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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Literacy has traditionally been associated with the ability to read and write. This is understandable as etymologically speaking its word’s stem refers to the notions of ‘familiar with literature’ or ‘well educated, learned’ (UNESCO, 2006). In this disruptive era, the meaning proliferates and operates in accordance with the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, and use printed and written materials associated with varying contexts (UNESCO, 2015). Literacy, in this sense, involves a continuum of learning that enables an individual to achieve his or her goals. This at the same time will develop his or her knowledge and potential.

The act of developing one’s potential requires the need for one to process various information and understand messages in the effective communication. These include creating, collaborating, communicating, and working together in a wider communicative context that should go parallel with the ethical rules. The awareness and critical thinking in this context is then crucial as not only does it improve the quality of one’s life, but that it also impacts the country index development (MoEC, 2016).

The countries with high literacy level, such as Singapore, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, outperform in education, economy, political, and socio-cultural contexts. These countries are among the highest rank of average of OECD member (MOE, 2011). Taiwan, for instance, was in the first rank of mathematic with score 524, fourth rank of science with score 532 and sixteenth rank of reading with score 496 when it participated PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) for the first time in 2006. In 2009, this high ranking remains relatively stable. This satisfactory achievement is closely related to Taiwan Ministry of Education’s policy on literacy. They encourage schools to promote reading by issuing the parents’ handbook to support their children reading habit since the day the baby was born. This then follows by the government’s act in encouraging parents to cultivate their local tradition, i.e. the Chinese characters (Liao & Lai, 2013). This, continued Liao and Lai, can overtly be seen especially in the kindergarten schools (both private and public schools). They have implemented early
literacy by involving school and parents. The results showed that the kindergarten students are motivated to read the book independently as they have basic narrative ability and social communication skills. The teachers thus play a pivotal role as they believe that literacy activities have to be meaningful, since it was the key to future academic success which enabled the students to do the complex task.

Indonesia, on the other hand, faces challenges in improving the nation’s literacy rank despite its significant improving efforts, such as revisiting curriculum, building teachers’ capacity, promoting literacy movement. Although McKenzie Global Institute (2012) predicted Indonesia will occupy the fourth-first position of countries with the world’s largest economy in 2030, the PIRLS’ (Progress International Reading Literacy Study) and PISA’s reports demonstrate Indonesia’s unsatisfactory profile on literacy. In 2011, the literacy level of Indonesian fourth graders were in the 45th rank (with score 428 under 500) from 48 countries in PIRLS. According to the 2016 PISA’s report the fifteen-year-old Indonesian Junior High School students, occupy the 64th rank of 72 countries with score 396 under 496. The further evidence also shows that 70% adults in Jakarta merely understand short information, as they are unable to comprehend the long-text information (PISA, 2015).

Facing the disruptive era, in 2015 the Ministry of Education and Culture Indonesia issued its Ministerial Regulation no. 23/2015 on character building as a foundation for school literacy movement (Gerakan Literasi Sekolah – henceforth GLS). This policy (read also: regulation) regulates the mechanism of how to develop the students’ character building as the culmination of school literacy movement. This can be seen as the government’s effort to improve society literacy skills, through school, family and community collaborative actions. The movement ranges in various literacy forms (not only reading and writing but also financial, culture, and citizenship and digital literacy) to develop skills needed for twenty-first century era.

The national movement defines three fundamental stages to enhance student’s literacy particularly in primary and secondary schools. They are habitual, development, and learning stages (MoEC, 2016). The habitual stage aims to help the students grow their sense of reading through the 15-minute-reading non-textbooks habit before the class
starts. The students then associate what they read with their experiences through critical thinking and communicating their ideas in various modes.

B. State of the Art

In the last two years GLS has been gradually implemented particularly in all secondary schools across Indonesia. However, the studies concerning the effectiveness and/or implications of the movement in improving students' literacy skills are still scarce. Some are found in relation to the roles of library in GLS. Ilmiawan (2017) found that the school library is inadequate to accommodate literacy activities, not only in terms of book collection, but also the learning facilities. The libraries are frequently employed as the teachers’ ‘personal room' and/or for administrative tasks only. In alignment with this, the function of the school library as well as the lack of books available to accommodate GLS. He also found many teachers do not know what to do with literacy program. Many schools only practice 15-minute-reading activities before the class starts to develop habituation (the first stage of literacy, Muldian, Sufyadi, & Antoro, 2016). They have not reached the second and third stages, i.e. to improve the students’ literacy skills through effective strategies and enrichments.

Conversely, Taiwan reaches a very high literacy rate 98.04 in 2010 (the Ministry of Interior data Taiwan, 2010), the fourth highest country in Asia. The literacy rate indicates the country's national competitiveness, advance education and development (Kuo, 2011). The literacy practices in Taiwan are conducted in various forms. Liao & Lai's findings (2013) show Taiwan teachers undertake the warm-up listening activity by providing the creative story to make their students enthusiastic in listening activities and curious about the story. They implement the guided reading strategies, i.e. by way of leading the students to read line by line, give the questions to develop their students’ comprehension skills, discuss the material they read, guide them to reflect and connect what they read to their life. They teach the students word recognition or phonic recognition and write them down on the whiteboard. Based on this, the students are challenged to be creative in developing their own story. They monitor the students and help them when they face difficulties. The students then share their writing with their peers.

Parents’ involvement in literacy practice in Taiwan is in the form of establishing
constructive communication and interaction with their children that will motivate the students to explore their physical literacy-enriched environment. The process of habituation is conducted in all aspects of the society (not limited to only students, teachers and parents), such as ordering food, asking their students to read the menu, or even sending messages to their relative using Facebook.

This discrepant condition of literacy practice between Indonesia and Taiwan is interesting to investigate. Thus, this multiyear (3-year duration) research will deploy mixed research designs. A two layered case study is conducted in the first year concentrating on the scrutiny of the literacy praxis in Indonesia and Taiwan. In year two, a Research and Development (R&D) will be deployed to develop effective coaching model based on the findings on year one (adopting and adapting Taiwan’s best practices on literacy). The same research design will be used in year three to design e-modules and application software for coaching (based on the findings on year one and two).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>Sub Category</th>
<th>Compulsory</th>
<th>Additional</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>TS+1</th>
<th>TS+2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>International – Reputable</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Articles published in proceedings</td>
<td>International – Reputable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Conducted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Invited speaker in academic events</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Patent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copy right</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trademark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Research Problems and Problems Limitation

As earlier discussed, the long-term objective of this research deals with designing the e-modules and application software for coaching as its end product. This product is developed from the lens of layered case study in comparing the literacy praxis in Indonesia and Taiwan and the R&D design, i.e. conducting the need analysis and assessment for the coaching model and designing/developing the effective coaching system/model.

The research itself concentrates on how to escalate the students’ literacy competence (in this case reading and writing activities). The financial and cultural aspects as well as citizenship the Indonesian government regulation demands is seen insignificant for this context, as Muldian, Sufyadi, & Antoro (2016) found that the program itself merely meets the forging of students’ habituation in reading and writing.

In this framework, this research will address the following questions:

Year one:
1. How is the implementation of school literacy movement in two countries?
2. To what extent are the scopes both countries’ strategies able to promote school literacy movement in accordance to the implementation of the existing curriculum?
3. How do the parents and community support the literacy movements in both countries?
4. How do the movement improve the literacy competence of the two countries?

Year two (portraying and assessing the school’s need on the literacy program and designing/developing effective coaching system/model):

1. What was the mechanism/system the schools employ in implementing the national policy of GLS in order to strengthening the implementation of the existing curriculum?
2. How much scope the mechanism or the existing system at school in accordance with the government regulation successfully escalates the students’ literacy competence?
3. How effective is the existing model/system of literacy program implementation in line with the implementation of the existing curriculum?
4. What coaching model can effectively accommodate the enhancement of the students’ literacy competence?

Year three (designing/developing effective e-modules and application software for coaching):

1. How is the effective design of e-modules and application software for coaching in order to facilitate learning?
2. To what extent are the e-modules and application software for coaching effective in escalating the students’ (if not only the teachers’) literacy competence?

