

Reading engagement of Indonesian secondary EFL teachers as literacy indicators perceived over reading resources and pleasure reading

Utami Widiati^{1*}, Tengku Intan Suzila Tengku Sharif², Lina Hanifiyah¹,
Meyga Agustia Nindya¹

¹Department of English, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jalan Semarang 5, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

²Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang, 26400 Bandar Pusat Jengka Pahang, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Nurturing students to become engaged readers for literacy development may need teachers who can play roles as models of keen readers. This descriptive quantitative study aims to profile the reading engagement of Indonesian EFL teachers as perceived from reading resources and pleasure reading. This study employed a survey questionnaire, requesting the respondents to reflect on their personal and school reading collection and their habits in reading for pleasure. Through a convenience sampling technique, voluntary responses were received from 183 secondary EFL teachers, mostly from East Java Province. The data were descriptively tabulated to result in frequencies and percentages. Research tool SPSS ver.24 was used to analyze the raw data for means, correlations, and compared means. Overall, this study found that reading engagement among secondary EFL teachers reflects moderately positive directions. The statistical analyses demonstrate that possessing personal reading resources may result in a slightly significant impact in assuring EFL teachers to read for pleasure yet better than having school reading resources. It has also been proven that both types of reading resources are weakly, yet significantly, correlated with reading for pleasure. This means that the more EFL teachers have access to reading resources, the more they will read and indirectly improve themselves. Future research may uncover the implications of having teachers engaged in reading on the design of more responsive reading instruction for the development of literacy culture at schools.

Keywords: Indonesian EFL teachers; literacy skill development; reading engagement; reading for pleasure; reading resources

First Received:

23 April 2022

Revised:

12 August 2022

Accepted:

8 December 2022

Final Proof Received:

27 January 2023

Published:

31 January 2023

How to cite (in APA style):

Widiati, U., Sharif, T. I. S. T., Hanifiyah, L., & Nindya, M. A. (2023). Reading engagement of Indonesian secondary EFL teachers as literacy indicators perceived over reading resources and pleasure reading. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(3), 828-839. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i3.45559>

INTRODUCTION

Many key qualities of progressive pedagogy reflect some acknowledgment that literacy skills are important fundamental tools for learning. In response to such global demands, the Indonesian government has enforced the implementation of the

School Literacy Initiative (SLI – *Gerakan Literasi Sekolah*) entrusted with the launch of the 2013 Curriculum. The main goal of the SLI, rooted in the principles of extensive reading, is to build up a school climate for literacy skill development so that elements of life-long learning as part of Indonesia's

* Corresponding Author
Email: utami.widiati.fs@um.ac.id

character education can be inculcated among students. In very practical ways, schools can interpret implementing SLI as a means of fostering character education through developing reading literacy among students. It implies that students ought to be helped to become lifelong readers through systematic, regular reading activities, including digital reading, which emerged due to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic (Pires & Morgado., 2021).

The guidelines for SLI implementation at schools suggest that the reading resources should be interesting and textbook-unrelated (MoEC, 2016). Textbook-unrelated resources might include novels, short stories, popular science books, magazines, comics, etc. Such resources should be accessible to all the school members, meaning that they can be displayed in the school library or reading corners in the classrooms. As the guidelines do not specify whether the resources should be in English or Indonesian, schools appear to have freedom in resource provision. This is in line with the spirit of extensive reading programs, where encouraging students to like and enjoy reading is more significant than requiring them to regard reading resources as objects for language studies (Day & Bamford, 2000). In other words, this present study holds the belief that the availability of reading resources matters more than the language as the medium. This belief is relevant as the Indonesian government also expects parents to actively take part in the success of SLI implementation (MoEC, 2016); parents' providing reading resources is essential than their worrying about whether the resources should be in English or Indonesian. Day and Bamford (2000) further specify that extensive reading is meant to develop good reading habits rather than to examine its impact on the ability to read in a second language; a variety of materials on a wide range of topics may "encourage reading for different reasons and in different ways" (p. 8).

Merga and Gardiner (2018), however, state that focusing only on developing reading habits might not be adequate to promote a love of reading in students; elements of engagement have to be sufficiently imparted as well to nurture mature, life-long readers. To become effective life-long readers, students need possess reading engagement (Merga & Gardiner, 2018). Without a reasonable emphasis on flourishing students' reading engagement, teachers may experience observing their students with even high reading proficiency not being engaged in reading at such times as holidays (Merga, 2016). Imaging a positive reflection has never been vital when reading is challenged by piles of visual or infographic representations of information, even in recent graphical novels. Fostering reading engagement should thus receive reasonable considerations.

Engagement is a very influential reference point for academic performance in general; there have even been such common claims as "... the 'engaged' student is the 'successful' student ..." (Aldridge, 2019, p. 39). Aldridge (2019) further highlights that engaged students are likely to go beyond just merely accomplishing the assigned tasks with the least possible effort. Furthermore, the review by Alrashidi et al. (2016) reveals that engagement has been empirically linked with students' investment in learning. In other words, engagement deals with students' quality of involvement, investment, commitment, and participation in school and school-related activities to enhance their learning performance.

