LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network
ISSN: 2630-0672 (Print) | ISSN: 2672-9431 (Online)
Volume: 16, No: 1, January – June 2023

Language Institute, Thammasat University
https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index

Literacy Teaching Strategies: Do Indonesian Secondary EFL Teachers Practice What They Know?

Utami Widiati [a,*], Tengku Intan Suzila bt Tengku Sharif [b], Sari Karmina [c], Nanang Zubaidi [d]

[a]utami.widiati.fs@um.ac.id, Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
[b] intansuzila@uitm.edu.my, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan, Pahang, Malaysia
[c]sari.karmina.fs@um.ac.id, Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
[d]nanang.zubaidi.fs@um.ac.id, Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
[*] Corresponding author, utami.widiati.fs@um.ac.id

APA Citation:
Widiati, U., Sharif, T.I.S.T., Karmina, S., & Zubaidi, N. (2023). Literacy teaching strategies: Do Indonesian secondary EFL teachers practice what they know? *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *16*(1), 339-364.

Received 22/09/2022

Received in revised form 27/11/2022

Accepted 07/12/2022

ABSTRACT

Developing students' literacy skills remains a challenge for many EFL teachers. The current study explores data about which literacy teaching strategies secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia report they know and practice and what roles they think they can play in developing students' literacy skills to support school literacy initiative programs. Quantitative data about literacy-teaching knowledge and practice as well as qualitative data about teacher roles were collected through a questionnaire distributed to as many accessible teachers as possible using a convenience sampling technique with Google Forms. Responses were obtained from 157 voluntary

secondary EFL teachers, mostly from East Java Province, Indonesia. The quantitative data were analyzed descriptively to result in percentages demonstrating knowledge, practice, and differences between knowledge and practice, whereas the qualitative data were analyzed using a deductive thematic method. The results show the use of various literacy teaching activities, but do not yet reflect pervasive influence of technology among teachers. Gaps are identified between EFL teachers' knowledge of literacy teaching strategies and their corresponding actual teaching practices, implying that knowing a certain literacy-teaching strategy does not necessarily mean taking actions. The qualitative findings show that EFL teachers played roles as providers of literacy access and facilities, motivators for students' love for reading and reading habits, creators of conducive environments, and role models to optimize literacy programs in school.

Keywords: EFL teachers, Indonesian secondary teachers, knowledge and practice, literacy teaching strategies

Introduction

The adoption of literacy teaching in the EFL context took place when there emerged the realization that English learning might also potentially address social, political, and economic aspects of society as highlighted by Pennycook (1990). Literature review by Novianti et al. (2020) suggests that EFL teachers' belated awareness of literacy skills is likely to have been caused by their perceptions that teaching English is seen as separate from developing literacy; EFL teachers tend to focus more on developing their students' language competence. Prioritizing the development of English proficiency seems to have resulted in EFL teachers' considering literacy enhancement as a cognitive issue separate from language teaching.

Literacy skills are considered a crucial component to life in order to access education, alleviate poverty, participate in a wider society, and, most importantly, improve the quality of wellness. Students having difficulties reading and writing, for example, have been empirically proven to experience some challenges to access many areas of the curriculum (Evans et al., 2016; Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009). Some previous studies have also proven that population with low literacy skills are likely to live in poverty (Bhattacharya, 2010; Piper et al., 2015; Tichnor-Wagner et al., 2015), and low literacy has

become a strong indicator of low-paid jobs (Peaslee & Hahn, 2011; Vernon-Feagans, 2015). Literacy skills have also embraced social engagement; failing to understand information in social media due to low literacy level may lead to misinterpretation (Avram et al., 2020; Seo et al., 2020). Moreover, research has revealed that low literacy skills potentially contribute to many health problems (Chen et al., 2016; McNaughton et al., 2014; Watts et al., 2017). EFL teachers should then consider developing students' literacy skills essential.

Recent studies on literacy development in the EFL context have embraced some key areas, including digital literacy, the relationship between L1 and L2 literacy, critical literacy, the roles of ER in literacy, and literacy as a component of L2 learning and cognitive development. Studies on digital literacy, for instance, showed that new technologies in general, and the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic in particular, have opened up more opportunities of shifts from printed-form to digital-form literacy in both developed and developing countries and that both forms of literacy are essential (Chamberlain et al., 2020; Peled, 2021; Sánchez-Cruzado et al., 2021; Tejedor et al., 2020). Pires and Morgado (2021) indicated that digital reading culture has emerged due to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, some studies on the relationship between L1 and L2 literacy reported that learners' L1 literacy has positive impacts on their L2 proficiency, particularly in some formal language aspects (Artieda & Munoz, 2013; Sparks et al., 2012b, 2012a; Sparks et al., 2008) including spelling (Artieda, 2017; Kahn-Horwitz et al., 2005; Sparks et al., 2012b, 2012a), word decoding for some groups of learners, such as beginner learners (Meschyan & Hernandez, 2002), as well as multi aspects of language covering spelling, grammar and listening (Muñoz, 2000) and reading comprehension and spelling (Sparks et al., 2008). Learners with high L1 literacy tend to display high L2 literacy, especially if both languages are linguistically close or similar (Paran & Wallace, 2016), while learners with different L1 and L2 orthography may find L1 interference in their L2 production (Williams, 2016a, 2016b).

In spite of the many essential functions that literacy skills can play, developing students' literacy skills remains a challenge for many teachers. As Li (2022) criticizes, effective pedagogy for (academic) literacy development is hard to find partly due to the lack of a clear and operational definition of literacy construct. In terms of understanding literacy concepts, Widiati et al. (2021) found that most of the EFL teachers under their study had good understandings of foreign language literacy in relation to linguistics and other sign systems, cognitive, sociocultural, and developmental literacy dimensions. Referring to this study, the current research is oriented towards exploring how these conceptualizations are realized in the classroom. There seems to be little literature evident in regard to EFL teachers' knowledge about literacy

teaching strategies and their practicing the strategies in the Indonesian context. Good understandings of literacy among EFL teachers need to be followed up with their ability in developing their students' literacy.