D. Research Objectives

The long-term objective is to design/develop the e-modules and application software for coaching to facilitate learning in the context of implementing the existing curriculum. Whilst the short-term objectives are to identify the schools’ needs to improve the program
implementation (in this case, in a form of the coaching system/model) and create the e-modules and application software for coaching.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW
This chapter discusses the notion of literacy in relation with the elements that correspond with the need of coaching system/model, such as school literacy and digital literacy. In this proposal, the financial and cultural aspects as well as the citizenship the Indonesian government regulation demands us to incorporate them in the program is given insignificant attention (see: research problems limitation for the rationale).

A. The Notion of Literacy

Literacy is traditionally defined as the ability to read and write (Ting, 2015). However, literacy is not merely about reading and writing, but also critical thinking, creativity, communication, team work and ICT and information technology (Thijs, Fisser, M. van der Hoeven (2014) in Bekker, Bakker, Douma, Poel, & Scheltenaar (2015). Binkley, et. al. (2012) classified these skills into ways of thinking (creativity and innovation, critical thinking, problem solving and decision making, learning to learn), ways of working (communication and collaboration), tools for working (information literacy and ICT literacy) and living in the world (citizenship, life and career, personal and social responsibility). In this sense, literacy can be perceived as ‘a social practice and form of cultural transmission’ (Barza & Suchodoletz, 2016).

In many countries, particularly the developing ones, literacy is one of the most critical issues of education amid the era of disruption. Almost every country develops a national policy and roadmap on literacy to foster and accelerate citizen's literacy competences to survive in the globalized world. However, literacy in well-developed countries, such as top OECD members, is no longer an issue but as an integral part of everyone's life. This can be seen from PISA rate of each country (2015). Interestingly, some Asian countries like Singapore, Taiwan, Japan, and Korea are on the top rank of PISA. On the contrary, Indonesia is in rank 64 (397 point) out of 72 countries (MoEC, 2017).

B. School Literacy

1. Policy
Different countries have their own policies and strategies to accelerate their citizen's literacy competences. But schools commonly take a central role of the country literacy development. Hence, it is worth to learn how a certain country like Taiwan promotes their literacy that successfully brings this country attained the fourth rank in science and reading literacy. Taiwan, as earlier mentioned, exemplifies the Asian country that outperforms in literacy (fourth rank in PISA). A key factor of this success story is its 'radical innovation of its educational system' particularly in its policy on multilingual learning in elementary schools (Chien, Lin & Chen, 2013). Despite its challenges, the country's policy on this issue is beneficial to note as a lesson learned by comparing it with the Indonesian policy on similar issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Key features of educational reform | • 9-year compulsory education since 1994  
• strengthening character education, since 2015  
• national literacy movement, since 2016 | • 12-year compulsory education, since 2014  
• multilingual literacy in elementary schools, since 2008  
• overexpansion of higher education |
| 2   | Policy documents on literacy | • MoE Curriculum Guidelines, 2013  
• MoE Regulation on character building and school literacy movement, 2015 | • MoE on Curriculum Guidelines |
| 3   | Guidelines for literacy | • National Guidelines since 2016  
• Parent's handbook (Gerakan Nasional Orangtua Membacakan Buku/Gernasbaku), since 2018 | • National guidelines since in 2012  
• Parent's handbook since 2008 |
| 4   | Aims of literacy policy | • To elevate quality of life, character building, social restoration and to strengthen unity and diversity | To foster reading habits from birth |
| 5   | Focus | 6 basic literacies: language, science, numeracy, digital, financial, culture, and | Multilanguage literacy: |
Both countries share similar path of literacy movement, i.e. through educational reform, but in a different pace. In Indonesia school literacy movement was launched in 2015 (a year later the national literacy movement), particularly aimed at elementary and junior high schools. Whereas, Taiwan launched the same policy (under the term of multilingual literacy, without movement) in 2008 for elementary schools.

Provided with guidelines, the movement practice in the two countries have different focus. Indonesia focuses on six basic literacies for 21st century education (based on World Economic Forum, 2015) in order to elevate students' quality of life. This is conducted by enhancing their life skills to live in multicultural settings with its culminating aim, i.e. to build students’ character. The movement involves all stakeholders in the education sector, such as central, provincial, district/city/municipal levels to the education units.

Taiwan, on the other hand, focuses on multi-language learning (English, Mandarin, and local language) to promote reading habits from birth. Therefore, the parents play pivotal role models. They prioritized their children by providing with handbook (2008) earlier than the national guideline (2012). The Ministry of Education (MoE) published a parent handbook to encourage and guide parents to foster children's reading habits since childhood to provide a strong foundation so that their children can develop their reading skills prior to preschool along with their skills to read and acquire basic Chinese characters (Liao and Lai, 2013). Echoing the policy, in 2012 MoE published Curriculum guidelines (2012a) to promote individual potentials through language learning and instruction in school (this includes comprehension of graphic symbols, written words and expression of graphic symbols). This is to enable children enjoy reading and articulate their personal viewpoints. The recent released guidelines (2012b) include instructions to plan the language and literacy curriculum.
2. School supports

All school members, such as teachers, principals, and librarian, as the supporting agents, need to collaborate in order to achieve the literacy’s goal (Pitcher & Mackey, 2013). Beside the school members, the school infrastructure, such as library, is needed, as it plays crucial role in improving the students’ literacy competence and the school’s academic atmosphere (Cohen & Bhatt, 2012; Laksono & Retnaningdyah, 2018).

Strengthening the students’ literacy competence and creating conducive school academic atmosphere for literacy needs, especially the teachers’ active roles in building creative learning atmosphere (Doležalová, 2017; Retnaningdyah & Laksono, 2017; Slovaček et al., 2017). The teachers also need to enrich their teaching materials, such as e-texts (Setiyadi, 2017). However, Retnaningdyah & Laksono continued that most teachers have inadequate understanding of the importance of scaffolding literacy strategies in developing the students’ higher-order thinking skills. Waluyo & Arifuddin (2017) found most teachers and principals are still confused with the implementation of the literacy for the government socialises the program in one seminar merely. That confusion leads to the misunderstanding where the literacy activities are managed by the language teachers merely (Waluyo & Arifuddin, 2017), whereas all teachers should be responsible for the literacy activities at school (Doležalová, 2017).

C. Digital Literacy

The ICT (information and communication technology) tools, such as computer and Web become everyday tools for today's’ kids. They also use the social media platforms to exchange the information with their friends and collaborate with them (Ting, 2015). Goulao & Fombona (2012) argue the use of the internet (this also represents the students’ computer literacy) for their learning leads to the students’ positive attitude.

What is digital literacy? ICT literacy panel (Ting, 2015) define literacy as the ability to use digital technology and communication tools for accessing, managing, integrating evaluating the information. Appel (2012) adds that digital literacy is also about the ability to analyse the information using computers and Web. They use them for various purposes, such as entertainment and education. In alignment with Ting (2015) and Appel (2012), Greene, Yu, & Copeland (2014) argue that digital literacy is also about the ability
to find, examine and integrate the information in critical way and meaningful in online learning. Voogt and Roblin (2010) and Boswinkel, Schram (2011) in Bekker, Bakker, Douma, Poel, & Scheltenaar (2015) support this as they perceive digital literacy as the capability to exert, understand, evaluate the technology and its principles and strategies to overcome the problem. Calvani, Fini and Ranieri (2009) in Covello (2010) frame the notion of digital literacy as the ability to use and explore the technology as well access and evaluate the information in flexible and responsible way for overcoming the problems. This can be seen in figure 1.

![Fig 2.1 Digital literacy](image)

In this sense, investigation on students’ digital literacy is exigent to be conducted especially due to the Internet and technology advancement (Greene et al., 2014) as well as today’s students’ high digital literacy. Covello (2010) reveals that the learner has different characteristics in skills, comprehension, interest and attitude of digital stuff (tools and content). One of the instruments to measure digital literacy is developed by National Educational Technology Standards for Students (2007). This is to measure the students’ creativity and innovation; communication and collaboration; research and information fluency; critical thinking, problem solving, and decision making; digital citizenship; technology operation and concepts. Therefore, the teachers should master the technological pedagogical content knowledge (Mishra and Koehler, 2006).

