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Abstract. Literacy Infrastructure and access to books are the foundation of literacy activity. Indonesia has regulations from the Ministry of Education and Culture requiring that 15 minutes should be used each day before the learning begins to read books other than textbooks. However, many schools are not yet obeying this requirement. The purposes of this study are to describe the literacy infrastructure in primary schools in Indonesia, to analyze access to books in primary schools, to explain the School Literacy Movement implementation, and to identify issues around the implementation of reading strategies in a context in which there is limited access to books. The questionnaire and interview study were conducted in 30 primary schools in East Java, Indonesia. The study concluded that the literacy infrastructure and access to books in 30 primary schools are below standard, but the school community enthusiastically implements the objectives of the School Literacy Movement. Many primary schools are already implementing good many reading strategies although there are some problems related to teacher competence.

1. Introduction
Indonesia is listed as one of the countries that are succeeding in reducing the illiteracy rate. United Nations Development Programme noted that the level of public literacy in Indonesia reached 92.8% for the adult group, and 98.8% in the category of teenagers [19]. This achievement shows that the literacy crisis is Indonesia has passed. Nevertheless, challenges remain, and one of these currently is a widespread lack of interest in reading. In addition, the availability of books throughout Indonesia has been inadequate; the government is also facing low motivation for reading among students, teachers and the wider community.

The results of the Progress International Reading Literacy Study or PIRLS, which evaluates the reading ability of students in grade IV, ranks Indonesia at the 45th place out of 48 participating countries with a score of 428, below the average value of 500 [17]. In the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), a survey which evaluates the ability of learners aged 15 years and includes reading, maths, and science, Indonesia which was originally in PISA 2009 ranked 57th with a score of 396, while the average score of Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development or OECD is 493, showed a decline in rank in 2012, when it was ranked 64th with a score of 396 (the mean score average OECD is 496) [13]. This data is consistent with findings of UNESCO concerning
the reading habits of the people of Indonesia, that only one in 1,000 people of Indonesia is reading for
pleasure.

Reflecting on this fact, the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) as the stakeholders feel
responsible and that they need to make changes strategically and systematically. Hence the Regulation
of the Minister of Education and Culture (RMEC) No. 23 of 2015 on "Growth Character" published in
mid-July 2015. In this rule, literacy became one of the principal concerns. This concern was
articulated in the obligation "to use 15 minutes before the day of learning to read books other than
textbooks (every day)."

Fifteen minutes reading activity in schools is not a new program in Indonesia. Some primary
schools (PS) have taken the initiative to create reading corners, they require students to read literary
books, and they publish books by students and teachers. The publication of RMEC No 23 was
intended as a legal protection for good practices that have been implemented in these PS and at the
same time to become a reference for emerging regulatory regimes at the local level. However, despite
the fact that the RMEC was published in July 2015, still many schools have not implemented it.
Therefore, to support the RMEC No 23 and to create a safe atmosphere for literacy, a task force was
set up to develop a School Literacy Movement (SLM). This was established in January 2016 by the
Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education, Ministry of Education. SLM Task Force
members come from academia, practitioners, literacy activists and non-governmental organization.
The Task Force has four tasks: (1) socialization and coordination to introduce the movement, (2)
implementation, (3) promotion of the SLM’s purposes to the wider public, and (4) monitoring and
evaluation.

Literacy infrastructure and access to books are very crucial to understanding state literacy policy in
Indonesia. All states maintain a state literacy education office headed by an official designated by the
state director. In Indonesia, the state director is Minister of Education and Culture. RMEC No 24 of
2007 identifies the fact that the number of books, as one element of the literacy infrastructure, is very
crucial in the development of literacy. The number and types of books for all schools have been set in
the Ministerial Regulation or RMEC No. 24 of 2007 on Infrastructure Standards, including enrichmen
t books in primary schools.

There are 13,466 islands that make-up Indonesia, and one of the most heavily populated islands in
Indonesia is Java. Java is relatively well equipped regarding infrastructure. Therefore, schools in Java
(including primary schools in East Java) can be one barometer for judgments related to school
infrastructure and the implementation of SLM strategies.

This study is important because RMEC No 24 of 2007 has been in effect for almost ten years and
RMEC No 23 has been in effect for more than one year, but the result of PIRLS and PISA are still
low. Therefore, based on the problems, the purposes of this study are to describe the literacy
infrastructure in East Java primary schools in Indonesia; to analyze access to books in East Java
primary schools and SLM implementation, and to identify and discuss how to implement SLM with
limited infrastructure.