The idea of engagement traditionally associated with the academic domain has been attached to other specific learning aspects, including reading. Reading engagement has been empirically proven as an essential element to boost learning success as it emulates certain behaviors, interactions, and strategies students may take in accomplishing their reading activities and tasks (Cantrell et al., 2017; Guthrie et al., 2012; Rahim & Hashim, 2015; Taboada et al., 2013; Yulia & Sulisty, 2019). It significantly contributes to students' academic engagement (Hassen, 2016; Yulia & Sulisty, 2019; Zheng & Kang, 2014) and thus becomes one of the essential components in developing students' academic engagement (Akarsu & Harptulu, 2015; Jafari, 2012; Neugebauer, 2016). Furthermore, much research has revealed that academic engagement significantly contributes to the attainment of students' success in their academic life (Kim et al., 2019; Yulia et al., 2020); academic engagement correlates with students' academic performance (Alrashidi et al., 2016), contributes to the attainment of students' learning outcomes (Cantrell et al., 2017; Lee, 2014; Rahim & Hashim, 2015), builds up students' motivation for learning and self-efficacy to cope with problems (Zhen et al., 2019), nurtures students' good personality traits such as perseverance, diligence, and resilience (Pietarinen et al., 2014), and prevents students from negative behaviors (Wu et al., 2010). Therefore, efforts need to be intentionally made to enforce the development of students' reading engagement, as good reading engagement may result in good academic engagement. A study recently conducted by Schmitt et al. (2022), for example, revealed that text-based social studies instructions could facilitate better attentiveness to text readability, even among low-proficient readers, to ensure reading engagement and achievement in reading comprehension. Additionally, a piece of research involving 68 students from a state university in East Java, Indonesia, found that knowledge of the type of genre and reading tendency to a limited extent will influence reading comprehension, which may prolong engagement in

reading (Andreani et al., 2021). The importance of reading engagement in developing reading literacy is congruent with how literacy is defined by Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2000 (Ho & Lao, 2018).

Reading engagement comprises the *skill* and the *will* to read (Merga, 2016), which implies the presence of reading-for-pleasure elements. When students have reading engagement, they can get long-term benefits in the form of intrinsic motivation to read with enjoyment (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Meanwhile, many research findings have suggested that in the school context, students' reading engagement appears to be partly determined by that of their teachers (Alrashidi et al., 2016; Hassen, 2016; Merga, 2016; Merga & Gardiner, 2018; Salikin et al., 2017); teachers function role models in the efforts of developing their students' reading engagement. In other words, EFL students' reading engagement may mirror the teachers' reading habits. Teachers who do not have reading engagement would find it hard to nurture their students' reading engagement. The findings of a longitudinal study by Vansteelandt et al. (2022) imply calls for urgent intervention in teacher training programs to ensure that teachers who read shall develop students who read too. Students should therefore be continuously exposed to various opportunities in which they can observe that their teachers are highly engaged in reading. SLI also highly recommends that teachers be reading role models for their students (MoEC, 2016).

Merga (2016) further emphasizes that the presence of reading engagement among teachers should not be based on assumptions; empirical evidence needs to be collected to prove whether teachers are indeed engaged in reading. Through interviews involving 65 Estonian educationists, Jakobson et al. (2022) found that reading comprehension knowledge and instruction among in-service teachers may affect the choice of reading processes used in classes and their effective reading comprehension instruction. They also identified that special education teachers use activities to support reading comprehension, whereas classroom teachers use activities to boost reading motivation. Based on the findings, the study proposed reading comprehension strategy interventions to be a topic added to teacher training programs. This lack of reading comprehension knowledge may suggest teachers' personal reading engagement. Another piece of research by Smith et al. (2022), analyzing 1,000 teachers in a mixed-method study, found that teachers chose fiction titles of, on average, 25 years old rather than newer ones for their classroom materials and provided instructional, affective, or contextual excuses as their justified reasons. This may reflect their own reading choices and engagement.

More studies on reading habits in the Indonesian context, however, have generally involved pre-service instead of in-service teachers. A survey about reading habits was carried out by Aisah et al. (2019) on 130 EFL pre-service teachers randomly selected. The results show poor reading habits based on indicators of reading for pleasure and frequency of visiting libraries. A study by Yulia et al. (2020), for instance, focused on exploring the reading engagement among EFL pre-service teachers. Using a semi-structured interview guide, Yulia et al. (2020) involved eight EFL student teachers in portraying their reading engagement. The findings revealed that many EFL student teachers showed a low liking for learning and demonstrated little enthusiasm, interest, enjoyment, and confidence in relation to academic reading. They should develop some awareness of the values of reading for their development as teachers. Similarly, Jaelani and Holisah (2021) found that the pre-service English teachers involved in their study did not have good reading habits.

Fewer studies on reading habits concern in-service teachers. The study by Wijayanti et al. (2022), for example, investigated the relationship between teachers' reading habits and teaching practices utilizing narrative inquiry. However, as the data were based on personal narrations, the construct of reading habit appears to vary among the three English teachers involved. A methodological issue has arisen in relation to the empirical data about in-service teachers' reading habits. Instead of describing their own reading habits, the teachers tended to explain how significant reading was for their teaching. Neno et al. (2022) showed that the reading habits of their six EFL teacher participants were of a low level, and their affective states were a moderate level. This finding implies a lack of reading delight among EFL teachers. Another study by Revina et al. (2020) involving primary school teachers, not necessarily EFL teachers, from three provinces in Indonesia reveals poor reading skills among the teacher participants. They had difficulty comprehending the training modules during the teacher professional development programs (Revina et al., 2020); the teachers attending all of the in-service days and having the time to learn the modules individually during the on-job training sessions still found the modules incomprehensible. As many of the samples about reading habits were obtained from pre-service teachers, further research with more established teachers should be considered. The urgency of profiling Indonesian EFL teachers' reading engagement has thus been inspired by at least two concerns: the scarcity of empirical data about in-service teachers' reading engagement and the importance of teachers becoming role models for the development of their students' reading engagement. These issues require the exploration of the reading engagement of

secondary EFL teachers in the Indonesian context. Therefore, this study aims to answer the following questions.

