

School Literacy Movement and Its Implications towards Students' Learning: A Comparative Case Study in Jakarta and Taiwan

Ilza Mayuni^{1*}, Eva Leiliyanti^{2,*}, Noni Agustina³, Vera Yulianti⁴, Yinghuei Chen⁵, Fang-I Chu⁶

^{1,2}*Language Education Department, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia*

³*English Language Education Department, Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia*

⁴*Japanese Language and Culture Department, Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia*

^{5,6}*College of Humanities and Social Science, Asia University, Taichung, Taiwan*

Abstract

As everyday practices as well as a form of cultural transmission, literacy cannot be seen as merely in its traditionalist notion, i.e. reading and writing. From the lens of nation-state building, it can also be construed as the indicator of one nation's competitiveness that encompasses critical thinking, creativity, communication, teamwork, and information technology. This comparative study on literacy praxis in Indonesia (Jakarta) and Taiwan sheds light on investigating how these two countries accelerate their citizen's (read also: Junior High School students) literacy competences. The investigation also includes the students' parents and community supports in the practices, as well as the impacts on the students' literacy development. This is imperative as it delineates the extent as well as scope of this learning continuum achieves its success. Deploying mixed-method approach, the data were taken from observation transcripts, questionnaires, interview transcripts, document analysis, and focus group discussion. It is found that the literacy praxis in Jakarta was merely focused on mass supporting activities (in form of school-based literacy celebration) rather than on its collective (government, school, community) attempt in developing students' literacy skills. Unlike Indonesia, the launch of the 2008 Multilingual Literacy in Taiwan not only proved to promote the literacy habit from birth, but that it also positioned Taiwan in 2018 PISA report as the seventeenth in reading and the eighth in math, science, and reading the highest of worldwide ranking of 71 OECD countries.

Keywords *Literacy, National Movement, Praxis, Indonesia and Taiwan*

1. Introduction

Literacy is generally associated with the ability to read and write [1], however, 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 individuals to achieve their goals and develop their knowledge and potential through the process making meaning in a wider communicative context.

In a wider context, literacy can be also perceived as 'a social practice and form of cultural transmission' [2], which can be also seen from four dimensions [3], i.e. "thinking" (includes creativity and innovation, critical thinking, problem-solving and decision making, and learning to learn); "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 it engages critical thinking, creativity, communication, teamwork, and information technology (Thijs, et.al. in [4])

In this framework, the notion of literacy competence cannot be detached from its assessment that

entails certain measurement level. From the lens of Kuo (2011), the level itself can be perceived as representing national competitiveness and advance education, i.e. each country develops its policy to foster its citizen's literacy skills. As in the context of Asian countries, Singapore, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, not only outperform in education, economy, political, and socio-cultural contexts, but also their literacy level [5]. Taiwan, in particular, makes a great progress and reaches a very high literacy level as the seventeenth of OECD countries [6]. The government of Taiwan encourages schools to promote reading by issuing the parents' handbook to support their children reading habit since the day the baby was born. This follows suit the government's actions in encouraging parents to cultivate their local tradition, i.e. the Chinese characters, and develop literacy skills from home to kindergarten[7].

Indonesia, on the other hand, faces challenges in improving the nation's literacy level despite its significant improving efforts, such as revisiting curriculum, building teachers' capacity, promoting literacy movement (MoEC, 2016). Although McKinsey Global Institute (2012) predicted Indonesia will occupy the fourth-first position of countries with the world's largest economy in 2030 [8], Indonesia demonstrates the unsatisfactory profile on literacy as shown by the PIRLS' (Progress International Reading Literacy Study) and PISA's reports. The literacy level of Indonesian fourth graders were in the 45th rank from 48 countries (PIRLS, 2011), whereas, the fifteen-year-old students were in the 72nd of 78 countries (PISA, 2018) even lower than in PISA 2015 were 64th rank of 72 countries.

In order to rectify this condition, 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*). This policy regulates the mechanism to build students' character as the culmination of the school literacy movement that accentuates direct involvement of school, family as well as community collaborative actions in the movement. Within this national program, students are also encouraged to develop the basic literacy skills for the twenty-first century, i.e. not only reading and writing, but also science, financial, numerical, digital, cultural, and citizenship literacy (MoEC, 2016).