2. Method
This study was conducted in 30 primary schools (PS) in East Java (9 cities/districts): 14 PS in
Surabaya; 3 PS in Sidoarjo; 3 PS in Lamongan; 2 PS in Gresik; 2 PS in Mojokerto; 2 PS in Bangkalan;
1 PS in Madiun; 1 PS in Trenggalek; 1 PS in Bojonegoro. Respondents are teachers. Some of them are
now studying further while still working.

Data were collected in September 2016 by questionnaire (related to access to enrichment books and
about SLM implementation). The survey was followed by an interview to investigate answers more
thoroughly. The questionnaire asked about the number of students and enrichment books in PS;
phases in the development of SLM (habituation, development, and learning); strategies used such as
reading aloud and sustained silent reading. Regarding SLM implementation, respondents were asked
to answer "already" "not yet", "yes" or “no" to indicate whether a particular strategy had been put into
action. Data were calculated in percentages (the number of PS choose "already" and "yes"). Therefore,
according to the Guttman scale [22], the results are presented in one of two categories: 0-49% is "less" and 50--100% is "good". Interviews conducted for exploration of questions about access to books strengthen the questionnaire data, especially if there are questionable data or empty responses. Furthermore, the interviews also explore the reasons for the answers in the questionnaire including a respondent’s solution or an idea.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 Literacy Infrastructure and Access to Books

RMEC No. 24 of 2007 on Infrastructure Standards for School in Indonesia cited a variety of book that should be used in PS. One of the important types of book is an enrichment book. All PS (100%) should meet the standards, especially concerning the number of enrichment book titles. Regarding enrichment books, the standard number that should be available at each PS is 840 titles, composed of 60% nonfiction (504 titles) and 40% fiction (336 titles).

However, although the regulation has been in effect almost ten years, PS in East Java -- which include schools which have received much attention and many amenities compared to schools outside Java-- almost nothing meets the required standards. The number of students in PS studied ranged from 62--850 students. Based on the data, from 30 PS, there are only two PS that meet the total number of titles. One PS has 1000 titles of enrichment books consisting of 500 titles of fiction and 500 titles of nonfiction. Regarding the number of enrichment books, it meets the standards. However, regarding details, the number of nonfiction books does not reach the minimum standard (504 titles). A second PS has 845 titles of enrichment books consisting of 225 fiction and 620 nonfiction. Regarding the number of enrichment books, it meets the standards. However, regarding details, the number of fiction books does not reach the minimum standard (336 titles). The third PS has 625 titles of enrichment books consisting of 375 fiction (meets the standard) and 250 nonfiction (does not meets).

The respondents from these three schools said that their primary schools had been getting a block grant for books of fiction and nonfiction and a special allocation fund for the purchase of books since 2007. The other PS did not receive this grant. There are 7 PS that do not have enrichment books: one PS that only had one enrichment book, and another had only two enrichment books and 10 PS have no fiction at all.

The data shows that many PS do not meet the number of enrichment books. Based on the data, from 90 entries, only five (5%) meet the standards (check mark), and this indicates that many students have poor access to books. In addition, respondents said that there are two PS that have no library. Some of PS do not have a record of the number of books in their schools. The issues than, for PS, are funding, poverty amongst their students, limited numbers of books and no libraries. Therefore, many students have very poor access to books.

Many PS lacked enrichment books but turned out to have various ideas as follows:

1. To laminate some stories from the newspaper.
2. To empower students to bring books from home to read together and exchange books among students when they have finished reading (although unfortunately, many poor students have no books because of the terrible cost)
3. Every few weeks, exchange books between classes.
4. Transfer books or borrow from each other between PS.
5. Invite a government car library to visit the school.

Respondents from Surabaya's PS said that many schools in Surabaya have even been aided by the city library to enter book details online and have the books delivered to their schools. In this scheme, each school has one or two librarians assigned to it.

The rules on the standard of infrastructure were issued in 2007. Until now many schools that do not comply. Studies confirm that children of poverty have very little access to books at home and in their communities, with poor access to good public libraries and bookstores [12]. Children from impoverished households have access to fewer books and other reading materials than do their more
financially stable peers. Not only do poor children have fewer books in their homes, but they also live in communities with fewer books in the classroom, school, and public library [16]. The study by Batool and Mahmood concludes that children will only become information literate with proper learning tools, resources, and flexible infrastructure in schools. In the U.S. schoolchildren, one of the lack of educational infrastructure is books [3].