**D. The Development of Digital Sources Used for Literacy Program at School**
The librarians set up the books that are going to be read by students. There are some schools that have already provided the books based on the standards set by the government (Yulianto, et al., 2017). Regarding the RMEC No. 24/2007, the standard number of books that should be available at each school is 840 titles, which consists of 60% nonfiction (504 titles) and 40% fiction (336 titles) (Laksono & Retnaningdyah, 2018). However, Ahmadi & Yulianto (2018) found most schools meet difficulty in obtaining up-to-date books. This condition deteriorates as Laksono & Retnaningdyah (2018) found that some schools are still lacking in the enrichment books. They then decided to implement literacy reading policies by focusing on reciting the Qur'an. Other schools decided to concentrate only on the reading supplemental textbooks as suggested by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Waluyo, et al., 2017).

The main reason why most schools do not have the adequate numbers of standardised books are due to the fact that they still think that books are not important. This goes in line with the condition where the tax charge on books are still considered high. The charge leads to the expensive book price (Ahmadi & Yulianto, 2018) which entails to limited fund on book purchasing (Laksono & Retnaningdyah, 2018).

Referring back to the Ministerial regulation no. 23/2015 which stipulates that students must read non-textbooks containing the moral value, local wisdom, national or global issue based on their development stage, folktale, in Antoro's lens (2017) becomes a rich reading resources to instil Indonesian local wisdom. Barza & Suchodoletz, Lee (2011) investigated the folktale practice conducted by pre-schoolers teachers in Korea. Lee found that many pre-schoolers in Korea preferred the western folk literature, such as Disney’s movie. They also learned English using western books that contradicted to Korean culture. For instance, when they say “hello”, they waved their hand in which it was unacceptable in Korean culture because they had to bow their head to greet someone. Korean teachers taught the pre-schoolers to anticipate the loss of traditional culture in early generation. Thus, they employed the folk literature in their class toteach their students pertaining local moral values. Parallel with Lee, Creese, Wu, & Blackledge (2009) found that the use of Chinese folk story in curriculum for overseas students give the students understanding their own culture and other culture (Arbona & Chireac, 2015).

Beside folktales, Abidin & Razak (2003) also argue that teaching animation has potential power to enhance the students’ learning, as animation offers interactive medium that
enable to retain in students’ learning memory longer. Alade, Folaranmi, & Qdejobi (2015) urged that animation folktale can build students’ motivation to read and their socio-cultural awareness among children as well preserve the local heritage.

E. Literate Environment
Access Center (2007) defines literate environment as the setting that engages the students to involve actively in language and literacy activities. It includes school physical environment, Social and affection-enriched environment and academic environment.

1. School physical environment
Wiedarti et al. (2016) argue that conducive and comfortable physical environment (library, reading corner, and posters) is important to support the literacy movement as it enhances students’ literacy competence. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning stated that the United Nations members set the 2030 Agenda to create the world with universal literacy. In EFA Global Monitoring Report, Lisa Krolakurges (2006) argues that library plays a key role in creating literate environment and promoting literacy by offering adult and family literacy classes. Libraries assist us in finding, using and interpreting appropriate information that opens up the opportunities for lifelong learning, literacy enhancement, informed citizenship, recreation, creative imagination, individual research, critical thinking, and empowerment in this increasingly complex world.

Christina Clark’s (2010) on the linkage between school libraries and students’ literacy found that from 112 schools and 17,089 students (11 to 16 years old) the students who like to visit the school library have higher self-assessments of reading ability as well as more positive attitudes towards reading than those who did not. This indicates a strong relationship between reading and school library use with students who read below the expected level for their age.

Beside library, reading corner in the classrooms plays important role. This was not designed to compete with the school library as its purpose is not to bring the book to the students, but to make students used to the book and closer with the books. The students can maximize their reading in class, wait for their teacher in the class, and spend time by reading during lunch break. The government allocated 5% of Bantuan Operational
Sekolah (BOS – School Operational Grant) funding, from the overall school’s fund, for buying the reading materials, fiction and non-fiction books. The principal is in charge of the allocation to buy the reading material books (Antoro, 2017).

The Ministry of Education and Culture itself published the Ministry of Education and Culture Law no. 8/2016 concerning the book used in school for the School Literacy Movement. There are two mandatory components for an acceptable book in the School Literacy Movement: (a) the content of the book must hold positive values and norms in society, i.e. no pornography, radicalism, extremism, violence, ethnic issue, gender bias, and moral indecency and (b) it fulfills the evaluation criteria of acceptable book to be used in school.

2. Social and affection-enriched environment

Wiedarti et al. (2016) argue that social and affection-enriched environment are literate communication and interaction model. They can be reached by giving the students appreciation for their participation in the literacy movement such as recognition and award. The appreciation goes not only to the students’ academic attainment, but also their willingness to be involved. Thus, every student has the same chance to obtain the appreciation for their participations. In addition, in conjunction with the school literacy program, the students will participate in important school events, such as book festival, poster competition, and storytelling. In those events, the principal is expected to actively participate in the school literacy movement, collective collaborate with teachers and staffs

Beside teachers, principals, students and school staff, parents play important part in the school literacy movement. Parents are demanded to show a strong commitment in the school literacy program. Parents play a vital role in their children emergent literacy as they become the first source of learning the children encounter. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1997) found three major factors that is believed to be the central in parents’ involvement in their children education. The first factor is parents’ belief. They felt responsible to be involved in their children’s education and establish the activities as important, necessary, and allowed for their own action with and on behalf of children. The second factor is the parents’ sense of efficacy, i.e. in form of helping their children to succeed in school. The third factor is the demands, invitation from school, and opportunities for parents to be actively involved at the school.
Eccles (2005) found that parents’ belief influence children and adolescents’ academic motivation and engagement. The parents’ education and job influence, their beliefs and behaviours also influence the children’s perceptions of their own ability. This evidently showed when the parents rate their children English abilities that undermined their children interest in mathematics. Thus, it does not matter how good the children actually at mathematics, they will come to believe they are better in English than they are in mathematics. In other words, parents influence the children’s own ability self-perceptions and interest.

F. Academic environment

Wiedarti et al. (2016) explain that teachers and the academic staffs need literacy coaching. This will improve their knowledge about literacy especially pertaining how to effectively implement the movement, and successfully deliver the knowledge to the students. In Indonesian context, Curriculum 2013 demands the teaching and learning activities to be student-centred, where the one who actively learning is the students and the teacher act as the facilitator. However, the position of teacher in GLS is not merely a facilitator. They are actively involved in literacy activities. The teachers are assumed to have wider knowledge and experience in literacy than the students. Therefore, the teachers’ involvement in the literacy activities are essential to guide the students. The teachers are expected to draw out their ability and potential in implementing the literacy movement.

In 2011, Penn-Edwards conducted a study to see Queensland University students’ and teachers’ understanding on literacy. The result showed that from 309 participants (the majority of participants were under 30 years old and 254 were pre-service teachers) had limited understanding of literacy. The participants’ conception of literacy was centred on texts. Their concept of literacy was limited to reading and writing only.

In line with Penn-Edwards, Taylor et al. (2003) investigates multiple aspects of literacy lessons and evaluates the relation between the children’s reading and writing growth. He found that higher-level questioning matters. The teachers who asked high-level questions appear to understand the importance of challenging their students to think about what they had read. This study also reveals that the high level of coaching and involving students in active reading enhanced students’ growth in fluency. Teachers’ effective
questioning of texts is aimed at assessing students’ learning, especially towards the challenging questions. Teachers use coaching and modelling to help students learn as well as help them to build up their sense of responsibility for their own learning.