After three years of the literacy national movement implementation, the Ministry of Education and Culture conducted at least three policy studies to investigate student's reading skills and literacy activity index in each Indonesian province. The study conducted by the Agency for Language Development of MoEC (2018) demonstrates that the reading skill of the nine graders in 34 provinces is satisfactory (489 from 800 on PISA-like test). However, it was still below the average score of PISA. In alignment with this the results from the study conducted by the Centre for Research and Policy of MoEC(2018) found that literacy activity across provinces of Indonesia was also not satisfying. None of the 34 provinces reach the desired high level (>652), only 9 of them (26%) attained medium level, most of them (71%) are unsatisfactory. A similar finding was also demonstrated by the Centre of Assessment and Evaluation of MoEC (2017) that student's literacy skill is not satisfying (46.83%) as indicated by *INAP* or Indonesia National Assessment Program. In this sense, these findings indicate that more efforts and effective strategies are required to accelerate literacy in this vast country with the complexity of demographic and geographic issues.

As previously mentioned, this comparative study focuses on comparing the literacy praxis in Indonesia (Jakarta) and Taiwan as its research locus, i.e. in the sense not only contrasting the literacy policy, implementation, regulation between Jakarta and Taiwan but that also the findings can be

perceived as a lesson learnt from both countries pertaining the success and failure of state affairs as well as involvement in developing (read also: accelerating) the students' literacy competences. By this, this paper aims to address the (a) how schools promote literacy practice to accelerate students' literacy skills, (b) how parents facilitate their children in developing their literacy competences, (c) how the communities support the school literacy program, and (d) how the literacy program improve student's literacy competences. In discussing these problems, this paper will discuss the literacy development policy in Indonesia and Taiwan, school literacy and environmental support, parents' roles in students' literacy enhancement, research methodology, results and discussion, and conclusion.

Literacy Development Policy in Indonesia and Taiwan Contexts

In term of education reform, Indonesia and Taiwan relatively share a similar path in literacy movement although both take different pace and focus. Indonesia launched a school literacy movement in 2015, particularly for elementary and junior high schools. Taiwan launched the similar policy earlier in 2008 for elementary schools under the term of multilingual literacy, without the term 'movement'. This, in the lens of Chien, Lin & Chen (2013) constitutes the key factor of the Taiwan government in its success story, i.e. the “radical” innovation [9]. Provided with guidelines, the literacy practice in the two countries has different focus. The Ministry of Education and Culture of 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 provides the mechanism of how to develop the students' character building as the culmination of the school literacy movement. The movement ranges in various literacy forms to develop six basic literacy skills for 21st-century education (World Economic Forum, 2015) in order to elevate students' quality of life (MoE of Indonesia, 2016). 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 the local language) to promote reading habits from birth; therefore the parents play pivotal role models. The policy prioritized to nurture a strong foundation of reading culture from early childhood by providing parents with a handbook (MoE of Taiwan, 2008) earlier than the national guideline (2012). Their children can develop their reading skills prior to preschool along with their skills to read and acquire basic Chinese characters[7]. Echoing the policy, in 2012 MoE published Curriculum guidelines (MoE of Taiwan, 2012) 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 to enjoy reading and articulate their personal viewpoints. The recent released guidelines (MoE of Taiwan, 2012) include instructions to plan the language and literacy curriculum.

School literacy and Environmental supports

School and its members, such as teachers, principals, and librarians are the supporting agents that play an important role in achieving the literacy's goal [10], i.e. by creating conducive school learning atmosphere for literacy needs [11], [12], [13]. In Indonesian context, schools are required to provide students to develop their literacy competences through three fundamental stages, i.e., 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. At the same time, teachers need to enrich their teaching materials, such as e-texts [14] and literacy strategies in developing the students' higher-order thinking skills. However, studies show that most of them have inadequate understanding of their roles in this literacy enrichment [15] and in implementing the literacy movement as they thought it is the language teachers responsibility merely [12]

Understanding the concept of literacy itself let alone the roles of all the literacy stakeholders are not a rocket science. The study conducted by Penn-Edwards (2011) that highlights the Queensland University's students and teachers understanding of literacy affirmed this. The result showed that from 309 participants (the majority of participants were under 30 years old and 254 were pre-service teachers) had a limited understanding of literacy [16]. The participants' conception of literacy was centred on texts. Their concept of literacy was limited to reading and writing solely. Taylor et al. (2003) further investigates multiple aspects of literacy lessons and evaluates the relationship between the children's reading and writing growth [17]. He found that high-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 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.