The present study aims at highlighting the importance of having a repertoire of literacy teaching among EFL teachers in order to frame their literacy lesson plans, design systemic study habits, and monitor their students' literacy progress. According to Afflerbach et al. (2008), reading (literacy) strategies are in fact techniques that readers employ. Over time, these strategies may become an automatic part of the reading process, but this automaticity requires practice and frequent use during reading. Therefore, students need to be exposed to various strategies of literacy development through teachers modelling what the literacy strategies are. Explicit instruction of reading (literacy) strategies might include when and how to apply the strategies, which according to De Milliano et al. (2014) can provide useful insights to student readers in helping them manage their metacognition and reading processes.

What has been reported so far concerns researchers' developing several frameworks of EFL literacy teaching (e.g., Gustine & Insani, 2019; Hayik, 2016; Huh, 2016; Kuo, 2013; Mahecha, 2018; Novianti et al., 2020). A study by Novianti et al. (2020), for example, reported the development of a framework to help teachers implement critical literacy in EFL contexts that involves curricula and standards, learners' experiences and background, local and social issues, and text selection and suggested that the framework can solve some challenges EFL teachers face when implementing literacy teaching. However, as many researchers have admitted, the implementation of literacy teaching in EFL contexts constantly encounters many challenges, including time limitation, syllabi, and curricula (Gutiérrez, 2015; Owodally, 2015; Riamliw, 2013). The study by Yapp et al. (2021) proved that L2 reading programs should contain explicit instruction from teachers. In other words, one central issue in students' literacy skill development in EFL contexts seems to be whether teachers' understandings of literacy dimensions are in line with their ability to implement the L2 literacy teaching strategies in class. This present study is thus intended to explore secondary EFL teachers' knowledge and practice of literacy teaching strategies, highlighting the possible benefits of explicit strategy instruction in the literacy development program. We believe that rigorous and meticulous description of literacy teaching strategies in the Indonesian context would provide empirical data about what is familiar in foreign language literacy studies contributing substantially to the success of school literacy programs in the country. To achieve this aim, we were led by these research questions:

RQ1: What literacy teaching strategies do secondary EFL teachers know and generally implement?
RQ2: What roles do secondary EFL teachers play in enhancing their students' literacy skills?

Method

A descriptive exploratory design was executed using a survey questionnaire as suggested by Punch (2005). The data reported in this article were sets of data we obtained in 2020 from questionnaire items requesting the respondents to identify various strategies they were familiar with and which strategies they generally implemented in the classroom to enhance their students' literacy skills, complemented with data about teacher roles in students' literacy enhancement.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire items we developed contain two types of data elicitation: respondents' choosing from the available lists and their providing information in the open space. The lists were meant to ensure that the prospective participants have the same perceptions as ours regarding literacy teaching strategies. The lists of possible techniques and activities were adapted from Garcia (1992), which is still substantially relevant for Indonesian context. Garcia's report suggests a variety of conventional techniques and activities that teachers can use in the classroom for developing as well as informally assessing literacy skills, some of which include classroom observations, running records of students' oral reading, story (re)-telling, tape recordings of oral readings, reading logs, reading response logs, think-aloud, writing folders, and student-teacher conferences. Besides referring to the techniques and activities in the lists, the respondents were provided with a blank space with the category of "others" to report what other activities they might know and practice in enhancing their students' literacy skills. This open space was meant to capture data based on personal experiences in order to complement Garcia's list of old-age literacy teaching with such current ideas as digital technologies as the impacts of social-media advancement. Furthermore, an open item was also provided for the respondents to report what roles they could play in developing their students' literacy skills.

We moderated the survey questionnaire by requesting two colleagues and five English teachers to respond to it to ensure the clarity of the instruction and the content of the items. This moderation was intended to minimize possible discrepancies between 'the reality studied and the reality reported' (Punch, 2005, p. 29) as part of our attempts to obtain more data

validity. Feedback in the form of suggestions from the two colleagues and the five English teachers was then used as the basis for necessary revision. In addition to technical and mechanical feedback, the suggestions covered the possibility for the respondents to use *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian language) for more freedom to express their answers, considering that the prospective English teacher respondents might have had various levels of English proficiency. In so doing, internal validity is evident as the research procedures we undertook reflected our research focus. The revised questionnaire was then distributed through Google Forms to as many accessible teachers as possible.

Research Participants

We employed a convenience sampling technique in inviting the research participants by referring to Cohen et al. (2011) when addressing ethical issues concerning the sampling. In such a technique, based on their willingness and availability, 157 individual secondary English teachers responded to our questionnaire. Considering these subject-selection procedures, we would assert that these 157 teachers were involved but not representatives of secondary English teachers in Indonesia. Yet, they "can provide useful information for answering questions" (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 155).

The demographical data reveal that these secondary English teachers were mostly from East Java Province, Indonesia, where the three of us (Widiati, Karmina & Zubaidi) reside. Out of the 157 English teachers, 149 (94.9%) were from various cities and regencies of East Java Province, and the rest (5.1%) were from other provinces. The willingness of these English teachers to voluntarily respond to the questionnaire can be assumed to have functioned as their informed consent as the introductory part of our survey questionnaire states information about their awareness of the rights to withdraw from completing the questionnaire items at any time, their understanding of the potential beneficence of the study, and our guarantees of confidentiality, anonymity, and non-traceability (Cohen et al., 2011).

In terms of educational background, 111 (71%) teachers hold a bachelor degree and 42 (27%) masters degree in English language education, reflecting their fulfilment of the requirements for professional English teachers as set by the government regulations. Two teachers (1%) have a three-year English teaching certificate, and another two (1%) bachelor degree in other subjects. Furthermore, 30% teachers have more than 20-year teaching experiences, 24.20% have 15 to 20 years of teaching experience, 17.80% 10 to 15, 14% 5 to 10, and 14% less than five years of teaching

experience. In other words, the majority of the teachers involved in our study are professional experienced teachers of English.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

We distributed the questionnaire through Google Forms, which took prospective participants around twenty minutes to respond. Using a convenience sampling technique, we managed to reach as many teachers groups and forums as possible and waited for two weeks to get the questionnaire back. After two-week waiting, we received responses from 157 EFL teachers.

