# AN INVESTIGATION INTO STUDENTS' PISA READING LITERACY PERFORMANCE AND READING ENGAGEMENT

**Gita Realita Chintia**
**Machdalena Vianty**
**Ida Rosmalina**
*English Education Study Program*
*Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University*
*gitarealitachintia2@gmail.com*

**Abstract:** The objective of this study was to find out reading literacy performance and reading engagement of tenth graders of three public schools in two districts in Palembang based on school location and socioeconomic status (SES). The sample of this study consisted of 254 tenth grade students selected purposively from three public senior high schools in Kemuning and Plaju districts. PISA 2009 Reading Literacy test in English and two questionnaires (reading engagement and SES questionnaires) were used to collect the data, which were analyzed statistically. The finding of this study showed that the students' PISA reading literacy score in English was 23.39 and it was below the Indonesian Standard of National Education (KKM). It was also at level 3 based on PISA level. In terms of school location, students' PISA reading literacy score showed significant difference, while in relation to father occupational status which was one of the SES aspects showed that the PISA reading literacy score of the students with *white-collar high skilled* father and *blue-collar low skilled* father were different significantly. The results of reading engagement showed that 244 students (96%) had positive attitude toward reading and they stated that they spent 30 minutes or less a day for reading enjoyment as well as have enough time to read online but they rarely spent time reading various types of books in English. In this study, based on school location reading diversity which was one of the aspects of reading engagement showed significant difference.

**Keywords:** *effectiveness, genre based approach, teaching English*

Reading is a primarily intellectual activity that is performed by humans. Devarajan (1979) defines Reading as an art of interpreting printed and written words. Reading is as one of the means to gain access to all the knowledge in this world (The US Department of Education, 2005). In its practice reading is influenced by many factors such as gender, age, socioeconomic, reading habits, strategy used, parent education level, and language at home. Reading plays a critical role in development of any

academic domain; therefore, competence in reading is the key to competence in other human endeavors (e.g., Alexander, 2002, 2005). At all levels of education, reading becomes the priority that must be mastered by students. By reading the students will acquire a variety of information. The more they read, the more a robust knowledge of the world is obtained. Thus, reading is a window to the world, anyone who read the most will expand the view of the world infinitely.

In addition to increasing academic success, reading also shapes students' lives success. According to Cunningham and Zibulsky (2013), reading is a very rich, complex and cognitive act that offers an immense opportunity to exercise human intelligence in many ways they lose if they don't read. Reading provides a cognitive workout that can transcend not only students' levels of education, but also their inherent abstract problem-solving abilities. Satija (2002) as cited by Lone (2011) appended that regular and systematic reading sharpens the intellect, emotions, elevates tastes and provides perspectives for one's living; thereby prepares a person for an effective participation in the social, religious, cultural and political life. Reading builds a cognitive processing infrastructure through robust vocabularies, deep knowledge of the world that then massively influences every aspect of thinking. In the other words, the better the literacy someone has, the bigger possibility to have a good life.

On the other sides, if a person has poor literacy, or even illiterate, it can limit a person's ability to engage in activities that require critical thinking. The World Literacy Foundation (Cree, Kay, & Steward, 2012) identifies several costs of illiteracy either in economic or social terms which are; lost earnings and limited employability, lost business productivity, lost wealth creation opportunities for individuals and business, lower technology skills capacity in future, health, crime, welfare, education and the role of family. This identification is also supported by the findings of study conducted by some researchers. For example, Hartley and Horney (2006) found that the cost to business in lost productivity and profitability because of illiterate includes the difficulty and cost of findings adequately skilled employees, customers lost due to poor communication, and internal problems and issues arising from miscommunication. Next, United States Department of Education in 2003 reported that lack of reading literacy skills limits options for adults with and without disabilities: 43% live in poverty, 50% have higher hospitalization rates due to an inability to understand health information, and one in five is unable to access or use the Internet (Stanford, 2015).