Referring back to Taiwan context, in Taiwanese schools, literacy practices are conducted in various forms as shown by Liao & Lai's findings (2013). Taiwanese teachers undertake the warm-up listening activity by providing creative story (ies) 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. In so doing, the students are challenged to be creative in developing their own stories. They monitor the students and help them when they face difficulties. The students then share their writing with their peers.

In line with Liao & Lai, Cohen & Bhatt (2012) argue that besides the school members, literate environment plays a crucial role in improving the students' literacy competence as well as the school's academic atmosphere [17]. A conducive and comfortable physical environment (such as the library, reading corner and posters) is important to support the literacy movement as it enhances students' literacy competence (MoE, 2016). In EFA Global Monitoring Report, the library plays a key role in creating a literate environment and promoting literacy by offering adult and family literacy classes. Libraries facilitate teachers and students to access 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 [18].

Furthermore, Clark (2010) studies on the linkage between school libraries and students' literacy found that from 112 schools, out of 17,089 students (11 to 16 years old), students who like to visit the school library, have higher self-assessments 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 [19].

Parents' Roles in Student's Literacy Enhancement

Parents also 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 in parents' involvement in their children education, i.e. parents' belief, sense of self-efficacy, and demand. Not only do parents believe that they are responsible for their children, but that they also confident they can help their children to succeed in school and have opportunities to actively involve at the school [20]. This belief influences their children as not only the parents' education and job influence their beliefs, but their behaviours also influence their children's perceptions of their own ability [21].

Referring back to Taiwan context, parents' involvement in literacy practice can overtly be seen through constructive communication and interaction with their children. These, in the lens of Liao & Lai (2013) 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 students, teachers and parents), such as ordering food, asking their students to read the menu, or even sending messages to their relatives using Facebook.

2. Research Methods

As previously stated, this comparative study aims at addressing the following question, deploying a mixed-method approach.

1. How do schools promote literacy practice to accelerate students' literacy skills?
2. How do parents facilitate their children to develop their literacy skills?
3. How do communities support the school literacy program?
4. How does the literacy program improve student's literacy skills?

2.1. Subject

Subjects of this study are principals, teachers, parents, students of public junior high schools along with literacy activists of Jakarta and Taiwan, as shown in the following table.

Table 1. Subject of the study

Subject	Jakarta	Taiwan	Total
Principals	23	23	46
Teachers	37	34	71
Students	238	114	352
Literacy activist	3	4	7
Parents	129	30	159
Total	430	205	635

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 eight graders of junior high schools were selected. Students from Taiwan and Jakarta had similar age. They were ranging from 13-15 years old.

Thirty-seven Indonesian teachers involved in this study which 26 were undergraduates and 11

were graduates. They had more than ten-year-teaching experiences. 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. On the other hand, 24 Taiwanese teachers were undergraduates and 10 were graduates. They had minimum teaching experience for 4 years and the maximum for 34 years. The literacy activity involved mandarin teacher (100%), homeroom teacher (76%), team leader (71%), director (38%), all teachers (12%) and some certain teachers such as computer teacher and social science teacher (6%)

Three literacy activists (33-36 years old) involved in this study each representing North Jakarta, East Jakarta, and Central Jakarta, Indonesia. Besides they were an early childhood teacher, a community library staffs, and a lecturer. While the literacy activists in Taiwan were four lecturers.

There were 23 principals from both schools in Jakarta and Taiwan who participated in this study. Most of the 23 principals from schools in Jakarta (96%) hold their Master Degree certificates, while 4% hold their bachelor ones), they were approximately 47-50 years old (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% three months, while another 4% served for 14 days. Furthermore, half of 23 principals from schools in Taiwan hold their Master Degree certificates (56.52%), while hold their Ph.D. degree certificates (39.13%) and bachelor's degree certificates (4.35%).

As for 129 parents of Indonesian students' profiles, 25% (32 respondents) were undergraduates, 13% (17respondents) was Diploma level, 12% graduated from junior high school, 2% (3respondents) 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 contrast, 30 Taiwanese parents were 20 % graduated from senior high school, and under 23% were undergraduates, 40% took Master's degrees, and 17 % hold Ph.D. degree certificates. A quarter of them are teachers (27%), and the others do various jobs.