If many PS in Java (East Java) do not meet the standards of facilities and infrastructure, how about the school in the other islands? There needs to be more attention from the government, community, business, and industry to increase access to books, especially enrichment books on the other islands. It appears that the funds from the government (Operational Aid to School Program), minimum 5%, which were allocated for the development of libraries, have not been used to procure books. This is the case even though studies confirm that increased access to materials such as books can reduce the effects of living in poverty for children (Krashen et al. 2010; McCoy, 2013 and increased access to books is related to increased reading achievement [7].

3.2 SLM Implementation

Beers et al suggest that for schools to be at the forefront of the development of cultural literacy there are several strategies needed to create a positive culture of literacy in schools [2]. These are conditioning the physical environment to make it friendly, promoting the social and affective environment, and promoting the academic environment. These strategies were adopted in the three phases in SLM. The implementation phases of the SLM are habituation, development, and learning [23].

3.2.1 Phase 1 of SLM: Habituation. RMEC No 23 of 2015 required that 15 minutes a day should be devoted to reading in all schools. SLM was formed in January 2016. In this case, the Ministry through SLM requires all schools (100%) to be carrying out the habituation phase, development, and learning.

From the ten items in this habituation phase, five items (50%) were classified as good, and five items (50%) were classified as less than good. In the habituation phase, it seems that 67% of PS have implemented the 15-minutes reading, including PS which used the time to read Al-Quran (8%). PS that have not implemented a 15-minute reading said they did not know about SLM, yet they understood the importance of literacy and its implementation in PS. There are several answers from these respondents which included:

1. Teachers and principals do not know the RMEC No23 of 2015.
2. There were no orders from their direct superiors (in this case the district/city education offices) which was one of the reasons why the respondents have not started SLM. It also means socializing SLM is not spread evenly.
3. The PS does not have enough books.
4. The PS has been allocated 15 minutes before class to read Al-Quran.
5. Teachers need to gain insight into the reading which is suitable for students.
6. The working time has been filled with a load of teaching and administration.

Ninety-three percent of schools have libraries, but not all libraries have a particular room, there is sometimes just a bookshelf in the corner of the school. 70% of PS have a reading corner in each class. Respondents said that books in the reading corners turned out to be a book that students themselves had brought to PS to read together. The school should provide the enrichment books, but according to many respondents, the books belong to the students because the teacher asked them to bring books to the school. The item "rich text materials are posted in each classroom, corridors, and other areas in the school" which reaches 87%, although in the form of simple rich text material. However, with the limitations, the spirit of the school community to carry out literacy is good: "Respondents and the principal have commitments" reaches 73%. The others were still waiting for direct orders from the immediate supervisor (the education office).
Less encouraging responses can be seen in the item "Teachers, principals, and educators to be a model of in fifteen minutes reading activities" which reaches 4% because--according to respondents--reading comprehension is for students and not the teacher who is in charge of overseeing the students. "Students have a daily reading journal" reaches 43%. PS that have not applied daily journal reading appears to be still waiting for instructions. According to respondents, the important thing is students have to read. Of the 67% of PS implementing the program of reading 15 minutes, only 40% apply it for one whole semester of school. Respondents that implement reading for 15 minutes for less than one semester said that they would continue it.

Only 47% of school gardens, canteens, and student health units are clean, healthy, and rich text. There are still PS that do not have a library, a garden, and student health unit because of limited space and funds. Problems associated with an area of PS infrastructure became one of the causes have not been fulfilled SLM implementation. In addition, some respondents also said that their PS is a school with poor students.

Furthermore, the involvement of the public (parents, community, and the alumni) to develop literacy activities is also lacking (17%). Respondents also argued that the public was rarely involved in literacy activities at PS because they were not started and had not been involved. In addition, the tracking of alumni (treasure study) is still not happening. A few PS engage alumni because the alumni's homes are relatively close and there is concern from alumni themselves.

Regarding the physical environment, there are constraints on the limited number of books, space constraints (narrow class of PS and PS yard limited), and limited funds to create rich text material. Studies confirm that children of poverty attend schools with poorly supported classroom libraries and school libraries (Neuman and Celano, 2001). This is even though increased access to materials such as books can reduce the effects of living in poverty for children [15].

3.2.2 Phase 2 of SLM: Development. From the ten items in this development phase, four items (40%) were classified as good, and six items (60%) were classified as less than good.