As previously explained, reading benefits people in many ways such as personal development, social life, and academic success. In the other words, reading helps people gain their success because reading as the basic competence of literacy is a means for an individual to interact with their social environment (McKenna & Robinson, 1993). In Indonesia, reading is the important elements of students' character building at school. It is outlined by the Indonesian Government

Regulation No. 23, year 2015 (as cited in Department of Education and Culture, 2016). Similarly, the law No. 20, year 2003 on Indonesia National Education System and Government Regulation No. 19, year 2005 on National Education Standard, also define that education should be conducted by developing the culture of reading, writing and numeracy for all members of community. In the other words, reading as basic competence of literacy becomes a serious attention in Indonesia.

Unfortunately, although reading literacy is a burning issue in Indonesia, data from international measures confirmed that the students' reading ability even in Indonesian language is still far being expected. The result from Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) studies conducted in 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, and 2015, Indonesia has always been reported as one of the countries that below the average score of all participating countries in OECD study. Based on Education GPS, OECD PISA 2015 result, Indonesian high school students' reading score was below the average of OECD average which was 397 points, compared to an average of 493 points in OECD countries. The results of study conducted by the World Bank and the IEA in 2008 (Hirawan, 2012) showed that in the East of Asia, Indonesian people have the lowest ability in reading. Indonesia only got 51.7 points below the other Southeast Asian countries such as the Phillipines (52.6 points), Thailand (65.1 points), and Singapore (74.0 points). It can be said that, even in national language Indonesia 15-year-olds students still encounter difficulty in reading. These results are also confirmed by the study from Diem, Purnomo, Ihsan, Sofendi, and Vianty (2015) who did a study about students' functional reading achievements in Bahasa Indonesia, in Palembang city and found out that from 184 of total sample, no students (0%) got excellent score, only 6.5% (N=12) had good achievement, and 8.40% (N=20) got very poor score.

In national scope, results of English proficiency pointed out that even English proficiency of Indonesian provinces was in moderate, but South Sumatera still had low mean score (49.16) (Education First, 2014). This makes sense due to the fact that the number of people who are illiterate is still very big, namely 154.032 people or 3,16% of the population (Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi Sumatra Selatan, 2008).Within South Sumatera Province itself, there is a worrying result related to literacy, in this case including reading. According to Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi Sumatera Selatan (2010), the average English score at the National Examination in academic year 2009/2010 for senior high schools in South Sumatera showed that the students from science program had 7.41 while those from social program only had 7.0. Similarly, the English score of students from science and social programs in Palembang achieved the mean score of 7.23 and 7.04 for their English. If these scores are converted into four categories based on *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* Number 23 Year 2015 (excellent—86-100; good—71-85; average—56-70; poor—0-55), it can be said that the students obtained *good* score of their English subject but it was still below the Indonesian standard of National Education

(KKM), which is 75. The same problem was also found by Diem (2012) who did research on the ability in reading of 102 students in 36 senior high schools which are accredited A, B, and C in Palembang. She found that reading achievement of students in Palembang of school accredited A, B, and C are very poor. The students' achievement in Palembang of school accredited A was 61.16, school accredited B was 39.53 and school accredited C was 42.84.

Moreover, this fact above is also supported by another finding from Rahmi and Diem (2014) who conducted a study of correlation between junior high school students' perception of classroom environment and their English achievement in 15 subdistricts in the city of Palembang. The result of the study which involving 378 students as the sample showed that the highest score obtained was 86 by only one student. If this score is converted into five categories (excellent-86-100; good-71-85; average-56-70; poor-41-55; very poor (fail) -0-40) (FKIP-Sriwijaya University, 2008), it can be said that only 0.26% from the total sample got excellent score. Furthermore, if the result is categorized based on the subdistricts, from the 15 subdistricts it is known that the highest students' English achievement was the schools in Ilir Barat I sub-district followed by Bukit Kecil, Alang-alang Lebar, Kemuning, Sukarame, Ilir Barat 2, Seberang Ulu 2, Ilir Timur 1, Seberang Ulu 1, Kertapati, Ilir Timur 2, Kalidoni, Plaju, Gandus, and the lowest was Sako districts in Palembang.