2.2. Data Collection and Analysis

The data consisted of documents, questionnaires and interview, as show in table 2. Interview is conducted to check and justify data validity and trustworthiness.

Table 2. Data collection

Instrument	Data	Source	Research Question
Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy and regulation on literacy • evaluation 	MoE	RQ #1
Questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program endorsement • program implementation • strategy to promote literacy • students' perspective on literacy • parents' supports • community supports 	principals, teachers, students, parents, and literacy community	RQ #2, 3, 4

Interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confirmation • crosschecking 	principals, teachers, students, parents	RQ #2, 3, 4
-----------	---	---	-------------

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Literacy Practice to accelerate students' literacy skills

The literacy practice undertaken to accelerate the students' literacy skills comprised school's strategies, teachers' strategies and learning sources. There were some similarities and differences of the literacy practice between Indonesia and Taiwan.

From the Indonesian principal's interview, the literacy program undertaken by schools in Jakarta 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%).

The results demonstrated that the principals as the supporting agents have played their important roles in accelerating the students' literacy skills by creating conducive school learning atmosphere for literacy needs through various kinds of activities and policies. From the principal's questionnaire, the literacy program undertaken by schools in Jakarta 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%). 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%). Besides, as the results of the interview, some Indonesian principals stated as below.

“ I supervised the teachers' involvement into School Literacy Movement periodically. And it is related to rewards that they will get ”.

“ I undertook directly the evaluation of the literacy activities in order to get the feedback of our school's policies related to literacy movements ”

“As principals, we considered several components in designing/formulating school literacy policies, , i.e. the stages of literacy (habituation, development and learning activities), literacy teams to be formed , literacy time whether to be integrated in teaching and learning activities or separate, expected outcomes, and monitoring and evaluation forms that measure literacy output”.

In line with the literacy movement held in schools in Indonesia, Taiwanese principals stated in the questionnaire results that literacy program in Taiwan has various activities, namely establishing a plan to promote reading literacy (91%), providing sufficient reading materials (91%), providing a good reading environment (87%), holding reading activities (87%), setting up a library (83%), teaching

what students should learn (78%), and establishing reading literacy plans (35%). This results in line with Doležalová, 2017; Retnaningdyah & Laksono, 2017; Slovaček et al that argued school and its members, such as teachers, principals, and librarians are the supporting agents that play an important role in achieving the literacy's goal (Pitcher & Mackey, 2013), i.e. by creating conducive school learning atmosphere for literacy needs (Doležalová, 2017; Retnaningdyah & Laksono, 2017; Slovaček et al., 2017). From the results mentioned before, it could be underlined that the Indonesian principals' roles to accelerate students' literacy were not only to create the literacy environment itself, but also to undertake some strategies in increasing the capacity of teachers and librarians/library staff in implementing the School Literacy Movement.

The result from the Indonesia 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. Conversely, teachers 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).

On the other hand, teachers' questionnaire pointed out that they assessed their students' literacy level by pop quizzes (88%), regular assessments (50%), joining contests (15%) and other (3%) such as weekday classroom questions and discussions. The forms of assessments were assignments (82%), oral presentations (62%), written tests (53%), joining contests (15%), and submitting articles for publication (3%).

Taiwanese teachers' questionnaire showed that the literacy activities that school promote were giving writing feedback after reading (91%), morning reading (71%), writing contests (68%), reading contests (56%), meeting writers (32%), e-reading (24%), library tours (21%), and student reading clubs (18%). Taiwanese students who filled the questionnaire showed that they liked were morning reading (51%), meeting writers (30%), library tours (18%), e-reading (16%), giving writing feedback after reading (14%), student reading clubs (13%), reading contest (7%) and writing contest (6%). However, 11% students did not like school literacy activities because they were displeased, boring and stressful; troublesome and wasted time; lack of ability such as they do not know to start writing; and they could hurt their eyes. Those comments were as follows:

Student 5: I don't like to read in the morning

Student 59: I'm stress and bored

Student 22: It's troublesome to write a book

Student 47: Because writing this is a waste of time, I might as well go to my favorite book

Student 10: I can't write it, so it's very unpleasant

93 % Taiwanese students' questionnaire pointed out that their teachers taught them the reading

strategies by providing some activities such as giving assignments and worksheets (82%), textbook instruction (73%), reading and writing courses (57%), group work and practice (46%), test (46%), films (27%), pictures (23%), after school program (17%), games (14%), Contests (11%), songs (11%) and presentation (7%).

