Experimental Group

Group of students	N	Mean (SD)	Df	T-value	P-value
Control Group	72	22.95 (7.50)	140	-4.112	.000
Experimental Group	70	28.64 (8.93)	140		

According to data in Table 5, differentiated instruction was superior to the traditional approach in terms of increasing the reading comprehension of the students (M=28.64, SD=8.93; t(140) = -4.112; p=.000). This was demonstrated by the obtained gain scores of the students taught using differentiated instruction, which was significantly higher than those of the students taught using the conventional approach (M=22.95, SD=7.50).

The findings of the current study's t-test and paired t-test supported Jefferson's (2016) claim that the implementation of differentiated instruction was really helpful in teaching reading. In comparison to kids who received instruction in the core curriculum, the intervention group's reading outcomes were enhanced by pupils who were given access to a variety of tier-based reading materials, according to the study's findings. The experimental group's large improvement in gain scores further supported, as asserted by Harem (2010), that there are three essential components to teaching reading and improving students' reading comprehension. These were: 1) a variety of reading materials that are accessible to students and relevant to their habits; 2) a constructive and innovative approach to teaching reading that takes into account students' needs and different learning preferences; and 3) engaging and enjoyable reading instruction activities. The current study further supported Clay's (2013) assertion that each child's needs and strengths should be the focus of reading training. Only through assessment can judgments regarding instruction be made, as assessment offers the facts necessary for effective instruction. Furthermore, the results of this study supported Alvarez's (2015) assertion that lessons for teaching reading to pupils should be closely tailored to their personalities and prior knowledge. When teaching reading to students, teachers should discover ways to hunt for reading materials with topics about the locals that can be used as alternatives to texts from other cultures.

3.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Utilizing Differentiated Instruction in Reading Class

Table 6. Weighted Average Outcomes from Teachers' Observation

Part	Items	Weighted Average	Description
A	Teaching Content and Procedure	3.72	Evident
B	Methodology in Teaching	3.72	Evident
C	The Participation and Learning of the Students	3.97	Evident
General Weighted Average		**3.80**	**Evident**

Data from the teacher-differentiated researcher's instruction in the classroom were reflected in the teacher-observers' comments. According to the findings, the area of Teaching Content and Procedure shows an average mean of 3.72 (evident), indicating that the essential parts of Differentiated Instruction, such as how the teachers elaborate the topic based on the real situation and the students' comprehension; the material of the lesson is adaptable to learner's readiness and needs; the numerous options as provided in the materials to better the students' creative thinking; the exercises integrated into the course enable learners to be more reflective so they can evaluate their own learning. The delivery of differentiated instruction included all of the essential elements, including being creative in discussing and expressing the lesson, being more collaborative in doing projects between teacher and students and other activities, a variation of management strategies to help desired instruction, problem-solving activities, adjustable groupings to support the learning process, as shown by the sub-mean for teaching methodology being 3.72 (evident). The last area, Students' Participation and Learning, has indicated a sub-mean of 3.97 (evident), indicating that the students' learning process included and was clearly characterized by the important components of DI, including student

participation and the opportunity for creative expression. Though the teacher-researcher used DI to deliver the lesson, the classroom observation results in Table 6 showed a high 3.80 for the general weighted mean, which is considered high.

Table 7. Weighted Outcomes from the Survey Given to Students Implementing DI

Part	Items	Weighted Average	Description
A	Teaching Content and Procedure	**3.82**	Strongly Agree
B	Methodology in Teaching	**3.82**	Strongly Agree
C	The Participation and Learning of the Students	**3.84**	Strongly Agree
General Weighted Average		**3.83**	**Strongly Agree**

According to the statistics from Table 7, the weighted mean for the teaching material of the lesson is 3.82, which is described as strongly agree, indicating that the students believe the Differentiated Instruction components are helpful in helping the learners understand the text of what was read. The weighted mean for the teaching methodology category was 3.82 (Strongly Agree), indicating that students thought the teacher's use of DI to deliver lessons was effective. The students who are taught utilizing DI found this strategy beneficial because it provides their full participation and engagement, as seen by the third area's weighted average of 3.84, which is described as strongly agree, indicated in the students' participation and learning.