The responses to the closed-ended questionnaire items were then analyzed quantitatively using percentages. More specifically, descriptive statistical analyses in terms of frequency and percentage were generated by the Google Forms used. In order to induce a more rigorous and advanced interpretation of each percentage gained, percentage differences and percentage changes were calculated to examine the significance levels of differences between percentages of teachers' knowledge and practice. The percentage difference illustrates the difference concerning two positive numbers which help to distinguish the difference in percentage between what the teachers know and what the teachers do. We made use of the available online calculator by Furey (2022) to give such outputs.

Qualitatively, the data in the forms of free responses to the open-ended questionnaire item were analyzed using a deductive thematic method proposed by Rapley (2011) and Bergman (2010). According to them, thematic analysis is meant to identify meaningful codes or taxonomies where relevance is based on the research questions or the theoretical frameworks. In this case, all the responses, that is, what the 157 teachers wrote down, were first listed as they were, mostly in *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian language), and then categorized based on the meaning similarities. Excerpts included from the questionnaire data were translated to English. In categorizing, we focused more on the meanings of the messages than the actual wording the teachers used. After that, we treated the categorized responses as response transcription to be analyzed further to become codes of the roles of the secondary EFL teachers. The core messages inferred from the codes determined the types of roles. Finally, the identified roles were examined further to become the induced themes referring to our research objectives. Here, we decided that the pre-determined themes for our research are knowledge advancement and strategy implementation, meaning that we referred to what literacy teaching strategies Indonesian secondary EFL teachers know and what literacy teaching strategies they do. More operational and concrete procedures of this qualitative analysis are presented in the

finding section on English teachers' roles as we consider that the presentation of the findings would help facilitate understanding the qualitative analysis better. In short, in analyzing the qualitative data, we followed the key actions of the deductive thematic method as outlined by Rapley (2011) in fundamental and procedural terms. Inter rating of the codes and themes were executed among the researchers to validate and ensure reliable output.

Findings

This section presents the quantitative findings about teachers' knowledge and practice of literacy teaching strategies, followed by the presentation of the qualitative data about teachers' roles.

Knowledge and Practice of Literacy Teaching Strategies

As explained before, the secondary EFL teachers may select more than one literacy strategy that they feel they recognize and execute. Table 1 shows the percentages gained from the survey to unfold secondary EFL teachers' perceptions of what literacy teaching strategies they know and do. As can be seen in Table 1, the findings are presented based on the degree of familiarity, from the most familiar literacy teaching activities to the least as indicated by the percentages.

Table 1

Literacy Strategies as to What Teachers Know and What Teachers Do

Literacy teaching strategies	What teachers know	What teachers do
story (re)-tellings	142 (90.4%)	136 (86.6%)
classroom observations	97 (61.8%)	84 (53.5%)
writing folders	81 (51.6%)	66 (42%)
tape-recordings of oral readings	74 (47.1%)	51 (32.5%)
running records of students' reading	71 (45.2%)	44 (28%)
student-teacher conferences	69 (43.9%)	44 (28%)
think-aloud	52 (33.1%)	41 (26.1%)
reading logs	50 (31.8%)	34 (21.7%)
Other suggestions		
reading theatre	1(0.6%)	0%
reading task at home, writing diary/ synopsis	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)
running dictation	1 (0.6%)	0%

The data about teachers' knowledge and practice were followed by analysis of the percentage difference of each literacy strategy as presented in Table 2. Significance level (α) analysis was also made to determine the viability of percentage differences and changes. The purpose of the presented analysis in Table 2 is to understand whether the percentages obtained earlier have a significant difference. These shall offer an in-depth discussion of each of the studied literacy strategies as perceived by the secondary EFL teachers under study. Table 3 shows the percentage changes, suggesting that the increasing (or decreasing) change of a percentage determines how much knowledge and practice of each literacy strategy are made.

Table 2

Analysis of Percentage Differences and Changes of Each Literacy Strategy

Literacy strategies	**Z test**				**Significant percentage difference**
	α	**Z score**	**p-value (X; H0: B ≥ A)**	**difference (B-A)**	
story (re)tellings	14.56 %	-1.05535	0.1456	-0.0380	4.3% difference
classroom observations	6.83%	-1.48828	0.0683	-0.0830	14.3% difference
writing folders	4.41%	-1.70461	0.0441	-0.0960	20.4% difference
tape-recordings of oral readings	0.41%	-2.6427	0.0041	-0.1460	36.8% difference
running records of students' reading	0.08%	-3.16357	0.0007	-0.1720	46.9% difference
student-teacher conferences	0.71%	-2.9357	0.0016	-0.1590	44.2% difference
think-aloud	8.71%	-1.35862	0.0871	-0.07	23.6% difference
reading logs	2.16%	-2.02157	0.0216	-0.1010	38% difference
Other suggestions					
reading theatre					NIL
reading task at home, writing diary/ synopsis	50%	0	0.50	0	0% difference
running dictation					NIL

Table 3

Analysis of Percentage Differences and Changes in Each Percentage

Literacy strategies	Z test				Significant percentage change
	α	Z score	p-value (X; H0: B ≥ A)	difference (B-A)	
story (re)tellings	14.09 %	-1.076352	0.140885	-0.042035	4.2% decrease
classroom observations	5.55%	-1.593960	0.055472	-0.134304	13.4% decrease
writing folders	3%	-1.880734	0.030004	-0.186047	18.5% decrease
tape-recordings of oral readings	0.08%	-0.309979	0.000826	-3.146588	31% decrease
running records of students' reading	0%	-3.9569	0.000038	-0.380531	38% decrease
student-teacher conferences	0.01%	-3.626571	0.000144	-0.362187	36.2% decrease
think-aloud	6.36%	-1.525533	0.063563	-0.211480	21.1% decrease
reading logs	0.75%	-2.431455	0.007519	-0.317610	32% decrease
Other suggestions					
reading theatre					NIL
reading task at home, writing diary/ synopsis	50%	0	0.50	0	0% change
running dictation					NIL

The data in Table 1 show that for literacy strategy of story (re)-tellings, 90.4% of secondary EFL teachers perceived familiarity with the strategy, and 86.6% of them conducted the literacy teaching strategy. The pre-determined α is at 14.56%, thus making a 4.3% percentage difference and 4.2% percentage decrease (α=14.09%) as seen in Table 2 and Table 3 insignificant. These findings imply that the Indonesian secondary EFL teachers generally perform what they know for story (re)-telling strategy in developing their students' literacy skills, reflecting the most common activity and the task of asking EFL students to (re)-tell what they have read.