Taiwanese students' answers were similar to teachers' answers that they taught the reading strategies to their students through critical thinking and self reflection training (71%), teaching reading skills (62%), summary strategies training (59%), taking tests (53%), guiding them and making them practice what they have learned (53%), arousing motivation (50%), making reading a habit (41%), raising reading interest (35%), graphical analysis training (29%), teaching them how to do presentations, be good listeners, respect others, reach agreement, etc. (29%), comparison and analysis training (18%) and setting up reading plans (9%). The activities that teachers applied were assignments and worksheets (88%), textbook instruction (85%), reading and writing courses (85%), group work and practice (56%), films (32%), presentations (26%), pictures (21%), tests (18%), songs (15%), games (12%), contests (9%), after school programs (9%) and other (6%) such as mind mapping.

During the activities, only 45% of Indonesian 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. While Taiwanese students explained that their teachers encouraged the students to find the supporting reading sources (89%) such as libraries (66%), recommended reading list (55%), the internet (53%), magazine and newspaper (49%), original works adapted into films (15%), reading societies or institution (10%), and radio transcripts (8%). Mostly their teacher supported them to look up the digital reading sources (76%) such as movies (54%), TV programs (41%), online reading games (28%), e-books (25%), online newspapers and magazines (25%), radio programs (9%), articles on web (2%).

Indonesian principal 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%). Similarly, Taiwanese teachers' questionnaire showed that Taiwanese teachers did some ways to develop their abilities especially in teaching reading literacy at school such as undergoing further study and attending workshops (85%), reading and researching extensively (71%), joined teacher societies (62%) and joined teacher reading clubs (6%).

56% Taiwanese students' explicated that school library provide interesting books for reading, while all teachers stated that their school library's books are interesting. It was contradictory. Taiwanese students revealed that the number of students to visit it did not show the large number. They did not often visit it (41%). Some of them explained for some reasons such as it's far away, the school books were boring, they bought the book by themselves, they did not have to time, the libraries were under renovation, and other reason such as did not have library card. They got the book for reading by buying books (58%), borrowing from the libraries (51%), and borrowing from classmates (35%), textbooks (24%), renting books (15%) and others (10%) such as from internet and borrowing

from the teachers and family.

The Taiwanese students' questionnaire showed that the students discussed the book they read with others (76%) such as friends (65%), classmates (57%), parents or family members (39%), relatives (15%), teachers (10%) and online friends (10%). They discussed with others in oral form (82%), digital form/app (32%), online forums/emails (11%), letter (4%), submitting articles for publication (3%) and blog (3%). Even the frequency for discussing with others was not often which was 51%. The other student (24%) did not like to discuss with others because they did not like discussing, did not have time and did not like reading.

83% Taiwanese teachers found obstacles in teaching reading literacy. Those obstacles were insufficient teaching hours (56%), students' low learning willingness (32%), lack of teaching resources (21%), not enough support from parents (3%), other (6%) such as poor teaching skills and insufficient funds. But, they overcome those by learning more and practicing; encouraging and accompanying students to improve students' interest and reading habit; finding extra time such as using summer vacation academic activities; changing teaching content or method and fight for funding. Their responses could be seen in the interview excerpt as follows:

Teacher 2: I do group learning to overcome the problem

Teacher 24: I read more with students (every week)

Teacher 24: Using competition bonus to buy books

Some obstacles were faced by Taiwanese students in reading such as lack of time (69%), lack of motivation (35%), lack of money to buy books (16%), dyslexia (12%), lack of ability (11%) and lack of resources (4%). To overcome those problem, they tried to practice more by reading multiple times, trying to understand and reading slowly; to find time to read; save money to buy the books; and reduce time for other activities.

3.2. Parents' support to develop students' literacy skills

From the distribution of the Indonesian 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.

Indonesian students explained that 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.

From the parents' questionnaires 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: they will buy books if they have money ; their children ask for it ; they themselves do not like to read: their children can read from their smart phones .