Table 8. Thematic Presentation of Observed Advantages and Disadvantages from Differentiated Instruction According to the Extended Teacher Observers' Responses

Advantages	Disadvantages
Teaching Content and Procedure 1. The students were able to demonstrate their creativity through activities and assessment. 2. The reading materials were appropriate for the students' backgrounds and interests	**Teaching Content and Procedure** 1. The quantity of materials for reading is provided to the students; the teacher ought to provide at least two, extensively explain them, and mix up the activities. 2. The time provided for lesson activities and discussion
Teaching Methodology 1. A creative lesson presentation and discussion. 2. included a variety of activities to encourage full class involvement 3. Less teachers' talk and more student-centered discussion 4. Well-crafted questions encouraged students to think 5. Innovative teaching tools that helped to capture students' attention	**Teaching Methodology** 1. Despite the variety of tactics, some of the strategies could not be used with other students. 2. the disturbance produced by the activities 3. Having trouble keeping track of the students during group projects 4. The instructional materials' preparation and setup delayed the start of the discussion.
Students' Participation and Learning 1. Students' creative outputs allowed them to demonstrate their abilities 2. For group projects, students could cooperate with their classmates. 3. The vigorous discussion kept students interested in the activity.	**Students' Participation and Learning** 1. The students received little summative assessments 2. The amount of time students had to prepare and work on their contributions was limited

3.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of DI According to the Extended Students' Responses students

The advantages of D.I were noted in several areas after synthesizing the extensive responses of the students. Among the activities that encouraged the students to participate more actively in the discussion were the teacher's challenging questions, simulation and role-playing activities, group activities, listening to audio and discussing the words, and watching visual content. The second category is interesting classroom presentations and outputs, which include authentic or real-world assignments, difficult tasks that need quick thinking and brainstorming, and outputs that honed students' creativity.

Similarly to this, differentiated education has been found to have two weaknesses. The first is time and other restrictions on completing the tasks, activities, and outputs, which include a shortage of materials and a lack of time to prepare for the activities. The second type of conflict that happens when people work together comprises dependency on and irritation with noisy group members who interfere with the task at hand. The thematic presentation of the extended student responses revealed that there were still flaws in the use of D.I. that the teacher must take into account when delivering the instruction, despite the survey to students showing a high weighted average, which is 3.84 and categorized strongly agree, on how the researcher from the teacher executed the course through Differentiated Instruction.

3.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of DI Based on the Teacher-Researchers' Reflective Notes

Using personal, theoretical, and methodological notes, the teacher-researcher presented his perspective on his individual experiences and advancement in the field. Implementing differentiated instruction generally presented three major challenges: allocating much time for the lessons to be completed; supervising and monitoring the students while they worked in groups, particularly given the inevitable noise; and strict preparation of instructional materials along with numerous planning paces. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the sessions that were taught utilizing differentiated instruction were successful in encouraging learning and raising the reading comprehension level of the students.

The following were the outstanding advantages for the students and teachers:

1. The students were inspired to concentrate on the reading materials they were given by the priming exercises;
2. The variety of activities helped to maximize student participation in discussing what was read;
3. The exercises and tests that were given to the students helped them sharpen their analytical and problem-solving abilities while also allowing them to show off their inventiveness.
4. Due to the connection between the reading materials and their own lives, the authentic or real-life tasks included in the exercises given to the students encouraged them to participate more.
5. The teacher's insights and realizations as he put all the lessons into practice enriched his viewpoints on teaching reading and strengthened his desire to give his all in instructing the students.
6. During the collaboration between students and teacher, the teacher was able to learn much about his students and develop more effective plans for teaching and evaluating reading skills.

4. Conclusion

Despite the fact that the results indicated that the reading comprehension levels of the students had not changed for a variety of reasons (such as limitations on the ability to differentiate the content, the process, and the product required by the lessons), it was still clear that differentiated instruction was superior to the traditional instruction in terms of raising students' reading comprehension levels. In order to enhance the likelihood that each student will learn as much as he or she can, as effectively as possible, teachers should proactively develop a variety of strategies for what students need to study, how they will study the lesson, and/or how they will perform what they have studied (Tomlinson, 2003). Here, differentiated instruction (DI) comes in to help students with their various learning demands. It is a procedure that provides entry points, learning exercises, and objectives that are adapted to each student's needs so that all students can access the same curriculum in the classroom (Hall, Strangman, & Meyer, 2003). Yet, there are advantages and disadvantages to using DI. They were noted in the study by taking into account the perspectives of the teacher observers, students, and teacher-researcher. Because the reading materials were relevant to their own lives, the real-life or authentic tasks in the exercises encouraged the students to comprehend more about the readings. They were able to express their creativity through the exercises and assessments, which also assisted them in honing their analytical and problem-solving abilities. There were, however, difficulties as well, such as time and other limitations in completing the task, activities, and outputs, which include a lack of supplies and a lack of time to prepare for the activities. Moreover, disagreements about dependencies and the discomfort of noisy group members also occur when performing collaborative tasks. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the teacher-researcher noted that lessons delivered utilizing D.I. were helpful in fostering learning and raising the pupils' level of reading comprehension. Also, it was discovered that pupils' levels of reading comprehension greatly increased. Because there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results according to the statistical analysis, differentiated instruction helped students' reading comprehension skills advance. The results of this study were consistent with those of McCullough (2011), who looked into whether differentiated instruction improved the vocabulary and reading comprehension of struggling second-graders. After differentiated instruction was put in place, the statistics showed that kids' reading proficiency improved. Moreover, Firmender et al. (2013) used the school-wide enrichment model-reading to assess how a differentiated instruction enriched reading program affected students' reading competence and comprehension (SEM-R). The study's findings showed that a differentiated instruction-based enrichment reading technique was just as effective as and even more effective than a conventional whole-group basal approach. With these points made and the findings of the study, it is possible to draw conclusions for positive social change that will help teachers improve their instructional techniques and give