The above data indicate that Indonesian people reading literacy requires serious attention, particularly to those of senior high schools. Participating in International comparative studies, such as Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) may therefore map Indonesian education standards, particularly reading literacy in the global. Besides, due to the fact that the typical reading test items in PISA lead the students to use their higher order cognitive process (OECD, 2009), it could accomplish the goal of national curriculum (curriculum 2013) as well. The goal is to create the productive, creative, innovative, and affective students through emphasizing higher order thinking skills (HOTS) (Department of Education and Culture, 2013). Wolfook as cited in Uno (2009) states that higher order thinking skill consists of 4 indicators, which are problem solving, decision making, critical thinking, and creative thinking. Unfortunately, although PISA reading literacy test items are relevant to the Indonesian national curriculum, however it is not in line with the burning issue in 21st century (English literacy) since the PISA assesses students' reading literacy in Indonesian national language. Therefore, in order to cope with the flood of information in 21st century and to prompt a review of education policy as well as more research in implementation of reading curriculum in Indonesia, specifically in Palembang, this certainly makes sense to use PISA reading literacy test in English.

The aim of PISA study do not only concern on students' reading literacy performance. Based on OECD (2009) the development of reading literacy includes the students' engagement in reading

and socioeconomic status (SES). According to OECD (2010) in United States there was an astounding finding about the connection between reading achievement and reading engagement. Being engaged in reading involves the reader's motivation to read and it's comprised of constructs including; (a) the enjoyment of reading, (b) online reading, (c) the diversity of reading, and (d) the attitude of reading. Reading for enjoyment is about how much students usually spend reading for enjoyment each day. Being enjoyed in reading according to Schiefele (2009) cited in OECD (2010) has been found to be associated with high levels of reading proficiency and the use of deep-level reading strategies. Smith as cited in OECD (2002) states that findings emerging from analyses of the association between what students reported reading for enjoyment and their reading performance are in line with evidence that some reading materials may nurture reading proficiency more than others. Reading diversity indicates the kind of materials students choose to read in form a list that included newspapers, magazines, fiction, non-fiction, comics, emails, and web pages. It also indicates the frequency with which they read each type of material.

Based on PISA 2009 result, students of Indonesia who read comic books regularly achieve higher scores than the students who did not read comic books regularly (OECD, 2010). Students' engagement in reading is also indicated by the diversity of the material that students read online and by the amount of time they spend accessing online material (OECD, 2010, p. 41). In terms of online reading, according to OECD (2010) students who are extensively engaged in online activities either for searching online information or access online material are generally more proficient readers than students who do little online reading. Meanwhile, reading attitudes refers to the students' high motivation and interest in reading (OECD, 2009).

Another concern which is associated with students' PISA reading literacy performance is Socioeconomic status (OECD, 2009). Vellymalay (2001) mentions students' socio-economic status affects students' academic success due to higher students' economic-social and cultural status tend to give students the necessary skills, knowledge, behavior, and values that were needed by the students for their academic success. The similar thing is also confirmed by Sarier (2016) who conducted a study about the factors that affects students' academic achievement. In Indonesia, men dominate in public and domestic sectors or known as patriarchy culture, a social system in which men have all power. Men culturally constructs the proper role which is earning income and providing protection for the family as well as at the household level, men's power is used to refer to the family that is fully controlled by men (Stivens as cited in Ibrahim & Suranto, 1998). Considering the patriarchy culture which occurs in Indonesian culture, therefore students' socioeconomic status in this study will only consider from the father aspects.