The items which have been classified "good" consist of "Libraries used for various activities of literacy" which reaches 77%; "Reading corner is used for various activities of literacy" which reaches 63%. According to the respondents, the library and the reading corner have been used to promote literacy activities, ranging from reading, discussing, and creating works.

"There are various follow-up activities to the fifteen minutes of reading" reaches 63% and "There are oral and written demands that are used as a non-academic assessment", reaches 50%. "The variation of the follow-up fifteen minutes reading activities" reaches 63%. This is to prepare a resume, notes, draw, retell, discuss. Of the 63%, not all respondents were used to non-academic demands (13%) because they think there should be no assessment.

The less encouraging results can be seen in the item of “There is Team of School Literacy (TSL) formed by the principal", which reaches 43%. Furthermore, there are several reasons for PS that without TSL, student portfolios, and activity that promotes a culture of literacy schools, namely:

1. PS have not implemented the TSL because they do not know about it,
2. There is no clue about the TSL and student portfolios.

"Students have a portfolio that contains a collection of reading response journals” which reaches 43%; of the 43% of schools using reading response journals with students, only 33% were on display in the classroom or the school corridor. “There is an academic activity that promotes a culture of literacy school” was found in only 37% schools. The reward for the achievement of students in literacy activities at regular intervals” was found in only 30% school. According to the respondents, some PS can not provide rewards because many PS are constrained by funding and the school community are economically disadvantaged (students of poverty). Furthermore, “The celebration activities in specific days on the theme of literacy” was found in only 23% school.

3.2.3 Phase 3 of SLM: Learning. From the eight items in this learning phase, three items (40%) were classified "good", and five items (60%) were classified "less than good". The items that have been
classified "good" consist of "There is rich text material related subject displayed in each classroom" which reaches 73%. When compared with the habituation phase in item "There are rich text materials are posted in each classroom, corridors, and other areas in the school", which reaches 87%, it means 14% of rich text material is not related to the subject. Furthermore, "Fifteen minutes each day reading followed by other activities by the academic demand" reaches 57%. The literacy activities related to subjects include a resume, storytelling, and discuss subjects related to Bahasa Indonesia. "Reading already entrenched and became school community needs," reaches 53%. According to respondents, this indicator came from students who love to read.

The less encouraging can be seen in the item "Team of School Literacy (TSL) arranges the planning, implementation, and assessment of school literacy program" which reaches 43%. These percentages are the same as those in the development phase, i.e. there is TSL formed by the principal. It means all TSL arrange the planning, implementation, and assessment of the school literacy program. Furthermore, "School networking with external parties for the development of literacy programs" reaches 43%; "There is a reward for the achievement of participants in the literacy activities based on academic demand" was found in only 43% school. It's more than "There is a reward for the achievement of students in literacy activities at regular intervals" which reaches 30% in the development phase. According to the respondents, rewarding the achievement of students in the literacy activities (based on academic demand) is done by the teacher during a lesson, through praise or a small gift such as a pencil. However, this is less than those rewarded in the development phase when the reward was given by the school rather than the teacher.

"There is show the work of students in celebration of certain days with literacy theme" was found in only 23% school. This percentage is the same as "there is a celebration activity in specific days on the theme of literacy" in the development phase and it means all celebration activities show the work of students. In addition, a show of the work of students (the results of the literacy activities) in celebration of certain days with literacy theme and students journal displayed in the classroom, and school corridors are not done by many PS because of limited funds.

Students’ journals (from reading enrichment books and textbooks) displayed in the classroom and school corridors was found in only 23% school. It's less than "Student's reading response journals displayed in the classroom and school corridors" in the development phase which reaches 33%, and it means that not all students’ response journals are the result of reading textbooks.

Based on the analysis performed, the recapitulation of the three phases can be seen in the following table.

| Phase           | Good (50--100%) | Less (0--49%) |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Habituation     | 50%             | 50%          |
| Development     | 40%             | 60%          |
| Learning        | 40%             | 60%          |

The table appears that in the habituation phase, 30 PS in East Java is in a category that is balanced. But in the phase of development and learning are still classified in the less than good.

3.2.4 Read-Aloud and Sustained Silent Reading as Learning Strategies. Some PS was already implementing stages of read-aloud and sustained silent reading in the 15 minutes of reading and learning of subject [18] [11]. SLM wants all PS (100%) to carry out read-aloud and sustained silent reading as strategies. Most PS was already implementing a read-aloud as one of the strategies (classified as good). However, this does not only apply to the fifteen minutes reading program but also in the learning of subjects.