1. How is the quality of reading resources accessible to EFL teachers to support their reading engagement?
2. How is their reading engagement reflected by their pleasure reading activities?

These questions appear essential if secondary English teachers in Indonesia are to participate in the implementation of SLI programs at schools to develop a literacy climate. Such variables as reading resources and reading for pleasure have been included in this study because not much evidence about these concerns seems to be yet available in our context. Besides, recently Brandmo and Bråten (2021) have proved that reading motivation and engagement constructs are associated with the total time spent on the Internet among the 386 Norwegian pre-service teachers involved in their study, which implies empirical evidence about the availability of reading resources and elements of pleasure with the utilization of the Internet. In other words, teachers' reading engagement in this study is tested in reference to the variables of reading resources and reading for pleasure. To ignite their students' reading engagement, teachers are supposed to be engaged readers themselves first and eventually be good models for their students through their pedagogical practice.

METHOD

A quantitative research approach was adopted, employing a survey questionnaire to obtain the data. The findings are later reported using statistical descriptive means. According to Punch (2005) and Creswell and Guetterman (2019), questionnaires can be used to seek factual data such as background information and knowledge as well as behavioral information and measures, which in this study is to induce data about the reading engagement of secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia. Through a Google form (G-form), this study received voluntary participation from 183 secondary EFL teachers. Convenience sampling was thus utilized here because this study relied on the G-form as the main research instrument and on the willingness of the teachers accessible from various teachers' groups or forums in reference to Punch (2005). In other words, the involvement of these 183 teachers was based on their availability and willingness, ensuring that concerns about some ethical issues, as raised by Cohen et al. (2011), were addressed in the data-collection processes. With such a sampling technique, the individual participants did not act as representatives, yet they had the potential to provide

useful information for answering our research questions, following Cohen et al. (2011).

The questionnaire consists of two sections: Section I to elicit background information and Section II to profile Indonesian EFL teachers' reading engagement. The respondents' demographic information obtained from Section I concerning teaching experience showed these descriptive data: <5 years, 15.3% (28 teachers); 5 – 10 years, 16.4% (30 teachers); 10 – 15 years, 24.6 % (45 teachers) and 15 – 20 years, 43.7% (80 teachers). This information shows that most of the English teachers were experienced, and only 15.3% were novices, having less than five years of teaching experience. In terms of academic qualification, 70.5% (129 teachers) bear undergraduate qualification in English education, 23% (42 teachers) hold master's degrees in English education, and the balance holds other degrees such as English Literature and Letters. Such data suggest that all 183 teachers have relevant academic degrees and qualifications to teach English at secondary schools in the Indonesian context.

Section II on reading engagement is divided into two sub-sections: reading resources and reading for pleasure. Brandmo and Bråten (2021) inspired the inclusion of these two elements, proving that reading motivation and engagement constructs are related to the amount of time spent on the Internet, which is then assumed in this study as reflecting the availability of reading resources and elements of pleasure. The sub-section on reading resources comprises two 3-tier questionnaire items, one about the personal reading collection and the other about the institutional collection through schools. The respondents were required to reflect on the quality of the reading facilities they personally possessed or could access and that their schools provided, whether the collection was poor, satisfactory, or excellent. Considering the various teacher backgrounds, this study left it to the teachers' personal perceptions about the subjective meaning of being poor, satisfactory, or excellent. Besides, this study did not concern the language of the reading resources, be they in English or Indonesian. The other sub-section contains ten questionnaire items on the reading-for-pleasure variable as one indicator of reading engagement, formulated in the form of 4-tier statements of 1=not true, 2=partially true, 3= true, and 4= very true about their habits. These 10 items were adapted from the questionnaire on pleasure reading by Mikulecky and Jeffries (2004), comprising habitual elements and potential benefits of pleasure reading. More specifically, referring to the construct of reading engagement comprising the *skill* as well as the *will* to read (Merga, 2016), Items 1 to 5 concern reading *will*, and Items 6 to 10 cover reading *skill*. The items required the respondents to reflect on the conditions of their parents' reading habits, their friends'

(colleagues') reading habit, their reading confidence, their reading time, and their beliefs about the possible benefits of pleasure reading in the areas of vocabulary, reading speed, comprehension, writing, and knowledge.

Before being distributed, the questionnaire was validated by two experts in ELT who were selected using these criteria: having experiences in teaching extensive reading courses and having been involved in training teachers in the implementation of extensive reading programs at schools. This moderation was done to ensure that constructs of reading engagement are present in the questionnaire items, covering statements about reading *will* and reading *skills*. Based on the validators' feedback, the final version of the questionnaire covers 10 items, as seen in Table 2, where the research findings are presented.

Responses from the 183 EFL teachers were descriptively tabulated to result in frequencies and percentages. Research tool SPSS ver.24 was able to be used to analyze the raw data further for means, correlations, and compare means, among others, to allow the outlining of Indonesian EFL teachers' reading engagement to unfold.