G. Research Roadmap

Research Roadmap of Literacy Interest Group

2015 - 2018
- Teacher’s Perspectives and practices in applying technology to enhance learning in the classroom
- Developing Sociolinguistic Awareness of Indonesian Learners Through Online Intercultural Exchange in Japanese Language Learning

2019 - 2021
- Implementation of Literacy Movement
- Coating model for literacy
- Designing E-Modules prototypes for coaching

2022-2025
- Program evaluation on coaching model for literacy movement
- Literacy learning model for elementary schools

Fig 2.2 Research roadmap

Research interest group on literacy which was developed in 2015 aimed to find out teachers' perspectives and digital literacy practices in classrooms as an initial response to the literacy national movement. As for many years studies on literacy were carried out on individual bases, the research group is expected to significantly contribute to the implementation of national movement particularly in improving students' literacy skills. By establishing a multiyear research collaboration with Taiwan Asia University (2019-2021) the group will be able to map literacy praxis in Indonesia and Taiwan contexts and further explore best practices from Taiwan as one of the Asian countries with highest literacy rate. The next research will then develop e-modules and application software for coaching school teachers. In the following stage, the model will be implemented in school’s wider contexts and further evaluate for its effectiveness.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section discusses the overall research design (multi/3-year research) along with data collection techniques and data analysis procedures of each year. The second section presents research design of the first year of the study, subject and techniques of data collection and analysis.
A. Overall Research Design

This study is divided into three stages (each stage takes one-year length of study). The first stage of study was conducted and reported this year 2019 to investigate the comparison of literacy praxis in Indonesia and Taiwan in the form of layered case study. The second stage focuses on designing the coaching model deploying research and development design, whilst the third one designing the e-coaching application deploying the same design as the second one in a form of fishbone diagram. This will delineate the research procedures of each stage, its outputs, indicators as well as location.

1. The First Stage (Year One)
   The study of this stage is focused on the praxis of literacy in Indonesian and Taiwan junior high schools. This will be further discussed in part B.

2. The Second Stage (Year Two)
   The aim of the research at this stage is to develop a coaching model to help the teachers/schools make effective and efficient implementation of the literacy program. Research and development (R&D) will be conducted at this stage. The need analysis/assessment will be conducted prior to designing of the coaching model. When the urgency of this model is justified, the coaching model will be designed by deploying Borg and Gall (2003) model of R&D.

3. The Third Stage (Year Three)
   The focus of the third stage will be on designing prototype of e-modules for coaching as well as online user-friendly application software to promote literacy rich activities for the students to upgrade their literacy competence. The application will later be tested to check its effectiveness and efficiency as well as undergone public hearing.

Diagram below illustrates the research’s procedures and the output of first, second and third stage.
Fig 3.1 Research flowchart

Layered Case Studies (Year 1) and Research and Development (Year 2 and 3)

First Stage (Year One) Layered Case Study

- Literacy praxis in Indonesian and Taiwan schools
- Data Collection Techniques:
  1. Documents analysis on policy and regulations on school-based literacy (movement);
  2. Observation on the implementation of school-based literacy;
  3. Questionnaires;
  4. Interview; and
  5. Focus group discussion

Data Analysis
- Procedures:
  - Examining the linearity of internal and external elements involved in the program implementation (Indonesia and Taiwan) and triangulate the findings

Location: Jakarta and Taiwan

Output: Scopus-indexed journal article discussing the comparative study of literacy praxis in Indonesia and Taiwan

The Second Stage (Year Two) R&D

- Coaching model to increase students' literacy competence
  1. Conducting need analysis/assessment by collecting data through:
     - Questionnaires
     - Observation on the implementation of the literacy program at the target school
     - Interview with relevant stakeholders.
  2. Designing the coaching model based on Borg and Gall’s theory.

Location of Year Two: Jakarta

Output: The 2nd Stage:
  1. Scopus-indexed journal article pertaining the design of the coaching model;
  2. Coaching model;

The Third Stage (Year Three) R&D

- E-modules and application software for coaching

Location of Year Three: Jakarta

Output:
  - The 3rd Stage:
    1. Scopus-indexed journal article pertaining e-modules and application software for coaching;

Location of Year Three: Jakarta
B. The First Stage of Study

The first stage is designed in the form of two-layered case study, concentrating on the study of literacy praxis in Indonesia (the first layer) and in Taiwan (the second layer) junior high schools. The literacy praxis in both countries will then be compared in order not only to scrutinize the similarities and differences between them, but more importantly also to adopt and adapt the best practices conducted in Taiwan and values that comply with the values of Indonesian local wisdom.

1. The First Layer: Literacy Praxis in Indonesia

The focus of this case study is on the implementation of the literacy movement, especially in junior high schools of Jakarta. The investigation commenced from the preparation stage to the implementation of the literacy program (as mentioned earlier literacy movement in Indonesia is itself a government program especially promoted in primary and secondary schools not only to escalate Indonesian students’ literacy competence, but also to make the movement as a cultural practice).

a. The Participants’ Profiles

The participants of this study were 37 teachers, 23 principals, 2 school supervisors, 129 parents, and 238 students. They were from 36 public junior high schools representing five districts of Jakarta (East Jakarta, West Jakarta, North Jakarta, South Jakarta, and Central Jakarta) along with 3 literacy activists. Public junior high schools were taken into main consideration since every public school is required to implement the school literacy movement since the first time of its commencement. The followings illustrate the participants’ as well as schools’ profiles.

Thirty-seven teachers involved in this study mostly have more than ten-year-teaching experiences. Almost two-third (60%) of them aged over 50 years and 30% aged 30 to 40 years (12 teachers), and 10% aged less than 30 years (2 teachers). Most of the teachers (84%) taught Bahasa Indonesia subject, 8% social studies, 3% mathematics, 3% marketing teachers, and 2% economics teachers. Only 68% of the teachers were actively involved in school literacy activities.

From 23 principals participated in this study most (96%) of them hold their Master Degree certificates, whilst 4% hold their bachelor ones), they were approximately 47-50 years
(22%), 51-54 years old (35%), and 55-58 years old (43%). 35% of school principals have served 3-4 years. 26% served for about 7-8 years (26%), 13% served for 5-6 years, 17%1-2 years, 4% 3 months whilst another 4% served for 14 days. Although 57% of principals claimed that they understood the school literacy guidelines, 43% of them asserted that they still did not understand. The later may be due to the lack of socialization, program guidelines, and/or the principal's unwillingness to learn more about the movement.

As for 129 parents’ profiles, two third (69%) of parents’ age was over 40 years (90 respondents) and only 31% (40 respondents) aged under 40 years. 25% (32 respondents) were undergraduates, 13% (19 respondents) was Diploma level, 12% graduated from junior high school, 2% (3 respondents) took Master degree education, 7% (9 respondents) graduated from elementary school, and 1% did not graduate from elementary school. Most of them (41% - 53 respondents) are housewives, 21% (27 respondents) are employees, and 13% (17 respondents) are self-employed. In terms of monthly income, 40% (51 respondents) earned less than Rp3 million per month and 38% (48 respondents) earned Rp3 million-Rp6 million per month. From housewives’ respondents it was known that 13% (16 respondents) received monthly allowance from their husbands. 1% claimed to earn Rp500 thousand per month. For books purchasing, 52% of parents (68 respondents) claimed that they have allocated a special fund to buy books for their children and 48% (62 respondents) did not allocate such fund. 66% (86 respondents) stated that they liked to read books at home and 34% (44 respondents) did not like reading books at home. 84% (59 respondents) said 1-5 books were read in a month, 3% (3 respondents) read 10-20 books, 13% (11 respondents) answered uncertain how many books they read in a month. 58% (75 respondents) claimed to have a collection of books at home while 42% (55 respondents) stated that they did not have a collection of books at home.

As for the students, there were 238 eighth graders (13-15 years old) from 15 public junior high schools in Jakarta province participated in this research. All filled out the questionnaires and 15 of them were interviewewed.