struggling readers a chance to acquire the knowledge and abilities they need to become independent, self-reliant, and competent people. Reading teachers must take into account and respond to these differences until they are completely irrelevant in a classroom of diverse learners with a range of learning styles and multiple intelligences.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1]   Alvarez, J. (2015). *Effects of Tier I Differentiation and Reading Intervention on Reading Fluency, Comprehension, and High Stakes Measures*. Retrieved February 24, 2016, from http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=15&s id=8b6167bc-b4be-48e5

[2]   Alyousef, H. S. (2006). Teaching reading comprehension to ESL/EFL learners. *Journal of Language Learning, 5*(1), 143-154.

[3]   Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. 1984. *Handbook of reading research.* New York: Longman.Humes, 2017

[4]   Clay, V., Abbott, R., Verneulen, K., & Fulton, C. (2013). Paths to reading comprehension in at-risk second-grade readers. *Journal of Language Disabilities, 39 (4),* 334-351. Retrieved November 25, 2014

[5]   Davoudi, M., & Yousefi, D. (2015). *Comprehension Breakdown:* A Review of Research on EFL Learners' Reading Difficulty and Problems. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics, 1*, 58-72.

[6]   Firmender, J. M., Reis, S. M., & Sweeny, S. M. (2013). *Reading Comprehension and Fluency Levels Ranges Across Diverse Classrooms.* Gifted Child Quarterly, 57(1), 3–14. doi:10.1177/0016986212460084

[7]   Harem, M. (2010). *The 7 Building Blocks of Differentiated Instruction*. Retrieved January 25, 2010 http://www.sde.com/Conferences/DifferentiatedInstruction/downloads/DI/7BuildingBlocksOfDI.pdf.

[8]   McCullough, Sh. (2011). *The effects of differentiated instruction on academic achievement of struggling second grade readers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3489743).

[9]   Miller, J. W., & McKenna, M. C. (2016). *World Literacy: How Countries Rank and Why It Matters.* Routledge.

[10] Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. & Sabouri, N. (2016). How Can Students Improve Their Reading Comprehension Skill. *Journal of Studies in Education. 6. 229. 10.5296/jse.v6i2.*9201.

[11] Pradana, S. A. (2017). The Analysis of Teaching and Learning Reading Through ThinkAloud Method. ELT Echo : *The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context, 2*(2), 170. https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v2i2.2177.

[12] Setiyadi, A. (2016). How Successful Learners Employ Learning Strategies in an EFL Setting In the Indonesian Context. *English Language Teaching, 9*(8), 28-38.

[13] Sholeh, A., Setyosari, P., Cahyono, B. Y., & Sutlhoni. (*2019*). Effects of Scaffolded Voluntary Reading on EFL Students' Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(4), 297-312. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12419a.

[14] Sulistiyo, U. (2016). *English language teaching and Efl teacher competence in Indonesia.* Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang, 4(2), 396-406.

[15] Suryanto, S. (2017). An Investigation of English Reading Comprehension Problems in Indonesian Cultural Contexts. *International Conference on Education, Science, Art and Technology, 0*, 200-205. Retrieved 5 January from http://ojs.unm.ac.id/icesat/article/view/3738.

[16] Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom: Strategies and tools for responsive teaching*. ASCD

[17] Tuan, L.T. (2011). Teaching Reading through WebQuest. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research. 2* (3): 664 – 673.