Table 1

Frequencies and percentages indicating the quality of teachers' reading resources

	Personal Reading Resources		School Reading Resources		
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Valid	poor	40	21.9	62	33.9
	satisfactory	131	71.6	106	57.9
	excellent	12	6.6	15	8.2
	Total	183	100.0	183	100.0

The data in Table 1 also suggest that quite many teachers had poor reading resources, with more teachers acknowledging poor school reading resources (33.9%) than those possessing poor personal reading resources (21.9%). Overall, the data on personal reading resources and school reading resources indicate similar trends of responses in that only a few teachers had excellent collections, the majority had satisfactory collections, and many admitted poor collections of reading resources. Regarding school collection in particular, our findings are consistent with what has been empirically proven by Wulyani et al. (2022), reporting that one of the many challenges Indonesian EFL teachers faced in implementing extensive reading activities to support the success of SLI programs at schools was the insufficiency of reading materials. The EFL teachers in their study suggested further that SLI programs would not run effectively without full support from various parties, especially from schools, in the form of the provision of reading resources (Wulyani et al., 2022). Schools need to provide not only students but also teachers with an array of reading materials, with choices to

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As explained previously, Section II of the questionnaire was meant to obtain data about the reading engagement of Indonesian EFL teachers. Their responses to the closed-ended questionnaire items are presented in the following sections regarding reading resources and reading for pleasure.

Reading Engagement as Reflected in the Quality of Reading Resources Accessible to Secondary EFL Teachers

The quality of reading resources seems to be a vital aspect in determining teachers' reading engagement; teachers may require possessing excellent and adequate personal reading resources to be engaged in reading. Our data in the form of frequencies and percentages of teachers' reading resources obtained from the questionnaire responses as presented in Table 1, however, reveal that out of the 183 EFL teachers, only 12 (6.6%) admitted having excellent personal resources to encourage reading engagement and only 15 (8.2%) acknowledged that they had excellent school reading resources.

access different reading media (soft or hard copy materials), in their attempts to foster school literacy culture. As explained in the method section, the quality of being poor, satisfactory, or excellent in this study was decided by the teachers themselves because of the variety of teacher backgrounds in terms of personal as well as institutional facilities in the Indonesian context. Further research might provide more fixed ranges of reading collections as quality indicators.

Our data about EFL teachers' personal reading collection shows a similar direction, confirming our speculative prediction that teachers' realization of limited reading resources at schools would not then ignite self-initiated actions to update their personal resources. based on the data, these teachers are mostly experienced with a long period of teaching experience. In the Indonesian context, senior teachers tend to be professionally certified and thus generally much better paid, which suggests individual affordances to develop professionally. With the current condition of the personal reading collection, it is very likely that these teachers have a relatively restricted repertoire of literature and thus

narrow knowledge about choosing texts to use in class on top of the required textbooks or suggesting supplementary reading materials for their students. Meanwhile, as reviewed by Ho and Lao (2018), much research proves that the successful development of reading engagement, to some extent, is dependent upon significant investment in literacy-related resources.

The literacy-rich environment seems to be a powerful factor leading to the growth of reading engagement. Unfortunately, with the closed-ended types of questionnaire items, our data did not provide sufficient information about whether the teachers in our study had the same perceived meanings about reading resources. Language educators perceive reading resources as any accessible texts or resources with which they can interact in the target language, English, be they printed like books or electronic/online. While acknowledging that book reading is beneficial, this study expected that the EFL teachers had some awareness of the availability of a wide variety of reading materials other than books that could increase their comprehension skills as well as empower them as readers. There was a doubt whether the teachers in this study had such perceived understandings when asked to rate the quality of their personal and school reading resources. The current social world obviously has full of accessible texts; therefore, such concepts as online reading and online reading habits have been emerging. The findings by PISA have even shown the contribution of extensive online reading engagement to the growth of more proficient readers (OECD, 2010). Guo et al. (2021) studied four Chinese EFL teachers' engagement with technology-enhanced text adaptations, showing distinct traits of behavioral, cognitive, and affective teacher engagement. Thus, personal reading resources can be boosted by migrating to this approach. Future research might further explore the issue of knowledge of various reading resources among Indonesian secondary EFL teachers. Referring to the findings of our study, it seems important for schools and teachers to invest in a better reading collection, considering that material resources have been proven as one of the strong predictors of promoting reading engagement.

However, if external factors such as reading resources are not available for some reason, inculcating intrinsic motivation to read would possibly be significant as well. There exists an array of theories and models of motivation for reading and reading engagement (Unrau & Quirk, 2014). Unrau and Quirk (2014) proposed a definition of reading motivation as "internal processes that instigate and sustain reading activity ... it is a pre-requisite to engaged reading" (p. 272). Like the concept of intrinsic motivation by Ryan and Deci (2000),

reasons for readers to engage in reading in fact, originate from personal interests and enjoyment in the reading activity itself rather than other external factors, including reading facilities. When teachers are found to have the intrinsic motivation to read, they might be expected to augment their students' reading motivation. Gambrell (2011), in this case, indicates that when teachers are aware of their students' motivation to read, they can design more responsive instruction in the form of a better variety of classroom activities and texts to contribute to cumulative benefits for students' reading engagement. Similarly, Neugebauer (2016) emphasizes that when teachers are able to assess students' affective reading motivation in class accurately, they would be able to infer their students' experiences of reading. However, as has been suggested by much research, the reading engagement of students is partly influenced by that of their teachers (Alrashidi et al., 2016; Hassen, 2016; Merga, 2016; Merga & Gardiner, 2018; Salikin et al., 2017). In other words, developing students' behavioral engagement in reading can be facilitated only when teachers are captured in situated events like daily engaged reading behaviors and motivations. When high intrinsic motivation does exist among EFL teachers, they themselves tend to be highly engaged and eventually might develop the ability to inculcate motivation among students; success (i.e., engaged teachers) breeds success (i.e., engaged students). However, our study did not tap into this intrinsic motivation variable, which may become inspiring concerns for future researchers to seek to investigate among secondary EFL teachers.