Three literacy activists (33-36 years old) involved in this study each representing North Jakarta, East Jakarta, and Central Jakarta. Besides they were an early childhood teacher, a community library staffs, and a lecturer.
b. Data collection
The data constitute relevant documents, such as government policy and regulation on literacy movement, the students’ works during the fifteen-minute reading activity before the class starts, the teachers’ evaluation instruments and the evaluation results, government/school regulations, questionnaires, observation, interview and focus group discussion with all the stakeholders involved pertaining the program implementation. The questionnaires were distributed to the aforementioned participants, whereas, observation was conducted in five public junior high schools representing five districts of Jakarta. The number of schools were considered sufficient to portray the implementation in public junior high schools since they share many things in common (i.e. school size, characteristics, and facilities). Three focus group discussions (FGD) were conducted and attended by 36 school representatives. It was divided into three groups: the first group consisted of 2 school supervisors and principals, the second group involved 37 teachers, whilst the third one was 3 literacy activists from different parts of Jakarta.

c. Data analysis and interpretation
The data is analysed by examining the linearity as well as triangulation of internal and external elements related to and involved in the implementation, such as government and/or school policies and regulations, questionnaires, observation, interview and focus group discussion. Triangulation is exigent to be conducted in order to check and justify data validity and trustworthiness.

2. The Second Layer: Literacy Praxis in Taiwan
As the literacy praxis in Taiwan is no longer a national issue (but as a way of life of the Taiwanese), the study in the second layer is conducted on the basis of Taiwan context. The participants, data collection, analysis, and interpretation follow similar mechanism with the one in Jakarta. However, some adjustment were made according to the research needs, such as number of participants, junior high schools, and covering area of this study.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the study and discussion in three main sections. The first illustrates the data presentation and interpretation of literacy praxis in Jakarta Indonesia and Taiwan on (1) the implementation of school literacy movement; (2) the strategies to promote literacy; (3) the parents’ and community support; and (4) the student's literacy competence
improvement. The second section discusses the research findings of the two countries and the last is lesson learned from the study for future direction.

A. Data Presentation and Interpretation

a. Literacy praxis in Jakarta

These sub-sections are fourfold. The first ones discuss the implementation of school literacy at 36 Junior High Schools in Jakarta. The second one examines the strategies to promote school literacy program. The third one explores the parents’ and community support, whilst the one sees whether the program implementation successfully improve the student’s literacy competence.

1. The implementation of school literacy movement

This sub-section examines the implementation of the program, i.e. how much knowledge the participants, such as the teachers and principals know about the national movement on literacy program (in this case in the form of school literacy program), the activities developed in this program, and also the teachers’ encouragement for students to use of the information technology.

Not all junior high schools in Jakarta received the socialization of school literacy movement program. The data showed that 78% of the participants were not informed about GLS dissemination, whilst the rest (22%) of the participants claimed otherwise. The dissemination itself was conducted by the government (education authority, Educational Quality Assurance Council, and Ministry of Education and Culture –88%) and 6% by the teacher associations (MGMP of Indonesian and English teachers) and 6% by universities (one of which is the state university in Jakarta) (Figure 4.1)

![Fig 4.1 The school literacy movement socialization (principal’s questionnaire)](image-url)
The difference in the data about whether they have been well informed with the GLS program (read also: socialization) or not between the school principals and teachers indicates that the communication gap between the teachers and principals pertaining the socialization potentially occurs. In addition, the information obtained in the socialization program for the teachers might not be specific. These potentially made the principals consider the information the teacher obtained inappropriate.

This also possibly relates with the data on figure 4.3 (represents the teachers’ knowledge of the guidelines of the school literacy movement). It was revealed that 76% of the teachers were responsible for the school literacy movement. However, this result contradicts the information as in Figure 4.2, i.e. from 92% of teachers who attend the socialization program, only 76% well understood the information disseminated. This can also be seen from the participants’ responses (who did not understand the guidelines): “we neither read the guidelines [4 teachers] nor received the instructions from the school principal [2 teachers]”. In this senses, this indicates that although the majority of the participants had participated in the socialization program, they did not have the initiative to increase their understanding of school literacy movement. This condition also deteriorated as no overt attempts from the principals as well as the government were conducted in order to bridge the missing links in the communication gap.
From the aforementioned condition, the program was developed into various activities, such as reading (32%), creating literacy environments, such as creating literacy corners, literacy trees (25%), establishing literacy teams (11%), integrating literacy activities in the lesson plans (11%), holding literacy contests (11%), creating events, such as writing books and compiling articles for anthology (7%) and making library visit schedules (4%). This can be seen in fig 4.4.

Seven school principals’ questionnaires contended that the school literacy program was conducted on daily basis, whilst the rest on selected days. The activities carried out were also varied from reading activities, drama activities, poetry reading, stand-up comedy, to retelling the gist of the books in front of other students.
During the activities, only 45% of teachers encouraged students to use information technology, such as the internet, devices, and other electronic devices. More than half (55%) did not utilize information technology (Fig 4.6).
2. Strategies to promote literacy

This sub-section explores the strategies conducted by the teachers as well as the principals in encouraging the literacy program at school.

**The strategies carried out by the teacher**

The result from the teacher's questionnaires showed that all schools used a number of strategies (read also: the combination) to carry out 15-minute reading activities before the teaching and learning activities, such as silent reading, summarizing and integrating teaching and learning activities in the classroom.

From the focus group discussion, it was also revealed that various forms of best practices were implemented as the strategy to arouse students' reading motivation. However, the practices were a mere performative in nature. This can be seen as follows:

Teacher B: *Penampilan siswa dari perwakilan kelas untuk mempresentasikan hasil bacaan sekaligus memperlihatkan buku bacaan dimaksudkan agar siswa lain termotivasi untuk membaca dan ikut mempresentasikan hasil bacaaannya. Kemudian pada waktu tertentu diadakan pameran di tiap kelas dan ada beberapa yang menampilkan pohon literasi pada saat lomba* (The students’ performance (the class representative), [i.e.] presenting the results of their reading as well showing the book is intended to give motivation to another student to read and participate in presenting the reading results. Then at certain point of times, an exhibition is held in each class including the showcasing of the literacy tree during the competition).

Conversely, the results of the questionnaires as well as the FGD results did not show what kind of follow-up from various strategies that could stimulate to build the students’ reading habits. This can overtly be seen as follows:

*Setiap kelas diberi waktu satu jam pelajaran anak bisa membaca di perpustakaan atau di taman literasi dan disuruh membuat ringkasan buku yang dibaca dikumpulkan dan dikoleksi di perpustakaan, dibuat pojok literasi di setiap kelas (40 minutes are allocated for the students to read in the library or at the literacy “park”. They are then asked to summarize the book they read, or the book they borrowed from the library. They then collected and compiled the summaries they made in the literacy corner).*
Hasil rangkuman membaca siswa dikliping dikumpul di mading (The results of the students' reading were collected in the students’ announcement board).

Buku yang dibaca adalah buku cerita rakyat nusantara, buku yang membangun karakter berbudi luur. Buku itu dirangkum, hasil rangkuman dijilid, dikumpulkan di perpustakaan (The books the students read are Indonesian folklores, or books that build the student characters. Those books are then summarized, compiled, and collected in the library).

Membaca di lapangan disatukan dengan kegiatan unjuk kebolehan (reading in the school yard is combined with the students’ performance).

The implementation strategy of the 15-minute reading activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discuss the contents of the book</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage using various learning</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fill in a journal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read loud</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrate into the lessons</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make a summary</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.7 The strategies of 15-minute reading activities

The strategies carried out by the principal

There were several steps taken by school principals in implementing the School Literacy Movement, namely adding library collections (13%), forming school literacy teams (12%), literacy policies-making (11%), involving all school members in literacy activities (11%), integrating literacy in teaching and learning activities (11%), encouraging teachers to make reading material in accordance with their field of expertise (8%), giving awards to students and teachers who excel in literacy (8% each), giving awards to librarians who excel in literacy (5%), and make reading corners (1%).
In addition, the principal also undertook some strategies in increasing the capacity of teachers and librarians/library staff in implementing the School Literacy Movement. These include sending the teachers to attend training (40%), providing opportunities for teachers to develop creative literacy activities (40%), conducting literacy training (16%), asking teachers to do classroom action research (2%) and making school bulletins (2%). In addition, the principals also provided opportunities for librarians or library staff to develop themselves, i.e. by joining the literacy-related trainings (54%) and conducting creative literacy activities (46%).