The next popular literacy strategy as presented in Table 1 is classroom observations. In Garcia's technical report (1992), classroom observations refer to ways to document or to keep track of students' literacy skill development. Our data reveal that as many as 61.8% of secondary EFL teachers claimed that they identified classroom observations as one of literacy teaching strategies that can be applied in teaching English, yet only 53.5% of

the teachers performed it in class. There is a significant 14.3% difference in percentage (α=6.83%) as indicated in Table 2, and there is a 13.4% decrease in change (α=5.55%) as shown in Table 3. Furthermore, at α=4.41%, writing folders literacy strategy has 20.4% percentage difference and 18.5% percentage decrease (α=3%) from the EFL teachers' knowledge (51.6%) and practice (42%) data.

The fourth literacy strategy in Table 1 is tape-recordings of oral readings. Teachers' knowledge is equal to 47.1%, exceeding their strategy implementation (32.5%). The percentage difference, as shown in Table 2, is at 36.8% (α=0.41%), while the percentage decrease presented in Table 3 is 31% (α=0.08%). These findings mean that there is a gap between knowledge and implementation for tape-recordings of oral readings. Furthermore, Table 1 also shows that only 28% of teachers conducted the strategy of running records of students' reading literacy despite the 45.2% perceived knowledge of the strategy. There is a significant difference between knowing and executing at 46.9% percentage difference (α=0.08%) with a 38% decrease at 0% significance, as presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

As can be seen in Table 1, student-teacher conferences with 44.2% percentage difference (at 0.71% significant) and 36.2% percentage change are significant at 0.01%. Knowledge is perceived by 43.9% of teachers, while implementation is only by 28%. This finding suggests that secondary EFL teachers do not apply their knowledge on student-teacher conferences as a literacy strategy to teach EFL. The next activity is think-aloud literacy strategy, which received 33.1% perceived knowledge and 26.1% perceived execution. It is a 23.6% percentage difference (α=8.71%) and 21.1% percentage change decrease at 6.36%, suggesting that teachers do not implement the knowledge about this activity.

Following those strategies, we found concerns in the reading logs literacy strategy which also appears to not be practiced in the classrooms by EFL teachers. Reading logs refer to the records of the different materials that students are reading (Garcia,1992). Reading logs have a recognition of 31.8% while the execution is at 21.7% with 38% percentage difference (α=2.16%) and 32% decrease with significance at 0.75%. Lastly, other literacy strategies like reading theatre, reading tasks at home, writing diary/synopsis, and running dictation have minimal impacts on statistical generalization.

Finally, we have to acknowledge that the open space we had provided in the questionnaire was not adequately responded by the EFL teachers. Alternative activities like digital media as had been expected did not emerge in our data, implying that pervasive influence of technologies was not yet evident among the EFL teachers in our research context. The teachers seemed to focus on selecting the provided lists of literacy teaching strategies. In other words, we did not yet find any possible methods indicated by the

teachers to ensure more lively and interesting literacy teaching instruction incorporating media advancement, technological savviness, and socially up to date resources. Meanwhile, at the international context, large scale online extensive reading programs (ERPs) in a university were recently researched in Thailand, where online platforms are present in the ERPs for literacy development (Puripunyavanich, 2022).

Suggested Roles in Literacy Skill Development

The open-ended questionnaire item to elicit possible roles that secondary EFL teachers can play in literacy skill development results in the qualitative findings as shown in Attachment A. As mentioned previously, knowledge advancement and strategy implementation are the two pre-decided themes in the content analysis of the teachers' responses because the focus of this study is to unfold secondary EFL teachers' perceptions of knowledge and implementation of literacy teaching strategies. The responses from the EFL teachers were recorded as they were written and then grouped according to similarities of their substantial meaning (see Attachment A). The grouping results are presented as translated transcription in the second column of the table. These raw data were analyzed using a thematic deductive method, resulting in categorization patterns as codes in the third column of the table. The induced themes we had determined based on the research aims are shown in the last column.

The qualitative data (Attachment A) show that there are 15 grouped comments based on the patterns of substantial similarities drawn from the raw data that the teachers had written down. When those 15 comments were further analyzed, they came up with the codes of possible roles that the secondary EFL teachers can play in developing their students' literacy skills, namely, providing literacy access and facilities, motivating students to love reading and develop a reading habit, creating conducive environments to support literacy development, and guiding students through role modelling. More specifically, in regard to the results of the qualitative analysis related to the induced themes that we had determined, only two out of the 15 grouped comments suggest that the secondary EFL teachers need to secure better knowledge in literacy pedagogy. Such knowledge advancement might include the importance of understanding course information that covers the syllabus, outcomes, and processes. Additionally, the 13 grouped comments were schemed towards how, when, and where a strategy implementation should be made. The importance of knowledge to be implemented is undoubtedly essential as success can only be achieved with well-planned executions.

Discussion

Overall, the current study has identified the common types of literacy teaching strategies secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia know and practice. The most familiar activity is story (re)-tellings, whereas the least familiar is reading logs. These data reveal that there has been a variety of literacy teaching strategies known and used by Indonesian secondary EFL teachers, which is in line with previous studies (e.g., Miller & Pennycuff, 2008; Tarone, 2010). Miller and Pennycuff (2008) suggested that teachers should employ different pedagogical strategies as various techniques and activities are likely to address individual differences among students to develop students' literacy learning more successfully. In many cases, explicit literacy instruction has been empirically proven beneficial (Yapp et al., 2021).