Reading Engagement as Reflected in Pleasure Reading Activities Among EFL Teachers

Table 2 presents the data about pleasure reading among secondary EFL teachers. The 10 questionnaire items required the 183 teachers to reflect on themselves by selecting one of the 4-tier statements denoting perceived description about their habits in reading for pleasure from 1, which means *not true*, to 4, which means *very true* about themselves. Table 2 shows that on average, the data about the mean scores of the reading *will* (Items 1 to 5) among the 183 EFL teachers are not as high as those of the reading *skill* (Items 6 to 10). Regarding the item "I enjoy reading for pleasure" in particular, the teachers rated themselves 3.45. Thus, prototypical teachers would report *true* (43.7%) and *very true* (51.1%) on recreational reading. However, there are still a few teachers who do not enjoy reading for pleasure, as revealed in the two occurrences of *not-true* responses and seven *partially-true* ones, making a total of 5.1% for Item 1.

Table 2
Habits in reading for pleasure (1 = not true; 4 = very true)

Item	Statements	1	2	3	4	Mean
1	I enjoy reading for pleasure.	2 (1.1%)	7 (4%)	80 (43.7%)	94 (51.1%)	3.45
2	My parents enjoy reading for pleasure.	32 (17.2%)	44 (24.1%)	70 (38.5%)	37 (20.1%)	2.61
3	Most of my friends (colleagues) read for pleasure.	6 (3.4%)	61 (33.3%)	85 (46.6%)	31 (16.7%)	2.77
4	I am a confident reader.	3 (1.7%)	27 (14.9%)	95 (51.7%)	58 (31.6%)	3.14
5	I have no time to read for pleasure.	74 (40.2%)	66 (36.2%)	36 (19.5%)	7 (4%)	1.87
6	I believe that reading for pleasure improves my vocabulary.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	41 (22.4%)	142 (77.6%)	3.78
7	I believe that reading for pleasure improves my reading speed.	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	45 (24.7%)	136 (74.1%)	3.73
8	I believe that reading for pleasure improves my comprehension.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	41 (22.4%)	142 (77.6%)	3.78
9	I believe that reading for pleasure improves my writing.	0 (0%)	10 (5.2%)	59 (32.2%)	114 (62.6%)	3.57
10	I believe that reading for pleasure gives me more knowledge.	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)	33 (17.8%)	149 (81.6%)	3.81

Though small in number, these pieces of evidence have led this study to speculate that for these teachers, reading activities might be perceived as reading the materials for teaching purposes only, intended to develop reading *skills* of their students without considering the need to inculcate reading *will* among themselves. As projected by Merga (2016), such teachers might showcase successful messengers in communicating that reading was vital but fail to convince their students that reading is indeed enjoyable.

One potential explanation regarding the absence of pleasure reading among these few teachers can be related to the data about the family background (Item 2) and workplace atmosphere (Item 3), having low means of 2.61 and 2.77, respectively. Our data about EFL teachers' family background show that 17.2% admitted having parents not enjoying pleasure reading and 24.1% somewhat enjoying, together composing a total of 41.3%, which is quite high in the percentage of occurrences. In regard to this, it might be relevant to refer to the survey back then by Clark (2011), reporting that Asian students were twice as likely to say they did not have books at home compared to Western students. Meanwhile, much literature has proven that parents can play a key role in fostering children's love of reading, implying how background experiences in the family shape later literacy skills (Mudzielwana, 2014). Ho and Lao (2018) also highlighted that parents highly engaged in reading are likely to be good role models for shaping reading engagement in the family. Reading for recreational purposes in the family has even been reported as more significant for learners' future success than their family's socio-economic status (OECD, 2002).

Similar data trends were seemingly found in the workplace, where 3.4% and 33.3% of the teachers had many colleagues who did not enjoy pleasure reading at all and enjoyed it a bit, respectively. These data might manifest the quality

of literacy programs at schools, mirroring how schools so far have designed and enacted SLI programs through formal policies to position literacy development since the launch of the programs by the government in 2015. According to Merga and Gardiner (2018), in order to foster reading engagement at school, thus building up literacy culture, there needs to be supportive whole-school literacy priority available. When checked further in relation to the teachers' teaching experiences, our raw data indicate that the increased number of teaching experiences does not go in line with the increased quality of personal reading resources. All this information seems to contribute to the findings that out of the 183 EFL teachers, there are still 30 teachers (16.6%) rating themselves as quite not confident readers (Item 4) with an overall mean score of 3.14. Therefore, it is quite reasonable that 43 EFL teachers (23.5%) mentioned not having time to read for pleasure, with 36 (19.5%) indicating *true* and 7 (4%) *very true* reflections when responding to Item 5. This item results in a different mean direction because it was formulated in a negative-sentence format.

Items 6 to 10 require the subject teachers to reflect on the possible benefits that reading-for-pleasure activities can offer them, thus contributing to elements of reading *skills*. Table 2 resembles similar directions of the teachers' responses to the five questionnaire items, all confirming the teachers' beliefs that pleasure reading benefits them, as indicated in the means of all the items nearly close to point 4. To be more specific in terms of the order of the benefits, the findings show these tendencies: Pleasure reading gives them more knowledge (\bar{x} =3.81), improves vocabulary (\bar{x} =3.78), improves comprehension (\bar{x} =3.78), improves reading speed (\bar{x} =3.73), and improves writing (\bar{x} =3.57). All EFL teachers are under study, but one truly believes that pleasure reading gives them more knowledge. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that responses to the items about vocabulary and comprehension

yield exactly the same frequency numbers and percentages, implying a high degree of agreement among the subject teachers that pleasure reading does improve vocabulary and comprehension. This piece of evidence is in line with the previous research confirming that more reading leads to improved vocabulary and continuing reading skill improvement (Ho & Lao, 2018; OECD, 2002).