![Fig. 4.8 Principals’ strategies to develop teachers and librarians’ capacity](image)

In order to build literate schools, one of the efforts undertaken by the principal is to develop a literacy-rich environment, i.e. establishing literacy corners (9%), providing bulletin boards to facilitate students' work (19%), displaying student work (19%), providing reading corners in each class (15%), revitalizing library functions (12%), adding reading sources such as e-books, audio books, etc. (9%) and creating digital learning resources (8%).

In carrying out the 15-minute reading activity, the principal evaluates the activity regularly (59%). In addition, the principal also regularly supervises teachers (41%).
In designing/formulating school literacy policies, several components were considered by the school principals, i.e. the stages of literacy (habituation, development and learning activities) (27%), literacy teams to be formed (24%), literacy time whether to be integrated in teaching and learning activities or separate (22%), expected outcomes (17%), and monitoring and evaluation forms that measure literacy outputs (10%)

3. Parents and community support

Parents involvement in school

From the questionnaire filled out by parents, it is showed that 88 respondents (67.7%) responded that they never received an invitation from the School Principal to attend the socialization on the School Literacy Movement. However, 42 respondents (32.3%) received such invitation. The parents’ questionnaire also showed that 89 parents (68.5%) stated that they never got involved in the literacy events held by schools, whilst 42 respondents (31.5%) had been otherwise. 89.2% of the parents claimed that they have never been involved in library management. They also never attended the literacy program held by the school (80.8%). Only 19.2% parents have attended. 80.8% of parents also never give input to schools related to the literacy activities. In addition, from the results of student interviews,
the average student did not know the form of parent involvement in literacy activities at school. The following is a brief excerpt from their answer in interview:

Student D: Orang tua jarang dilibatkan (Parents are rarely involved)
Student E: Nggak, belum (No yet)

The findings from the parents’ questionnaires were different from the teacher’s questionnaires which demonstrate that parents have a high involvement in support school literacy.

Table 4.1. Parents’ involvement in supporting school literacy movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ involvement at school</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receive invitation from school</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in literacy event</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve in managing school library</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend literacy event</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give inputs to the school</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the parents’ questionnaires show that parents' involvement in literacy activities include buying books for their children (56.2%), participating in school literacy activities (21.5%).

Related to the implementation of School Literacy from questionnaires, it was revealed that the internal and external parties of the school have direct and indirect involvement. There was only one participant who responded that all parties in his school were involved in School Literacy. In other words, it can be concluded that GLS has not been fully supported even though parents, supervisors and school committees are already involved. However, it needs to be explored further how the involvement of these parties.

Parents’ involvement at home

From the distribution of the student’s questionnaires, it was known that 40% of students rarely read non-text books as other activities hindered them to do so, such as playing games on their smart phones or playing with their friends and doing homework. Besides, they also asserted that they did not like to read; they had to attend courses outside school; and they claimed that they did not have many (non-text) books. 29% of students usually read books, 22% of students often read books, and 9% of students always read non-textbooks at home.

From the student’s questionnaires, it was found that they (38%) discussed the books they read with parents at all times, 30% claimed rarely, 15% often read, and 10% never read the
books at home. This is due to the findings that their parents were busy; they did not like to read; other activities hindered them to do so; they considered book discussion with their children unimportant; they preferred discussing book content with friends; and they did not understand the contents of the book. These contradict with the data obtained from the parents’ questionnaires. It was found that the majority of 79.2% parents claimed they read a book (read aloud) to their children and only 20.8% of parents never do so as their children love to read by themselves; they were busy working, their children did not want to read books; they are illiterate; and no books are available.

Student B: *Gak karena sudah besar, sudah bisa baca sendiri.* (No, because we have already grown up, we can read by ourselves).

*Waktu kecil, sekarang nggak.* (Yes, when I was a child, not now).
From the questionnaires above, it is showed that only 2.3% of parents always buy books for their children, 36.9% rarely, 30.8% often, 16.9% claimed that they usually buy non-text books, and 13.1% never buy non-text books for their children. The parents’ reluctance in book buying is due to the following conditions:

1. they will buy books if they have money ;
2. their children ask for it ;
3. they themselves do not like to read ;
4. their children can read from their smart phones .
94.6% parents contended that they forced their children to find the information from the internet as it was cheaper, it is easy to access and practical, it will broaden the students’ horizons, knowledge and information, whilst 5.4% claimed otherwise as they love to go to the bookstores rather than finding the information from the internet.

In addition, 84.6% of parents encouraged their children to visit public libraries, museums or other sources of information to add insight, knowledge and experience, whilst 20 parents (15.4%) did not do so as their children objected such encouragement; no time to do so; it was easier to find information via smart phone; and the locations of those places were too far from home. In this sense, parents’ involvement at home play little role as the children read also: students’) activity in reading non-text books is seen insignificant; and that the activities to discuss the contents of the books with parents were also limited. Besides, the awareness of parents to provide reading resources is not yet high.

**Community involvement in schools**

Based on the principals’ questionnaires, it was revealed that the steps taken by the community (read also: the literacy activists) to promote literacy program are as follows:

1. strengthening the role of school committees;
2. involving community leaders or members from various professions in literacy activities (30%);
3. engaging the public community (30%);
4. working with government/private institutions/institutions to facilitate literacy activities (30%) .

From the FGD data, it was found that merely one school principal joined the Training of Trainer (ToT) for the integration of literacy in each subject.

However, when two activists contended that they had been invited by school-based related literacy activities, i.e. in Gerakan Nasional Orang Tua Membacakan Buku (Gernas Buku) which was held by Ministry of Education and Culture and in the teachers’ meetings), the principals asserted that no activists have showed up at their schools.

Kepala Sekolah D: *Tidak ada pegiat yang datang ke sekolah kami* (There were no activists who came to our school)
As for the activities held specifically involved the students as well as the teachers, the three activists (the participants in the GD) claimed that they had such program. They are “Gernas Buku” – a mobile library that lend a number of books to school for reading corners and 15-minute reading activity – , writing workshop, and morning reading presentation activities (the students read books and present them to the class every day).

Such activities are not easy to be implemented. The activists were frequently associated with having ulterior motive, i.e. aiming for money-seeking from school. This is experienced by one of the literacy activists as quoted below:

*Sudah 12 tahun menjalankan kegiatan literasi, mengalami banyak tentangan, penolakan. (It's been 12 years running literacy activities, experiencing a lot of opposition, rejection)*

The lack of acceptance does not only come from the school, but also the provincial education office (*Dinas Pendidikan*). The latter has not yet opened a wide access to literacy activists:

*Saya agak malas berhubungan dengan Sudin (Suku Dinas Pendidikan) karena harus bersurat dan pihak Sudin kadang menganggap kegiatan literasi merepotkan. Sudin sering melempar surat permohonan atau menolak. Belum ada budaya di instansi yang memudahkan pegiat literasi masuk/terlibat (I’m rather lazy to deal with Sudin (the Office of Education, Suku Dinas). I have to write a letter and Sudin sometimes find literacy activities [developed by the
activists] are troublesome. Sudin often throws out our proposals or refuses them. No bureaucratic culture facilitates us).

From the activists group discussion, it was revealed that the easy collaborative activity between the activists and schools was the library management. The volunteers can work with librarians or library staff to make the library lively. This is as stated as follows:

*Kegiatan membaca di sekolah sekadar formalitas ketika buku hanya dipegang dan dibaca. Kadang sekolah (negeri) tidak mau dibuat repot. Alasannya di antaranya kegiatan sekolah sudah padat. Perpustakaan sekolah sangat leluasa mengelola perpustakaan karena anggaran dan fasilitas sudah tersedia* (Reading activities at school were just formalities as the books were only held and read. Sometimes the public schools do not want to be disturbed. [They claimed that] that school activities are already tight. [Nevertheless] the school librarian has his/her liberty to manage the library as [they manage their own] budget and facilities).