One seemingly interesting point to highlight is that the order of the teachers' knowledge about the literacy teaching strategies from the most familiar to the least is the same as that of the teachers' practice. Most of the strategies, except story (re)-tellings, show decreases in percentages from knowledge to practice. These findings suggest that knowing certain literacy teaching strategies does not necessarily transpire as action in EFL classrooms. It seems relevant at this point to juxtapose what Zulfikar (2021) has just recently found in his study: (Indonesian) EFL teachers might be knowledgeably well in preparation but practically challenged in-classroom implementation because they need to address such aspects as accommodating their students' characteristics and competencies, coping with classroom disruptions, and handling some external interferences.

As the data were induced from secondary EFL teachers, it is surprising to disclose such findings in regard to decreases, with the strategy of running records of students' reading having the most significant percentage difference and change. As the strategy name suggests, teachers are supposed to make notes on their students' reading developmental progress, implying the need for monitoring the development of individual students. The widest discrepancy found in this strategy type is speculated to have been caused by typical problems faced by Indonesian EFL teachers such as executing heavy teaching load, handling much administrative work, and managing big classes, as has also been reported in the studies by Hayati et al. (2018), Widiati et al. (2018), and Zulfikar (2021). This particular strategy requires EFL teachers to juggle between teaching their subject, doing non-teaching duties, and continuously recording the reading progress of their students, a demanding workload understandably hard to accomplish when they generally have to handle several big classes.

The next biggest discrepancy is in student-teacher conferences, a platform for teachers to work with their students and give opportunities for

students to reflect on their interests, performances, and progress. Students understanding feedback is an essential way for them to practice writing skills so this decrease in change should be seen as alarming. Individual conference activity between students and teachers has been reported to contribute to students' learning progress significantly (e.g., Alfalagg, 2020; Isnawati et al., 2019; Nicholas & Paatsch, 2014). Alfalagg's (2020) findings showed that conferences statistically impacted the students' writing performance with a significant effect size. Isnawati et al. (2019) also provided empirical evidence that interactions between teachers and students were necessary to help students understand teacher feedback to revise their writing drafts better. Nicholas and Paatsch (2014) have proven that literacy (reading) programs that include the provision of individualized, timely feedback and student-teacher conferences influence student reading progress, particularly in the area of letter-sound and name knowledge as the indicator of phonemic awareness, "a precursor or predictor of future reading success" (p. 148). Miller and Pennycuff (2008) also emphasized that literacy instruction appears most effective when developed through social interaction and collaboration with others. Despite the many benefits that student-teacher conferences can offer, with the typical circumstances of the teaching context described previously, the secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia might feel doubtful and insecure about implementing the strategy routinely.

Story (re)-tellings literacy strategy has the lowest insignificant percentage difference and decreased change. Such findings suggest that knowledge is apparently available among the teachers under study, and thus story (re)-telling as a literacy teaching strategy tends to be widely implemented by secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia. Furthermore, the findings might also be interpreted that story (re)-tellings literacy strategy is the most uncomplicated strategy to implement. This trend is quite understandable as the national English curriculum adopted in the country has been literacy-based since the implementation of the competency-based curriculum (CBC) in 2004 (Cahyono & Widiati, 2011), with narratives appearing as one of the texts more frequently introduced.

It is interesting to discuss this particular strategy in more detail to shed light on how story (re)-tellings have been used so far in education. Story (re)-tellings are generally understood as sharing activities of narratives (stories). This strategy has been empirically proven as an effective pedagogical way that can be woven into instruction, including literacy instruction. According to Miller and Pennycuff (2008), the motivation of even the most reluctant reader or writer can be boosted by engaging them in storytelling activities as the social element of language can potentially be encouraged through interaction and collaboration with others in the activities. Miller and Pennycuff (2008) further highlighted that much research has revealed that "the weakest readers

and writers are often the most adept at storytelling" (p. 37). Satriani (2019) has also reviewed many studies demonstrating the benefits of a story (re)-telling in instruction.

Regarding the findings, it is necessary to note that the various activities identified in this research, however, tend to be of old-age types. Reinforcing language learning and digital technology as highlighted by Anderson et al. (2018) seems not apparent yet among the teachers under study, which is in contrast to the internationally growing interests in the application of technologies as educational tools. Research by Rahimi and Yadollahi (2017) empirically proved that students working with computers developed their literacy skills. As for story (re)-tellings, for example, the obtained data did not reflect our EFL teachers' use of digital storytelling (DS) yet. In fact, DS, which originated from the USA, has been found to receive continuous interest there, and as Wu and Chen (2020) indicate, it is increasingly adopted in Asian and European countries. Their literature review uncovers eight positive outcomes influenced by DS: affective, cognitive, conceptual, academic, technological, linguistic, ontological, and social (Wu & Chen, 2020). They further highlight that in addition to being used in other fields of social studies, DS is commonly used for language and literacy development. Similarly, Rahimi and Yadollahi (2017) show that DS offers positive impacts on language learning; and therefore, more and more educationists have put attention on DS use. In certain contexts, where technologies are inexpensive and accessible, according to Schuch (2020), DS can even be effortlessly created and shared with others possibly in the form of online publishing.

Our supplementary qualitative data from the open-ended questionnaire item evidentially suggest that 15 categorized comments lead to four roles that EFL teachers can play in their attempts to develop their students' literacy skills covering providers of literacy access and facilities, motivators for students' love for reading and reading habit, creators of conducive environments, and role models. The responses that we have grouped imply that the English teachers acknowledged that they should provide their students with literacy access and facilities. Furthermore, they feel that they are supposed to motivate their students to love reading and develop a reading habit. Additionally, they admitted that creating conducive environments to support literacy development should become one of their responsibilities. What is more important is that the English teachers realized that showing their students that they themselves love reading is essential. In addition, the EFL teachers under study seemed to understand that the application of knowledge is vital. Below are some sample statements found in the teachers' responses in the open-ended questionnaire items, which have been put into their English equivalents.