Another interesting finding to highlight is that there were ten teachers' responses reflecting uncertainty about whether pleasure reading improves writing skills, quite many occurrences of point-2 responses compared to the other four questionnaire items. This finding might be attributed

to much empirical evidence that writing requires a wide range of knowledge (e.g., Rofiqoh et al., 2022); it covers knowledge of the writing process, system, content, and genre, which possibly has made some subject teachers in this study experience lack of self-belief in their writing competence.

While scrutinizing the raw data further to unfold the significance of reading resources to teachers' reading for pleasure, those who suggested having excellent personal (\bar{x} =3.92, SD.289) and school (\bar{x} =3.80, SD .414) reading resources tend to be the ones who have higher means for reading for pleasure (See Table 3).

Table 3
Means for reading for pleasure vs reading resources

Perceptions	Personal Resources			School Resources		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Poor	3.12	40	.723	3.44	62	.643
Satisfactory	3.48	131	.573	3.38	106	.624
Excellent	3.92	12	.289	3.80	15	.414
Total	3.43	183	.624	3.43	183	

All in all, however, Table 4 indicates that personal reading resources and pleasure reading are weakly correlated (ρ =.311) although the correlation is still higher than that between school reading resources and pleasure reading (ρ =.078). Based on the statistical data presented in Table 4, having personal reading resources may pose a slightly significant impact in ensuring EFL teachers to read for pleasure yet better than possessing school reading resources. Both reading resources have positive correlations to reading for pleasure, which implies that the more EFL teachers have access to reading resources, the more likely they will read and indirectly improve themselves in such various

aspects as knowledge, vocabulary, comprehension, reading speed, and writing, respectively sequenced based on their means. As has also been previously proven by Clark and Rumbold (2006), some benefits of pleasure reading include text comprehension and grammar, positive reading attitudes, pleasure in reading in later life, and increased general knowledge. This is further confirmed, as seen in Table 5, that the null hypothesis can be rejected as the comparison between means shows that EFL teachers' personal reading resources yield a significant impact p-value <.001 with 3 degrees of freedom, where the ratio F is at 7, to EFL teachers' habits in reading for pleasure.

Table 4
Correlations between reading resources and reading for pleasure

Variable	Variable2	Statistic			
		Correlation	Count	Lower C.I.	Upper C.I.
Personal Resources	Read For Pleasure	.311	183	.174	.436
School Resources	Read For Pleasure	.078	183	-.068	.221

C.I. Level: 95.0

Table 5
Compared Means of reading for pleasure and reading resources

ANOVA						
Reading for Pleasure		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
School Resources	Between Groups	.452	3	.151	.418	.740
	Within Groups	64.477	179	.360		
	Total	64.929	182			
Personal Resources	Between Groups	5.048	3	1.683	7.060	<.001
	Within Groups	42.667	179	.238		
	Total	47.716	182			

All in all, our study has demonstrated the palpable urgency of profiling the reading engagement of Indonesian EFL teachers in relation to the implementation of SLI programs. Research in this area is deemed necessary since, as Merga (2016) suggests, it may be erroneous to assume that (EFL) teachers are enthusiastic readers just because they regularly teach reading to their students. As empirical data about in-service teachers' reading engagement were still scarce, the findings of our study can be used to predict EFL teachers' readiness in supporting the success of SLI programs at their schools considering that teachers should be the role model for the development of their students' literacy skills. Many EFL teachers in our study stated that they had poor reading resources and only a few had excellent collections (See Table 1), and the mean score of pleasure reading is 3.45 (See Table 2). The presence of a relationship between the variables of reading resources and pleasure reading is particularly notable in this study, even though the correlation is weak yet significant. From these conflicting data, there must be a confidence in making inferences about the extent of EFL teachers' reading engagement. On the one hand, it is *true* and *very true*, as reflected in the respective occurrences of 43.7% and 51.1%, that the EFL teachers enjoyed reading for pleasure, which is also supported by the data that 40.2% had much time and 36.2% had time for pleasure reading. On the other hand, the data about their family background as well as their workplace environment did not seem conducive to supporting the growth of their reading enjoyment. To make this piece of evidence more baffling, 21.9% of teachers admitted having poor personal reading resources and 33.9% poor school reading resources. Additionally, there are still some teachers who rated themselves as quite not confident readers, with an overall mean score of 3.14. The findings indicate that whilst these teachers may be readers who read personally for pleasure, their working knowledge of reading resources to be imparted to students might be somewhat narrow and limited considering the availability of reading collection. How do these teachers realize their reading-for-pleasure activities then when possessing poor reading collection? How do they perceive reading resources in this current social world? What patterns of personal and professional reading can in fact, be examined among EFL teachers? How can we be more certain about whether these EFL teachers really enjoy pleasure reading? These are just some of the many questions that can be addressed in future research. Additionally, the research findings might have been caused by our instruments which did not specify the number of reading resources to be considered poor, satisfactory, or excellent as well as the language as the medium, English, Indonesian, or both. Future researchers may explore further the

issue of this subjectivity about the quality of reading resources and the language as the medium.