4. Student's literacy improvement

**Obstacles encountered and solution to overcome in implementing school-based literacy movement**

The followings are the obstacles during the school-based literacy program implementation from the lens of the principals:

1. The lack of creative human resources (16%);
2. Teachers’ complaint pertaining the full time learning (20%) which diminished literacy time allocation (14%);
3. The lack of socialization of GLS (14%);
4. The lack of budget (8%);
5. The lack of education authority supervising (8%)

These findings contradicted what they described during the focus group discussion. They claimed that their school had limited reading sources; the students had low reading motivation; the teachers and students had lack understanding on the book they read; the students did the plagiarism; the books and students’ work displayed were missing; and the parents did not involve to support literacy school program. These can be overtly seen as follows:

Principal I: *Siswa hampir menerbitkan antologi puisi namun setelah diperiksa di internet, hasil karya siswa plagiat* (the students almost published their
anthology on poetry. However, when it was checked, their works indicated plagiarism).

Principal E: Buku yang sangat minim sehingga anak tidak bisa membaca buku yang berbeda. Orang tua memiliki keinginan memberikan buku namun pelaksanaannya belum maksimal. Minat baca rendah. Guru perlu pelatihan tentang literasi untuk mengubah mindset. Karya siswa dan buku non-fiksi mulai menghilang (The book collection [at the library] is very limited. [This made] the students can’t read various book. The parents have willingness to provide the book, but unfortunately it is very poor. But it is contradictive to the implementation. [The student’s] reading motivation is low. The teachers need to have literacy training to change their mindset. The students’ work and non-fiction books were gradually disappearing).

Principal N: Siswa ketika membaca, pemahaman mereka kurang. Tidak semua guru memiliki kemampuan itu juga (Students and some teachers have lack understanding in reading).

Principal O: Kesinambungan 15 menit membaca ke pembelajaran dan banyak guru dan siswa yang belum menganggap pentingnya 15 menit membaca (Many teachers and students consider 15-minute reading activity less important)

Principal P: Guru belum literat terlihat dari tidak sinkron antara rujukan dengan daftar pustaka (Teachers are still considered “illiterate”. This can be seen from the non-synchronization between the book’s content and its reference).

Principal K: Ketika membeli di percetakan, harganya tidak terjangkau dan buku tidak ada. (The price of book is unaffordable and it is rare to find)

In order to overcome the obstacles, the principals conducted several strategies, such as:

a. learning other school’s best practice (24%);
b. asking parents to provide reading sources (20%);
c. cooperating with publishers to add the library collection (20%);
d. cooperating with industry to provide facilities (12%);
e. extending learning time (2%);
f. motivating school members (teachers, students, and staff) (2%);
g. adding the literacy budget (2%).

Some responses were congruent with the results of focus group discussion, i.e. motivating the students to read and write, extending the time allocation as well as adding book collection. These can be seen as follows:
Principal I: *Guru harus mensortir bahan bacaan yang layak dibaca. Langkah awal kami adalah menumbuhkan minat membaca siswa.* (The teacher must sort reading material. Our first step is to foster interest in reading students.)

Principal J: *Menambah jam, sehingga kepulangan diundur.* (Adding the school time, so after-school hours were postponed)

Principal H: *Kepala sekolah membeli buku-buku fiksi sehingga banyak siswa ke perpustakaan untuk membaca.* (The principal bought fiction books to make the students went to the library to read)

---

**Fig. 4.13 Obstacles and strategies to overcome during school-based literacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The obstacles encountered during school-based literacy</th>
<th>Principal’s strategy to overcome the obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supervising from the education authority</td>
<td>Add the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load of teaching time</td>
<td>Motivate all school members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of budget</td>
<td>Add learning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of socialization</td>
<td>Cooperate with the publisher to add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of creative human sources</td>
<td>Cooperate with public or literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>Learn from other good schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of book</td>
<td>Cooperate with industry or company to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### The student’s literacy improvement

The principal’s questionnaires demonstrated that the school-based literacy movement benefited to students’ learning achievement, i.e. the students’ reading ability increased (41%), academic (37%) and non-academic achievement (20%) increased and ability to make poem or story increased (2%). It was also found in focus group discussion in which principal K described that her students’ reading motivation increased as the result of school-based literacy activities:

Principal K: *Setelah adanya GLS, siswa memiliki minat baca yang cukup tinggi* (After conducting GLS, students showed better reading motivation).

From the teacher’s questionnaires, it was also found that the dominant learning outcome was in form of the student’s reading ability escalation, the improvement of students’ ability to express their opinion, and the increase on students’ reading motivation. However, this
contradicts the results from the FGD. It was found that the literacy program outcome merely highlighted the improvement of students’ reading habit and motivation and the students’ ability to summarize:

Teacher A: Kami menargetkan siswa dapat membaca minimal 1 buku dalam 1 bulan, fiksi atau nonfiksi dengan menggunakan perpustakaan sebagai sarana dalam literasi. (We targeted one student to read 1 book a month, fiction or non-fiction book)

Teacher B: Melalui gerakan membaca 15 menit sebelum pelajaran ini diharapkan siswa membaca dua buku lebih per bulan (the students are expected to read two books or more in a month during this GLS movement)

Teacher C: Kami tidak mengharuskan berapa halaman yang harus dibaca dan buku apa saja yang dibaca. Yang penting siswa membawa buku yang disukai asal bukan komik dan membiasakan membaca setiap harinya semampunya. (We do not force the students to read what book and how many pages they read. The important thing is they bring books and read them voluntarily).

Teacher D: Anak-anak membuat sinopsis atau rangkuman sebagai bukti sudah membaca. Acuan rangkumannya tidak kami tentukan yang penting anak menuliskan kembali apa yang sudah dibaca. Nantinya hasil rangkuman dijilid dan dipajang di perpustakaan. (The students create synopsis or make summary as the evidence they read the book. They summarize freely as long as they rewrite what they read. Their summary will be compiled and displayed at library.)

The student’s questionnaires showed that GLS increased their learning outcome by 86%. They perceived that their reading ability improved; they liked reading; they could conclude the story the read well; they could write and express their idea well; they could solve the problem and love to discuss; their academic achievement (learning report, national examination test result, school-based examination test result) and non-academic (the winner of some competition such as literacy competition or festival) increased. On the other hand, 14% of them claimed that the program did not give any changes.

Student E: Senang karena dapat ilmu yang banyak, jadi rajin baca, tambah buku yang dibaca, rajin tulis, bikin rangkuman. (I am happy because I get a lot of knowledge, love reading and writing and like to make summary).

Students C: Saya jadi lebih senang membaca. Kalau ada teman cerita tentang buku dan menarik, saya akan pinjam bukunya dan saya baca. (I love reading. If my friends talk about interesting book, I will borrow it)

Students D: Menambah pengetahuan dari cerita orang, tambah wawasan, kesenangan, dan hiburan. Sudah terbiasa membaca di sekolah, di rumah jadi suka baca. Kita jadi rajin baca buku dan rajin nulis. Saya jarang baca buku di rumah, tapi baca di internet. (GLS adds my knowledge and I am happy. I am get used to read at school and it affects my habit to read at home, too. I seldom read a book at home but I read in internet).
B. Discussion

1. Literacy praxis in Jakarta

In the last three years of literacy movement implementation, MoEC conducted at least three policy studies to investigate student's reading skills and literacy activity index in Indonesia. These studies also portray the implementation of literacy movement in each province. A study of Agency for Language Development of MoEC (2018) shows a significant improvement on student's reading skill of grade 9 junior high school in 34 provinces (489), however, it is still below the average score of PISA. Echoing the results of the study, Centre for Research and Policy of MoEC finds that literacy activity across provinces of Indonesia is not satisfying (2018). None of the 34 provinces reach high level, only 9 of them (26%) attained medium level, most of them (71%) are unsatisfactory. Similar finding is also demonstrated by Centre of Assessment and Evaluation of MoEC that student's literacy skill is not satisfying (46.83%) as indicated by INAP or Indonesia National Assessment Program (MoEC, 2017). The findings of the studies indicate more efforts and effective strategies are required to accelerate literacy in this vast country with the complexity of demographic and geographic issues.

The latest publication of PISA report 2018 (has recently launched on the third of December 2019) furthermore indicates that reading literacy score of Indonesia very significantly
decreases, 26 points, from 397 (2015) to 371 (2018). This report also reflects that Indonesian
schools and MoEC have to work harder since the literacy competence of most (7 out of 10)
students is below average. They are only able to identify daily routines from short and simple
texts.