Providers of literacy access and facilities

Providing easy-to-read resources in English; providing Wi-Fi in the library for students to get easy access to new narratives, in the form of either films or story books.

Motivators for students' love for reading and reading habit

Motivating students to love reading and writing and to develop reading habit. Start learning to write. Start writing. Planning a literacy activity in the form of, for example, 30-minute reading before the lesson.

Creators of conducive environments

Developing the habit of using spoken and written English to create a conducive atmosphere for English instruction.

Role models

In this global era, teachers need to become role models for their students in the love for reading. When teachers enjoy reading, frequently shown by reading at the school library or at the staff room, students might develop their reading enjoyment.

Results of further analysis to the four identified roles regarding the two pre-determined themes suggest that firm intention and continuous implementation are needed to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice. Out of the 15 categorized comments, the majority (13 categories) concern strategy implementation, and only two deal with knowledge enhancement. These findings imply that good knowledge of literacy teaching strategies is secured among the secondary EFL teachers under study. However, they seem to urgently need suggestive ideas of how to put the literacy teaching strategies into practice, making the strategies more concrete and operational in actions. Such an urgent need is similar to the concerns identified by Novianti et al. (2020), in that EFL teachers need more operational frameworks that can address the complexities of literacy teaching in the classrooms.

The development of literacy skills among students is undoubtedly very essential, and teachers thus need to be equipped with a range of pedagogical strategies to realize the attainment of the literacy skills through classroom practices. Utilizing media advancement, employing technological savviness, and developing socially up-to-date resources might become things to consider pertaining to such issues. However, besides relying on the roles that teachers can play, building up literacy skills at the school level is also highly required. As Hanrahan (2009) has reviewed, much literature substantiates that literacy needs to be taught across the curriculum in order for literacy programs to be successful. She even argued that "it is not possible to become literate as it is understood in the 21st century without developing

student skills in reading, writing, and argument" (p. 290). It highlights the recognition for spreading the responsibility of developing student literacy skills to teachers of other subjects and not only to the language teachers, mainly because literacy is specific to each discipline.

Limitations of the Study

To summarize, our study demonstrates discrepancies between knowledge and action in the literacy skill development strategies among Indonesian secondary EFL teachers except story (re)-telling. This implies that having the knowledge of a certain teaching strategy does not necessarily mean practicing it in classes or at schools. However, regarding using a questionnaire as the main instrument to collect the data in the current study, we have to admit that there might have been dishonest answers and conscientious responses from the teachers despite the advantages of questionnaires in terms of practicality scalability and respondent anonymity. Using both quantitative and qualitative data shows that attempts were made to explain the phenomena of knowledge and practice under study objectively. However, the richness and complexity of student literacy skill development would have been mapped out fully had interviews or observations been employed, referring to the concept of triangulation as proposed by Cohen et al. (2011). Additional data from interviews or observations could have been used to generate shared knowledge and practice of literacy teaching strategies among EFL teachers to lead to more data objectivity. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic during the data collection stage seems to have prevented us from utilizing interviews or observations, which might inspire future researchers to address such limitations. In addition, exploring school culture in establishing programs for literacy skill development is essential in order to triangulate the possible identification of future data on perceptions and realities.

Conclusion

The current study has revealed perceived knowledge and practice of literacy teaching strategies among secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia. The quantitative data show several identified teaching strategies, with the strategy of story (re)-telling being the most popular one and reading logs being the least. The popularity of story (re)-telling is likely to have been caused by the competence-based curriculum, which puts discourse competence as the central focus. Such a curriculum emphasizes mastering various text types, with narratives appearing as one of the texts more frequently introduced in secondary education. The identified strategies, except story (re)-telling, suggest the same trends of percentage decreases between knowledge and

practice, implying discrepancies between what the teachers reported they know and what they reported they do. This reveals that compared to other strategy types, knowledge about story (re)-telling is evidently available, and it is commonly used in literacy teaching. The identified teaching activities, however, do not yet reflect the integration of media and technology utilization.

Additionally, the qualitative data support the quantitative findings in that 13 categorized comments demonstrate EFL teachers' concerns on strategy implementation, that is, how to put strategy knowledge into action in the classrooms. Moreover, there are four identified roles that the secondary EFL teachers in the current study can actively play so that literacy programs can take place as expected at the levels of both classrooms and schools: providers of literacy access and facilities, motivators for students' love for reading and reading habit, creators of conducive environments, and role models.

Recommendations for Future Studies

Concerning the limitations of the current study, it is recommended that future research be geared toward the employment of interviews and observations, which was not possible during the study because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviews and observations would ensure richer data about literacy skill development, making gap spaces between knowledge and practice narrower. Furthermore, with the idea of literacy across the curriculum, exploring how schools systematically develop student literacy skills is indeed worth it. Future research may also be geared toward recording comprehensive and systematic attempts at teaching literacy.

Acknowledgements

This article was based on a research study financially supported by Research Institute of Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia, to which we are sincerely grateful.

About the Authors

Utami Widiati: A professor of ELT in Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her main research interests are curriculum and material development, second language acquisition, and teacher professional development. ORCID. 0000-0002-8603-4556.

Tengku Intan Suzila: A senior lecturer at the Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia. She is a well published researcher and his areas of interest include TEFL and TESL, languages and studies on endangered languages.

Sari Karmina: A faculty member at the Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her main research interests cover English teaching and learning, literacy pedagogy and education, and collaborative learning.

Nanang Zubaidi: A faculty member at the Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. His areas of interests include English teaching and learning, translation studies, and language and linguistics.