94.6% Indonesian 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.

Taiwanese teachers' questionnaire showed 53% teacher pointed out some parents did not involve in reading literacy while 47% teachers revealed that they involved in attending workshops/talks (26%), involving in parent-child reading (24%), donating books (9%), and joining reading clubs (3%).

3.3 .Community support the school literacy program

The community support in Indonesia and Taiwan were almost similar. From the interview, the three Indonesian literacy activists claimed that they had such program. They were “Gernas Buku” – a mobile library that lent 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 were 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)

They 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 but the principal revealed that they never come to their schools. The principal's excerpt as follows:

Principal 4: *Tidak ada pegiat yang datang ke sekolah kami* (There were no activists who came to our school

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).

In Taiwan case, teachers admitted that the literacy community involved in reading literacy activity at school (79%) by holding workshop (68%), donating books (26%), providing counseling

service (24%), offering scholarships/funding (3%), and other (6%) such as collaborative teaching and borrowing books. (Teachers' interview)

Teacher 6: The literacy activists provide the books and teach the students

Teacher 20: They give the workshop

From the Taiwanese literacy activists' questionnaire suggested that their involvements were taking part in education reform activity, editing and examining the curriculum guidelines, holding or attending workshops and conferences, promoting digital reading, providing literacy learning and reaching resources, providing literacy learning programs, donating books, providing parent-child reading activity, providing counseling service, editing teaching and learning resources, holding reading contests, providing library tours, publishing / presenting research findings.

Almost similar to Indonesian literacy activists, the Taiwanese literacy activists had some obstacles in conducting literacy activities. Those were teachers need continuous empowerment for literacy teaching understanding and practice; not enough support from the school; lack of teachers; not enough support from teachers; insufficient teaching hours; lack of teaching resources; lack of funding; lack of supportive policies; teaching content is too difficult.

3.4. Literacy program to improve students' literacy skills

The Indonesian 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 interview of principal 11 that described her students' reading motivation increased as the result of school-based literacy activities:

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

From the Indonesian 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 interview. 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 2: 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 3: 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 4: 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 Indonesian student's questionnaires showed that school literacy program increased their learning outcome by 86%. They perceived that their reading ability improved; they liked reading; they could conclude the story they 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)

In Taiwan case, teachers' questionnaire showed that students have reading habit (91%) because they asked them to read other books (91%). They like to read (94%) because they often visit the library and borrow the books after class, they can pass their time and homeroom teachers help the students to cultivate reading habit. It could be seen in teachers' interview as follows:

Teacher 16: Homeroom teachers assist in cultivating reading habits; our school library has rich and diverse books

Teacher 2: Students often use the library and borrow books to read after class

Taiwanese students liked literacy activities because they could enhance their capabilities and knowledge such as increasing their reading volume and ability, improving their writing skills, getting the experience from other writers. The other reasons were they love reading and those activities could make them relaxed and stress released. The literacy activities also made the students convenient. Those responses could be seen in the interview excerpt as follows:

Student 1: He can let me increase my reading volume and reading ability

Student 74: Because it can improve writing skills

Student 76: Because you can learn many different things

Student 99: I can get different experiences from writers

Student 22: I can enjoy reading in the morning

Student 38: Reading in the morning is very relaxing

Taiwanese teachers and students' questionnaire showed the similar responses that students' reading literacy was dominant at average level. The remain were good (44%), excellent (3%) and bad (3%) (Data is taken from teachers' questionnaire).

4. Conclusion

Results show that both of the Indonesian and Taiwanese principals as the supporting agents have played their important roles in accelerating the students' literacy skills by creating conducive school learning atmosphere for literacy needs through various kinds of activities and policies. Their roles are not only to create the literacy environment itself, but also to undertake some strategies in increasing the capacity of teachers and librarians/library staff in implementing the School Literacy

Movement. However, the result from the teachers' data does not indicate the direct results. An essential fundamental difference from the role of the teacher in the school literacy movement in Taiwan and Indonesia is from the form of activities carried out by the teachers. In Taiwan, teachers mostly promote giving writing feedback after reading, while in Indonesia, teachers conduct summarizing and quizzes after reading. It indicates that in Taiwan, the teachers play the role of facilitator communicatively.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank to Universitas Negeri Jakarta for the funding.