CONCLUSIONS

This study aims to profile EFL teachers' reading engagement as perceived from reading resources and pleasure reading. Our findings suggest that elements of reading engagement related to reading *skill* score much higher than those related to reading *will*. In addition, this study has identified that reading resources become additional significant contributors in determining teachers' reading engagement. Our data indicate similar directions between teachers' personal reading resources and school reading resources in that only a few teachers own excellent collections, the majority have a satisfactory collection, and many admit to having a poor collection of reading resources. The results of our statistical analyses lead the study to infer that possessing personal reading resources may result in a slightly significant impact in assuring EFL teachers to read for pleasure yet better than having school reading resources. This implies that EFL teachers may need to have excellent and adequate personal reading resources to be engaged in reading. With the advancement of technology, it is essential to migrate personal reading resources to technology-enhanced text adaptations.

Having positive reading engagement may assist EFL teachers in becoming better language teachers who can transmit similar habits to their students. Our findings reveal that though small in number, there are still EFL teachers acknowledging not having reading enjoyment. These teachers might showcase successful messengers in telling their students that reading is indeed vital but cannot convince them that reading is pleasurable. The data about the absence of pleasure reading might be attributed to the data about the reading habit of the family as well as that of colleagues. Our study has proven that both types of reading resources are weakly, yet significantly, correlated with reading for pleasure. This means that the more EFL teachers have access to reading resources, the more they will read and indirectly improve themselves.

Overall, our findings regarding reading engagement among secondary EFL teachers reflect moderately positive directions. However, the present focus on teachers' reading engagement as perceived from reading resources and recreational reading was obtained from a survey questionnaire only. Such a single data source may fail to manifest more visible evidence about teachers as avid recreational readers. As it is vital to show students that their teachers are indeed engaged readers, systematic attempts should be made to unravel patterns of teachers' reading engagement, both personally and professionally, through more sensitive assessment criteria. Students, as well as the school community, should be able to

easily observe that teachers are regularly captured performing daily experiences with reading, teachers value reading resources, and teachers are intrinsically motivated to read.

Data about reading engagement among teachers may outwardly manifest the position of literacy programs at schools at large. When teachers can show their identity as lifelong readers, it would be more feasible to transfer the Indonesian programs of SLI from just merely formal designs to become genuine literacy promotion. Further research can verify the influence of such key social agents as teachers in shaping the success of school literacy development. Equally important is uncovering the implications of having teachers engaged in reading on the design of more responsive reading instruction for the development of literacy culture at schools.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PNBP Universitas Negeri Malang (Indonesia) 5.3.1575/UN32.14/LT/2021 and University Teknologi MARA (Malaysia) 600-TNCPI/PBT 5/3 (169/2021) recorded grants are acknowledged for the financial support and permission for the collaborative research work.

REFERENCES

- Aisah, S., El-Sulukiyah, A. A. & Aisyah, R. N. (2019). Survey on the reading habit of Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers. *Journal of English Language Education*, 2(2), 148-171. <https://doi.org/10.20414/edulangue.v2i2.1212>
- Akarsu, O., & Harptulu, L. (2015). Perceptions of EFL students toward academic reading. *The Reading Matrix*, 14(1), 61-75. <http://www.readingmatrix.com/journal.html>
- Aldridge, D. (2019). Reading, engagement and higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(1), 38-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1534804>
- Alrashidi, O., Phan, H. P., & Ngu, B. H. (2016). Academic engagement: An overview of its definitions, dimensions, and major conceptualisations. *International Education Studies*, 9(12), 41-52, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n12p41>
- Andreani, S., Muniroh, S., Suharyadi, S., Astuti, U. P., & Yulizar, Y. (2021). The contribution of genre awareness and reading habits towards students' reading comprehension. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 463-476. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i2.35260>
- Brandmo, C., & Bråten, I. (2021). Measuring internet-specific reading motivation and engagement in an academic domain. *Nordic Journal of Literacy Research*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.23865/njlr.v7.2215>
- Cantrell, S. C., Pennington, J., Rintamaa, M., Osborne, M., Parker, C., & Rudd, M. (2017). Supplemental literacy instruction in high school: What students say matters for reading engagement. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 33(1), 54-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2015.1081838>
- Clark, C. (2011). *Setting the baseline: The national literacy trust's first annual survey into reading - 2010*. The National Literacy Trust.
- Clark, C. & Rumbold, K. (2006). *Reading for pleasure a research overview*. The National Literacy Trust.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed). Pearson Education.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (2000). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gambrell, L. B. (2011). Seven rules of engagement: What's most important to know about motivation to read. *Reading Teacher*, 65(3), 172-178. <https://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01024>
- Guo, K., Chen, J., Lei, J., & Jin, T. (2021). Teacher engagement with technology-enhanced text adaptation for reading assessment: A case study. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, 11(4), 100-112. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.2021100107>
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (3rd ed., pp. 403-422). Longman.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S.L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 601-634). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_29
- Hassen, R. (2016). Reading habits of secondary school teachers: A study of selected secondary schools in Addis Ababa and Dessie. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(22), 59-67. <http://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP>
- Ho, E. S. C. & Lao, K. (2018). Reading engagement and reading literacy performance: Effective policy and practices at home and in school. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 41(4), 657-679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12246>
- Jaelani, A., & Holisah, F. (2021). A survey of pre-service English teachers' reading habits of English text. *Journal of English Language*