References

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P.D., & Paris, S.G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher*, *61*, 364–373. https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.61.5.1

Alfalagg, A.R. (2020). Impact of teacher-student writing conferences on frequency and accuracy of using cohesive devices in EFL students' writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5*(21), 19 pages. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00104-z

Anderson, J., Chung, Y. & Macleroy, V. (2018) Creative and critical approaches to language learning and digital technology: findings from a multilingual digital storytelling project. *Language and Education*, *32*(3), 195-211, https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1430151

Artieda, G. (2017). The role of L1 literacy and reading habits on the L2 achievement of adult learners of English as a foreign language. *System*, *66*, 168–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.03.020

Artieda, G., & Munoz, C. (2013). The role of age and literacy in adult foreign language learning. *Fremdsprachen in Der Perspective Leb-Enslagen.* Peter Lang. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316118872_The_Role_of_Age_and_Literacy_in_Adult_Foreign_Language_Learning

Bergman, M.M. (2010). Hermeneutic content analysis: Textual and audiovisual analyses within a mixed methods framework. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Mixed methods in social & behavioral research (2nd Edn.)* (pp. 379–396). SAGE Publications.

Cahyono, B.Y. & Widiati, U. (2011). *The teaching of English as a foreign language in Indonesia*. State University of Malang Press.

Chamberlain, L., Lacina, J., Bintz, W. P., Jimerson, J. B., Payne, K., & Zingale, R. (2020). Literacy in lockdown: Learning and teaching during COVID-19 school closures. *The Reading Teacher*, *74*(3), 243–253. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1961

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education (7th Eds.)*. Routledge.

De Milliano, I., Gelderen, A, & van Sleegers, P. (2014). Types and sequences of self-regulated reading of low-achieving adolescents in relation to reading task achievement. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 39(2), 229–252. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12037

Furey, E. (2022). *Percentage difference Calculator*. https://www.calculatorsoup.com

Garcia, G.E. (1992). *The literacy assessment of second language learners*. (No. 559). Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois. https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/18058/ctrstreadtechrepv01992i00559_opt.pdf

Gustine, G. G., & Insani, H. N. (2019). English students' experience of reframing narrative stories from a critical literacy perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *8*(3), 691–696. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15254

Gutiérrez, C. (2015). Beliefs, attitudes, and reflections of EFL pre-service teachers while exploring critical literacy theories to prepare and implement critical lessons. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *17*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2015.2.a01

Hanrahan, M. (2009). Bridging the literacy gap: Teaching the skills of reading and writing as they apply in school science. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science &Technology Education, 5*(3), 289–304. https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/75280

Hayati, N., Widiati, U., & Furaidah. (2018). Understanding reasons behind student teachers' pedagogical decisions. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 15*(2), 256–270.

Hayik, R. (2016). What does this story say about females?: Challenging gender-biased texts in the English-language classroom. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *59*(4), 409–441. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.468

Huh, S. (2016). Instructional model of critical literacy in an EFL context: Balancing conventional and critical literacy. *Critical Inquiry in Language*

Studies, *13*(3), 210–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1154445

Isnawati, I., Sulistyo, G. H., Widiati, U. & Suryati, N. (2019). Impacts of teacher-written corrective feedback with teacher-student conference on students' revision. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(1), 669-684. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1201335.pdf

Kahn-Horwitz, J., Shimron, J., & Sparks, R. L. (2005). Predicting foreign language reading achievement in elementary school students. *Reading and Writing*, *18*(6), 527–558. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-005-3179-x

Kucer, S.B. (2014). *Dimensions of literacy: A conceptual base for teaching reading and writing in school settings (4th Edn.)*. Routledge.

Kuo, J. (2013). Implementing critical literacy for university freshmen in Taiwan through self-discovery texts. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *22*(4), 549–557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0057-1

Li, D. (2022). A review of academic literacy research development: from 2002 to 2019. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 7*(5), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00130-z

Mahecha, F. A. G. (2018). Implementing critical literacy in A1 undergraduate students. *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, *16*, 100–116. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1184934

Meschyan, G., & Hernandez, A. (2002). Is native-language decoding skill related to second-language learning? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.1.14

Miller, S. & Pennycuff, L. (2008). Using storytelling to improve literacy learning. *Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education*, *1*(1), 36–4. https://jonsundell.com/wp-content/uploads/The_power_of_story_using_storytelling_to.pdf

Muñoz, C. (2000). Bilingualism and trilingualism in school students in Catalonia. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language.* (pp. 157–178). Multilingual Matters.

Nicholas, M., & Paatsch, L. (2014). Teacher practice: A spotlight on the use of feedback and conferencing in the first year of schooling. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(9), 136–152. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n9.10

Novianti, N., Thomas, A., & To, V. (2020). Addressing challenges in the practice of critical literacy in EFL classrooms: A new framework.

Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, *10*(1), 206–217. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.25049

Owodally, A. M. A. (2015). Code-related aspects of emergent literacy: How prepared are preschoolers for the challenges of literacy in an EFL context? *Early Child Development and Care*, *185*(4), 509–527. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.936429

Peled, Y. (2021). Pre-service teacher's self-perception of digital literacy: The case of Israel. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*(3), 2879–2896. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-020-10387-x

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language education. *System, 18*(3), 303-311. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(90)90003-N

Pires, N. C., & Morgado, M. M. (2021). The project eMysteries–From reading to writing. *Álabe: Revista de Investigación sobre Lectura y Escritura*, *24*, 7. https://doi.org/10.15645/Alabe2021.24.7

Punch, K.F. (2005). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches (2nd Edn.)*. SAGE Publications.

Puripunyavanich, M. (2022). The implementation of a large-scale online extensive reading program in Thailand—From decision-makingto application. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *15*(1), 320-360. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index

Rahimi, M. & Yadollahi, S. (2017). Effects of offline vs. online digital storytelling on the development of EFL learners' literacy skills. *Cogent Education, 4*(1), 1285531, 13 pages. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1285531

Rapley. T. (2011). Some pragmatics of data analysis. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research (3rd Edn.)* (pp. 273–290). SAGE Publications.

Riamliw, J. (2013). *Concepts of literacy of Thai foundation English teachers: A national study* (Order No. 3577040) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh]. ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Global.