Based on the explanation above, it is felt that it is worthwhile to know the students' PISA reading literacy performance in English, reading engagement, and SES due to the fact

that English literacy is a burning issue in 21st century and the typical PISA reading test items are in HOTS which also in line with Indonesia national curriculum (K13). Moreover, sufficient survey-designed study of the reading engagement, SES, and PISA reading literacy in English especially of the teenagers in Palembang city is very small. Therefore, from all these factors above, an attempt is made by the writer to study the PISA reading literacy performance and reading engagement of the state senior high school students in Kemuning and Plaju districts looking at the fact that these districts represent schools which get the high scores in reading achievement and then afterward, looking at the significant differences of the results based on school location and SES. In relation to this, the aims of this study were to answer these following research questions:

(1) What is the description of PISA 2009 English reading literacy performance and reading engagement of year 10 students of SMAN 3, SMAN 4, and SMAN 6 Palembang based on school?;
(2) What is the description of PISA 2009 English reading literacy performance and reading engagement of year 10 students of SMAN 3, SMAN 4, and SMAN 6 Palembang based on socioeconomic status?,
(3) Are there any significant differences in students' PISA 2009 English reading literacy performance and reading engagement based on the school?, and
(4) Are there any significant differences in students' PISA English reading literacy performance and reading engagement based on socioeconomic status (SES)?.

This study was part of the study conducted by Mirizon, Vianty, Rosmalina and Erlina (2017) which investigated the reading performance of Year 10 of Sstate senior high school students in Palembang as measured by PISA 2009 Reading Litearcy Test.

## METHODOLOGY

Quantitative descriptive survey was applied as the research design of this study. The sample of this study consisted of 254 tenth grade students chosen purposively from two state senior high schools in Kemuning and Plaju districts. To measure students' PISA reading literacy in English, PISA Reading Literacy Test 2009 was used. The procedure of this study was as follow: first, the test was tried out and the reliability of which was 0.844; second, reading engagement questionnaire also adapted from OECD in PISA 2009 which had four components; *time spent reading for enjoyment, reading attitude, reading diversity,* and *reading on line* in it was used. From the calculation by using Pearson Correlation Coefficient showed that all r-obtained of the items were higher than the r-table (0.329). Its reliability of each component was 0.829 for reading attitude, 0.951 for reading diversity, and 0.945 for reading online. However, the writer did not calculate the item of time spend reading for enjoyment component because the item was open ended question; and third for the second questionnaire was about students' socioeconomic status and also adapted from OECD. Since the

questionnaire was open-ended questions, the reliability was not checked. However, the validity of the questionnaire was checked by lecturer of Bahasa Indonesia study program University of Sriwijaya due to the questions were translated into Bahasa Indonesia. In brief, the instruments were valid and reliable to be used. An analysis of Descriptive statistics, One-Way Anova, Kruskall Wallis, Independent Sample t-Test, and Mann Whitney u-Test were calculated statistically.

## FINDINGS

### Students' Reading Literacy Performance

The results of the student's reading test were grouped based on Indonesian standard of National Education. As shown in Table 1, the average score of the each school is far below the Indonesian standard of National Education, which is 75.00. Further description about students' PISA reading literacy performance in English based on schools and districts are shown in Table 2 and the students' reading literacy performance was classified based on levels of reading proficiency from PISA (see Table 3).

**Table 1**
**Results of PISA Reading Literacy Performance in English**

| Indonesian standard of National Education | N | Sc | | | Total (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| ≥75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ≤74.9 | 254 | 84 (33%) | 94 (37%) | 76 | 100 |
| Total | 254 | 84 (33%) | 94 (37%) | 76 | 100 |

**Table 2**
**Students' PISA Reading Literacy Performance based on School**

| Districts | School | N (%) | Mean | Std. dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kemuning | Public School 1 | 84 (33%) | 21.85 | 10.001 |
| | Public School 2 | 94 (37%) | 29.61 | 7.014 |
| Plaju | Public School 3 | 76 (30%) | 17.39 | 7.959 |
| School Total | | 254 (100%) | 23.39 | 9.780 |

**Table 3**
**Students' PISA Reading Literacy Performance measured by PISA Level**

| Districts | School | Mean | St.Dev | Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kemuning | 1 | 492.82 | 104.267 | 3 |
| | 2 | 519.24 | 97.601 | 3 |
| Plaju | 3 | 484.14 | 95.463 | 3 |
| Total | | 500.00 | 100.000 | 3 |

As shown in Table 2, school 2 in Kemuning district had the highest score (29.61) followed by school 1 (21.85), and school 3 in Plaju district (17.39).