As a capital city of Indonesia Jakarta municipality offers literacy-reach environment. With its
vast development in various aspects, Jakarta takes the first position of literacy activity index
among 34 provinces of Indonesia, particularly in the dimensions of literacy skill (86.48) and
literacy activity (58) (Centre for Research and Policy, 2018). This is also shown by PISA report
2019 that the score in Jakarta municipality is as high as Malaysia and Brunei (410).
Nonetheless, another policy study (Language Development Board, 2018) finds that school-
based literacy movement in Jakarta shows insignificant improvement. Using a similar PISA
type of reading test, grade 9 students of Jakarta only achieve 483, whereas in South Sumatera
reach the highest (587) and Banten gets 530.

Student's reading score in Jakarta junior high schools in fact has a positive correlation with the
teacher reading activities and their understanding on reading texts. As shown by the same study
(Agency for Language Development, 2018), only 30% of language teachers in junior high
school understand various genres of texts. Whilst a bigger number of teachers in Central Java,
Bali, and East Java (89%, 82%, and 59% respectively) comprehend types of texts to be taught
in junior high school.

The study also finds unsatisfactory implementation of literacy supporting program in Jakarta as
indicated by low percentage of junior high schools participating in the program (Agency for
Language Development, 2018). Only a half (56%) of junior high schools in Jakarta implement
'15 minute-reading' activities, whereas national average is 71%. Journal reading, another
literacy supporting program, is merely practiced by 33% schools (noting that the average is
49%). Furthermore, despite adequate school facilities, only 22% of the schools in Jakarta have
reading corners.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the conclusion of findings consisting of (1) the implementation of school literacy movement; (2) strategies to promote literacy; (3) parents and community support; and (4) student's literacy competence improvement. The second section is the recommendation for future direction.
A. Conclusion

1. The implementation of school literacy movement

Firstly, junior high schools in Jakarta by and large have implemented literacy movement since the beginning of its commencement. Despite various institutions, government agency of educational sectors had conducted socialization programs on the guidelines and distributed the grand design of the movement to schools, principals, and teachers, different schools and even different parties at the same school have different perspectives on the implementation. This might be due to the ineffective communication patterns between the principal and the teacher and/or different mindset in understanding the literacy praxis.

Secondly, although most of the schools had carried out the school literacy movement, they merely focused on mass supporting literacy activities rather than the essence of the movement, i.e. the improvement of student literacy competences. The activities were mostly in the form of 15-minute reading activity prior to class activities without the follow-up action and measurable targets. Besides, not all school teachers were actively involved with school literacy movement as they thought that it was a reading movement and it was the responsibility of Indonesian language teachers.

2. Strategies to promote school literacy movement

The results of the teacher’s questionnaire showed that all schools used a number of strategies to carry out 15-minute reading activities before the teaching and learning activities. The most combined strategies are silent reading, summarizing and integrating teaching and learning activities in the classroom. In addition, students are asked to present their reading results in front of their peers. Students are asked to resume their reading results. Unfortunately, there was no follow-up activities. The resume of student’s reading results is only gathered and collected as library collection. In implementing the School Literacy Movement, the school principals took several steps, such as adding library collections, forming school literacy teams, and making literacy policies.

The steps taken by the principals in increasing teacher capacity like sending teachers to attend training, providing opportunities for teachers to develop creative literacy activities, and conducting literacy training. In addition to increasing the capacity of teachers, principals also provide opportunities for librarians or library staff to develop themselves like giving...
them the opportunity to take part in literacy-related training and create creative literacy activities.

In order to build literate schools, one of the efforts undertaken by the principal is to develop a literacy-rich environment, such as providing literacy corners, providing bulletin boards to facilitate students’ work, and displaying student work. In making literacy policies, several components are considered by the school principals, such as the stages of literacy (habituation, development and learning activities), literacy teams to be formed,

3. Parents and community involvement
Most parents (68%) claimed that they do not involve to support school literacy program. They neither attend the socialization of the program nor involve in the literacy event and library management as well as give input to school. This is due that they do not have time for doing such activities. However, this contradicts the teachers’ statement that the parents have high involvement in supporting school literacy.

From the students’ responses, parents do not discuss the books with their children. But from parents’ responses, they like to read the book for their children. Moreover, a small number of participants buy the book for their children because they buy books if they have money, children do not ask for it, do not like to read and their children can read from a smart phones.

The number of students reading non-textbooks is still lack and the activities to discuss the contents of the books with parents are also limited due to several factors such as parent activities and other factors. In addition, the awareness of parents to provide reading resources is not yet high.

The literacy community has not been involved fully in supporting school literacy. In the focus group discussions, it was pointed out that all school principals said they had never involved literacy community in literacy activities in their schools. Only two of literacy community admitted that they have been invited by school in literacy activities i.e. Gerakan Nasional Orang TuaMembacakan Buku (GernasBuku) which is held nationally by Ministry of Education and Culture and in teachers’ meetings event.

4. Student’s literacy improvement
Principals face some obstacles in conducting school literacy movement, such as the lack of creative human resources, limited reading sources, students’ low reading motivation, lack of teachers and students’ understanding on the book they read, students’ plagiarism, missing books and students’ work displayed, lack of parents’ involvement. They overcome those problems by asking parents to provide reading sources, cooperating with publishers to add the library collection, cooperating with industry to provide some facilities, extending learning time, motivating school members (teachers, students, and staff), adding the budget, motivating students to read and write and extending the time allocation.

Mostly principals, teachers and students admit that school literacy movement give the good impact. The students’ reading ability was claimed to be improved. The students asserted that they like reading. They claimed to able to write and express their idea well, solve the problem, and their academic achievement (learning report, national examination test result, school examination test result) and non-academic (the winner of some competition such as literacy competition or festival) increased. Only limited number of students explained it does not give any changes.

B. Recommendation

Literacy is a prime indicator to survive and succeed in this globalized era, yet, Indonesia has not succeeded in improving its literacy rate as shown in the recent PISA report 2018. There must a breakthrough in implementing school literacy movement by prioritizing “real” (not merely performative) literacy activities in every subject matter rather than by focusing on supporting (performative?) programs such as 15-minute reading activities, reading corner, and other extra-curricular activities. Critical literacy can be arguably be seen as the key to elevate the Indonesian students’ literacy rate (read also: competence). De-emphasizing the aforementioned traditional performative literacy activities is then seen exigent, as the recent PISA report 2018 demonstrated otherwise. Our findings, especially the contradictory parts, indirectly depict congruent literacy condition.

More importantly, teaching and learning materials and evaluation system that reflect the attempt to improve the students’ (critical) literacy competence need to be upgraded by utilizing information technology, so that it meets the needs of not only the millennial urban students but also the ones particularly in remote areas, including Kepulauan...
Seribu (Thousand Islands) in Jakarta. E-modules and application software that reflect are among the alternatives to provide opportunities for students to maximize their potential to accelerate their literacy skills.

Notwithstanding the existing condition, the School literacy is not the responsibility of language teachers (read also: especially the Indonesian teachers) merely. Every teacher is responsible to facilitate his/her students to develop their (critical) literacy competences by integrating (critical) literacy in every subject matter and in extra-curricular activities. Understanding the genre of the texts, effective instruction and literacy activities scrutinizing the texts, reading the text against its grains will help develop the students’ as well as teachers’ linguistic competence through the explicit integration of content and language skills learning process into instruction across all content areas. It is therefore imperative for all teachers to have teaching skills to develop students'(critical) literacy competence as well as to become role models in literacy activities.

Literacy learning takes place at home, in the classroom, public areas, in every corner of private and public spheres. It is then imperative to facilitate students with literacy-reach environment. Hence, establishing a more productive network of school-parent-community is critical so that students can optimize their potential for (critical) literacy development.

For further research there is a need to develop e-modules and application software to support students develop their literacy skills. The modules are not only on language literacy but cover all basic literacies across subject areas as recommended by the GLS guideline.
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