Eighty-six percent of teachers selected books/stories that are useful and exciting, and after reading a story, the teacher conducted a discussion of the book; teachers who do not choose a book do so
because of the limited books in their school. 83% teachers read the text with the pronunciation and intonation clearly and not too fast, and they asked a question on the sidelines of the story to arouse students’ reaction and response. In this case, respondents, as teachers were felt, are still not right in pronunciation and intonation when they were reading aloud. They want to learn to be more confident when they read aloud, especially when reading to the public. 79% teachers asked things related to the story that would be read, and they gave freedom for students to choose books in accordance with their interests and pleasures. Teachers who could not give freedom to the students to choose books did so because of the limitations of existing books. In addition, many students do not have books, even though they have been asked to bring books to school. It is associated with the limited funds of the student's family.

Furthermore, 76% of teachers in PS had read the book that would be read aloud and could open a conversation about the reading material. Teachers who had not read the book that would be read aloud felt that the story was familiar and well-known.

Several sessions were allocated to reading the book to completion (if a readable book is thick) or they chose one section of a thick book to be read aloud. This reaches 76%. In addition, teachers who were not following with the discussion of books and other things related to books read did not do so because they feel the time is very limited.

Most PS was already implementing Sustained Silent Reading as one of the strategies (classified as good). However, this does not only apply to the fifteen minutes reading program but also in learning of subjects. Of the three steps beginning in sustained silent reading, it appears that only 69% students can choose his preferred place to read. This reaches 76%. In addition, teachers who were not following with the discussion of books and other things related to books read did not do so because they feel the time is very limited.

"Students may choose another book" reaches 79%. According to the respondents, in sustained silent reading, some students can not choose his preferred place to read because of space limitations, including in the classrooms. Students can only take the book and returned to their seat again for reading. The limited number of books including thick books makes it difficult to choose the books and teachers (respondents) felt no need to explain a thick book. In addition, "teachers explain that the students will read the book to completion within a particular time, depend on the thickness of the book" reaches 76%. Not many books are thick in PS because of the limitations of funds for the purchase of books. Many PS have proposed the procurement of books to the foundation or government, although it is recognized that the purchase of books is not a funding priority. In addition, the respondents admitted that they do not read many books, especially literary books. Reading habits have not become a part of the culture in their everyday lives.

Based on the analysis performed, the recapitulation of Read Aloud and Sustained Silent Reading as Strategies is good (50—100%). Although read aloud and sustained silent reading strategies have been implemented as well, there are some interesting findings, namely:

1. Competence and reading habits teachers need to be improved
2. The limitations of the book and place are the constraints of implementation, backed up by limited funds and poor students
3. The short time constraints make it difficult for teachers to improve their creativity, including discussion about the book.

4. Conclusions
The standard of literacy infrastructure—including the number of enrichment books—is the basis of access to books and SLM development. The condition of schools in Indonesia, especially in East Java is not the same across all schools. The 30 PS in this study in East Java is still below standard (than RMEC No 24 of 2007), especially in the number of enrichment books. Therefore the access to books is poor. This problem arises from the lack of funding for the procurement of books and this is not a
priority in school. Suggesting that "students must bring books from home" is not the right step because many of the students are poor. Furthermore, the implementation of the three phases of the SLM is still less than good and this is due to the fact that the SLM is still relatively new. In this implementation, the factor of access to books is a major constraint. Nevertheless, the implementation of the read-aloud and sustained silent reading as a strategy (including in 15 minutes reading and learning) is "good" although there are some problems related to teacher competence. In spite of the fact that the number of enrichment-books is still below standard, and there is poor access to books, the school community in 30 East Java PS enthusiastically implements the objectives of the School Literacy Movement. Even though there are some PS still in wait and see mode because there are no orders from the immediate supervisor (district education offices/city), the reverberations of SLM is increasingly clear, not only for schools but also for society more widely. Growing the culture of literacy in schools in Indonesia has started. SLM is a continuous and long-term program. The result cannot be quick; we must proceed slowly but surely. SLM has begun to appear and is expected to be a virus that spreads among students and teachers. Local government support should continue to be pursued so that the literacy movement extends to the schools, families, and societies. Hopefully, SLM can help brighten the world of education in Indonesia.
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