References

- [1] Y. L. Ting, "Tapping into students' digital literacy and designing negotiated learning to promote learner autonomy," *Internet High. Educ.*, vol. 26, pp. 25–32, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.04.004.
- [2] L. Barza and A. von Suchodoletz, "Home literacy as cultural transmission: Parent preferences for shared reading in the United Arab Emirates," *Learn. Cult. Soc. Interact.*, vol. 11, pp. 142–152, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.lcsi.2016.08.002.
- [3] M. Binkley *et al.*, "Defining twenty-first century skills," in *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills*, London: Springer Science+ Business Media, 2012, pp. 1–358.
- [4] T. Bekker, S. Bakker, I. Douma, J. van der Poel, and K. Scheltenaar, "Teaching children digital literacy through design-based learning with digital toolkits in schools," *Int. J. Child-Computer Interact.*, vol. 5, pp. 29–38, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ijcci.2015.12.001.
- [5] G. Kuo, "Taiwan's literacy rate hits record high," *Taiwan Today*, 2011.
- [6] OECD, "PISA 2018 insights and interpretations," *OECD Publishing*, pp. 1–64, 2019.
- [7] Y.-H. Liao and C.-C. Lai, "Becoming literate in Taiwan: Kindergarten experiences as the first part of a long literacy journey," *Glob. Stud. Child.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 53–71, 2013, doi: 10.2304/gsch.2013.3.1.53.
- [8] R. Oberman, R. Dobbs, A. Budiman, F. Thompson, and M. Rosse, "The archipelago economy: Unleashing Indonesia's potential," 2012.
- [9] C.-K. C. Chien, L.-C. Lin, and C.-F. Chen, "The main features and the key challenges of the education system in Taiwan," *High. Educ. Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 1–14, 2013, doi: 10.5539/hes.v3n6p1.
- [10] S. M. Pitcher and B. Mackey, *Collaborating for real literacy*, Second. California: Linworth, 2013.
- [11] J. Dolezalova, "Competencies of teachers and student teachers for the development of reading literacy," in *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2015, vol. 171, pp. 519–525, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.156.
- [12] P. Retnaningdyah and Laksono-Krisyani, "Exploring the use of literacy strategies in junior high school level," in *First International Conference on Education Innovation 2017*, 2017, vol. 173, pp. 166–169.
- [13] K. A. Slovaček, Ž. Sinković, and N. Višnjić, "The teacher's role in the creative teaching of literacy," *Croat. J. Educ.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 27–36, 2017.

- [14] D. B. P. Setiyadi, “E-literary texts : Reading materials for school literacy movement,” in *The First International Seminar on Language, Literature and Education*, 2017, pp. 538–545, doi: 10.18502/kss.v3i9.2716.
- [15] H. Soepriyanti, U. Waluyo, M. Sujana, and Arifuddin, “The implementation of School literature movement in West Lombok Regency , West Nusa Tenggara Province – Indonesia : An exploratory study,” in *Proceeding of The 1st UR International Conference on Educational Sciences*, 2017, no. 1, pp. 612–618.
- [16] S. Penn-Edwards, “I know what literacy means: Student teacher accounts,” *Aust. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 15–32, 2011, doi: 10.14221/ajte.2011v36n6.4.
- [17] B. M. Taylor, P. D. Pearson, D. S. Peterson, and M. C. Rodriguez, “Reading growth in high-poverty classrooms: The Influence of teacher practices that encourage cognitive engagement in literacy learning,” *Elem. Sch. J.*, vol. 104, no. 1, 2003, doi: 10.1086/499740.
- [18] L. Krolak, “The role of libraries in the creation of literate environments,” 2006.
- [19] C. Clark, “Linking school libraries and literacy: Young people’s reading habits and attitudes to their school library, and an exploration of the relationship between school library use and school attainment,” *Natl. Lit. Trust*, pp. 1–17, 2010.
- [20] K. V. Hoover-Dempsey and H. M. Sandler, “Why do parents become involved in their children’s education?,” *Rev. Educ. Res.*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 3–42, 1997, doi: 10.3102/00346543067001003.
- [21] J. S. Eccles, “Influences of parents’ education on their children’s educational attainments: The role of parent and child perceptions,” *London Rev. Educ.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 191–204, 2005, doi: 10.1080/14748460500372309.