Sánchez-Cruzado, C., Santiago Campión, R., & Sánchez-Compaña, M. T. (2021). Teacher digital literacy: The indisputable challenge after COVID-19. *Sustainability*, *13*(4), 1858. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041858

Satriani, I. (2019). Storytelling in teaching literacy: Benefits and challenges. *English Review: Journal of English Education, 8*(1), 113–20. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v8i1.1924

Schuch, A. (2020). Digital storytelling as a teaching tool for primary, secondary and higher education. *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 45(2), 173-196. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26974203

Sparks, R. L., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., & Humbach, N. (2012a). Do L1 reading achievement and L1 print exposure contribute to the prediction of L2 proficiency? *Language Learning*, *62*(2), 473–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00694.x

Sparks, R. L., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., & Humbach, N. (2012b). Relationships among L1 print exposure and early L1 literacy skills, L2 aptitude, and L2 proficiency. *Reading and Writing*, *25*(7), 1599–1634. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-011-9335-6

Sparks, R. L., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., Humbach, N., & Javorsky, J. (2008). Early first-language reading and spelling skills predict later second-language reading and spelling skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*(1), 162–174. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.1.162

Tejedor, S., Cervi, L., Pérez-Escoda, A., & Jumbo, F. T. (2020). Digital literacy and higher education during COVID-19 lockdown: Spain, Italy, and Ecuador. *Publications*, *8*(4), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications8040048

Widiati, U., Suryati, N., Hayati, N. (2018). Unraveling the challenges of Indonesian novice teachers of English. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(3), 621–629. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9824

Widiati, U., Wulyani, A. N., El Khoiri, N., Hanifiyah, L., Nindya, M. A., & Sharif, T. I. Z. T. (2021). English teachers' conceptualization of foreign language literacy in relation to Indonesia's gerakan literasi sekolah (school literacy initiative). *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 233–244. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i1.34586

Williams, C. (2016a). L1 Literacy strategy impact on L2 word-priming effects. *Thoughts*, 44–57. https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thoughts/article/view/59274

Williams, C. (2016b). Reading against the stream: Using the wrong strategies to acquire L2 literacy. In C. Williams (Ed.), *Teaching English reading in the Chinese-speaking world: building strategies across scripts* (pp. 141–159). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0643-27

Wu, J. & Chen, D-T.V. (2020). A systematic review of educational digital storytelling. *Computers & Education*, *147*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103786

Yapp, D., de Graaff, R., & van den Bergh, H. (2021). Effects of reading strategy instruction in English as a second language on students' academic reading comprehension. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820985236

Zulfikar. (2021). Evaluating certified Indonesian EFL teachers' performance: A case study in a high school in Aceh. *ELT Worldwide*, *8*(1), 60–81. https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v8i1.19349

Appendix A Thematic inductive analysis of open-ended data

No	Transcription	Codes	Induced themes
1	*Students, with the assistance of parents, schools, and the surrounding environment, promote a continuous literacy culture.*	Guide, deprive, and demand knowledge-able teachers	Strategy implementation
	When it comes to reading, it is uncommon for teachers to teach their pupils to read the class materials before the class. Typically, a teacher's delivery of learning is regulated only by the lesson plans (RPP) and syllabus, which serve as learning guides. Some instructors rely entirely on student worksheets (LKS) as a learning resource, oblivious to students' needs.		Knowledge advancement
2	*Enhancing students' abilities to think rationally and creatively, to speak English effectively, to compete favorably with their peers, and to produce works in English.*	Optimize talent	Strategy implementation
3	*Literacy growth can only be accomplished effectively with the cooperation of all stakeholders, both in terms of facilities and motivation. The primary influences are the involvement of instructors and parents in learning, as well as the availability of infrastructure.*	Guide, facilitate and motivate	Strategy implementation
4	*Motivate pupils to enjoy reading English literature by starting with basic, easy, and enjoyable materials such as short stories,*	Motivate	Strategy implementation

	folk tales, or simple and engaging applied skills.		
5	*Encouraging and supporting the literacy growth in schools may be accomplished by providing specialized literacy programs, allocating more time for kids, and establishing a learning environment that encourages students to engage in literacy activities.*	Motivate, facilitate, create conducive environme-nt	Strategy implementation
6	*Foreign languages are prepared and taught in the most appealing manners and media imaginable. The instructor delivers current socialization on the increased importance of English in the future.*	Demand knowledge advanceme-nt	Knowledge advancement
7	*Schools must assist participants' attempts to raise their interest, motivation, and emotional connection to literacy; schools must serve as the primary agent in increasing student passion for literacy. Literacy is comparable to prayer; we are not encouraging youngsters to pray, but rather to compete in literacy. Perhaps some motivation is required; for example, pupils who read a large number of pages might get awards, and on other occasions can submit comments and a description of what was read.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation
8	*Motivation, solid parental support, and English reading/writing habit.*	Motivate	Strategy implementation
9	*Teachers should act as motivators, facilitators, and mediators for their students, ensuring that their literacy skills improve as a result of their increased time spent at school versus at home. And this is expected of parents who play a critical part in students' literacy development. In terms of schools, it is preferable to accommodate the needs of students and instructors in*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation

	order to promote effective literacy development.		
10	*Motivating kids to be rigorous in their reading and writing, and acclimating them to book reading can be started by learning how to write. Write, and then establish a literacy schedule at your school; it can be as little as 30 minutes before class each day.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation
11	*I hope that instructors and institutions, in their capacity as facilitators, can entice literacy pupils by providing engaging stimuli. Additionally, readings should be prepared neatly to pique students' interest in exploring them.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation
12	*The instructor acts as a catalyst or motivator, encouraging pupils to advance and guide them to avoid deviating or becoming down in spirit.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation
13	*Efforts to enhance foreign language literacy may begin as early as kindergarten by teaching frequently used terminologies. Additionally, the support and involvement of parents, teachers, and the surrounding environment play a significant part in the development of reading habits.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation
14	*There is a need for a print literacy resource with a simpler vocabulary...particularly for students with limited literacy. Additionally, instructors reward students who participate in school-sponsored reading programs to encourage other children to participate in literacy activities.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation
15	*At least once a week, teachers will activate the reading corner by motivating and assisting students in literacy activities at school.*	Motivate, facilitate	Strategy implementation