- Learning (JELL)*, 5(2), 7-18.
<http://doi.org/10.31949/jell.v5i2.3200>
- Jafari, S. M. (2012). EAP students' reading motivation of English academic expository texts: A mixed methods design. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(4), 372-392.
<https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2459>
- Jakobson, K., Soodla, P., & Aro, M. (2022). General and special education teachers' knowledge about reading comprehension processes and instructional practices. *Reading and Writing*, 35, 2229–2256.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10280-8>
- Kim, H. J., Hong, A. J., & Song, H. D. (2019). The roles of academic engagement and digital readiness in students' achievements in university e-learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(21), 2-18.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0152-3>
- Lee, J. (2014). The relationship between student engagement and academic performance: Is it a myth or reality? *The Journal of Educational Research*, 107(3), 177-185.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2013.807491>
- Merga, M. K. (2016). "I don't know if she likes reading": Are teachers perceived to be keen readers, and how is this determined? *English in Education*, 50(3), 255-269.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/17548845.2016.11912584>
- Merga, M. K., & Gardiner, V. (2018). The role of whole-school literacy policies supporting reading engagement in Australian schools. *English in Australia*, 53(3), 37-50.
<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/44208>
- Mikulecky, B. S., & Jeffries, L. (2004). *More reading power: Reading for pleasure, comprehension skills, thinking skills, reading faster* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- MoEC, Ministry of Education and Culture. (2016). *Panduan gerakan literasi sekolah di sekolah menengah atas* [Guidelines for school literacy initiative implementation at secondary schools]. Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Mudzielwana, N. P. (2014). The role of parents in developing reading skills of their children in the foundation phase. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 41(2), 253-264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2014.11893361>
- Neno, H., Emanuel, U., & Yulita, D. (2022). Teachers' reading habits and their effect on the students' literacy. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(3), 811-820.
<https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i3.5705>
- Neugebauer, S. (2016). Stable or situated understandings of adolescent reading engagement across readers and raters. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(4), 391-404.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.968914>
- OECD. (2002). *Reading for change performance and engagement across countries - Results from PISA 2000*.
- OECD. (2010). *PISA 2009 results: Executive summary*. OECD.
- Pietarinen, J., Soini, T., & Pyhältö, K. (2014). Students' emotional and cognitive engagement as the determinants of well-being and achievement in school. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 67, 40-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2014.05.001>
- Pires, N. C., & Morgado, M. M. (2021). "The project eMysterie—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 ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Rahim, P. H. M. A., & Hashim, F. (2015). Facilitating reading engagement by foregrounding students' voices through epistolary writing: A case study. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 15(1), 57-75.
<https://doi.org/10.17576/GEMA-2015-1501-04>
- Revina, S., Pramana, R. P., Fillaili, R. & Suryadarma, D. (2020). Systemic constraints facing teacher professional development in a middle-income country: Indonesia's experience over four decades. *RISE Working Paper Series*. 20/054.
https://doi.org/10.35489/BSGRISEWP_2020/054
- Rofiqoh, R., Basthomi, Y., Widiati, U., Puspitasari, Y., Marhaban, S., & Sulistyono, T. (2022). Aspects of writing knowledge and EFL students' writing quality. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 14-29.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.20433>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Research*, 19, 430–446.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Salikin, H., Bin-Tahir, S.Z., Kusumaningputri, R., & Yuliandari, D.P. (2017). The Indonesian EFL learners' motivation in reading. *English Language Teaching*, 10(5), 81-90.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n5p81>
- Schmitt, H. A., Witmer, S. E., & Rowe, S. S. (2022). Text readability, comprehension instruction, and student engagement: Examining associated relationships during text-based social studies instruction. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 61(1), 62-83.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2021.2008561>

- Smith, K. C., Young, C. A., & Core Yatzeck, J. (2022). What are teachers reading and why?: An analysis of elementary read aloud titles and the rationales underlying teachers' selections. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 1-19*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2021.2008558>
- Taboada, A., Townsend, D., & Boynton, M. (2013). Mediating effects of reading engagement on the reading comprehension of early adolescent English language learners. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 29(4)*, 309-332.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2013.741959>
- Unrau, N. J., & Quirk, M. (2014). Reading motivation and reading engagement: Clarifying commingled conceptions. *Reading Psychology, 35(3)*, 260-284.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2012.68442>
- Vansteelandt, I., Mol, S. E., & Van Keer, H. (2022). Pre-service teachers' reader profiles: stability and change throughout teacher education. *Journal of Research in Reading, 45(1)*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12378>
- Wijayanti, E., Mujiyanto, Y., & Pratama, H. (2022). The influence of the teachers' reading habit on their teaching practice: A narrative inquiry. *English Education Journal EEJ, 12(2)*, 205-214.
<http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>
- Wu, J., Hughes, J. N., & Kwok, O. (2010). Teacher-student relationship quality type in elementary grades: Effects on trajectories for achievement and engagement. *Journal of School Psychology, 48*, 337-355.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2010.06.004>
- Wulyani, A. N., Widiati, U., & Khoiri, N. E. (2022). Challenges in implementing extensive reading (ER) programs: Voices from English teachers at Indonesian secondary schools. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12(1)*, 74-83.
<https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.08>
- Yulia, M. F., & Sulisty, G. H. (2019). Academic reading engagement among EFL teacher candidates: A pilot study. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles, 26(6)*, 36-59.
<https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/tag/volume-26-issue-6-1-2019/index.htm>
- Yulia, M. F., Sulisty, G. H., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Affective engagement in academic reading: What EFL Student Teachers Reveal. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 9(3)*, 791-798.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20635>
- Zheng, J. & Kang, N. (2014). An investigation on English reading strategy use in major-related materials among native and foreign language learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(2)*, 283-290.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.283-290>
- Zhen, R., Liu, R., Ding, Y., Jiang, R., Jiang, S., & Hong, W. (2019). Gratitude and academic engagement among primary students: Examining a multiple mediating model. *Current Psychology, 40*, 2543-2551.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00202-3>