Next, the students' reading literacy performance was classified based on levels of reading proficiency

from PISA. Those levels were *below level 1, 1, 2, 3, 4,* and *5*. The reason for this is to give the information especially to the schools about how many its students are able to successfully complete tasks mapped at the same level, lower, or higher on the PISA scale. Further explanation about students' PISA reading literacy performance based on PISA level is presented in the Table 4.

.

**Table 4**
**Students' PISA Reading Literacy Performance based on PISA level**

| Range of Score | PISA Level | N | School | | | Total (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Kemuning Districts | | Plaju District | |
| | | | 1 (%) | 2 (%) | 3 (%) | |
| less than 335 | 1b | 16 | 3 (4) | 5 (5) | 8 (11) | 6 |
| 335 – 407 | 1a | 33 | 18 (21) | 9 (10) | 6 (8) | 13 |
| 408 – 480 | 2 | 73 | 24 (29) | 21 (22) | 28 (37) | 29 |
| 481 – 552 | 3 | 41 | 13 (15) | 14 (15) | 14 (18) | 16 |
| 553 – 625 | 4 | 57 | 14 (17) | 29 (31) | 14 (18) | 22 |
| more than 625 | 5 | 34 | 12 (14) | 16 (17) | 6 (8) | 13 |
| Total | | 254 | 84 (100) | 94 (100) | 76 (100) | 100 |

As shown in Table 4, the score of all schools participated in this study were at Level 3. Referring to PISA reading proficiency levels, this means that the students who are at this level are able to locate, and in some cases recognize the relationship between, several pieces of information that must meet multiple conditions. The readers are able to integrate several parts of a text, identify a main idea, understand a relationship or construe the meaning of a word or phrase because they need to take into account many features in comparing, contrasting or categorizing. They are also able to evaluate a feature of the text since some reflective tasks require readers to demonstrate a fine understanding of the text in relation to familiar, everyday knowledge (OECD, 2009).

Next, the results of students' PISA Reading Literacy performance were categorized by 3 aspects of socioeconomic status, which are *father occupational status, father educational level,* and *home possessions.* The highest mean score (24.85) among the aspects was students with *white-collar high skilled* father (civil servant, teacher, lecturer, lawyer) while the lowest one (M=16.25) was students with *blue-collar low skilled* father (cleaners, drivers). The second highest mean score from the level of schooling was students whose father completed Diploma, S1, Master and Doctoral degree (M=23.98). Finally, in terms of home possession in all schools involved in this study showed that mostly the students who were in less affluent category got higher mean reading score than those from more affluent category.

In order to see whether or not there is a significant difference of the students' PISA reading literacy performance based on school and socioeconomic status, the analysis was further conducted by using One Way-ANOVAThe result showed that the students' reading literacy score among three schools were different significantly ($p = 0.000$) (see Table 5).

**Table 5**
**Analysis of Variance of Students' PISA Reading Literacy Score among Three Schools**

| (I) school | (J) school | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | -7.756* | 1.258 | .000 |
| | 3 | 4.467* | 1.327 | .004 |
| 2 | 1 | 7.756* | 1.258 | .000 |
| | 3 | 12.223* | 1.293 | .000 |
| 3 | 1 | -4.467* | 1.327 | .004 |
| | 2 | -12.223* | 1.293 | .000 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Knowing that there were significant differences among the results of reading literacy score in those three schools, the analysis was then continued by using Post Hoc Test analysis to see how much school aspects influenced on *students' PISA reading literacy performance.* Table 6 shows the results of analysis of variance PISA reading literacy score among three schools. Furthermore, the description of the differences of PISA reading literacy performance in each school to its total can also be observed in Table 5.

As shown in Table 5, the score of PISA reading literacy between public school 1 and 2 (p<.000), public school 1 and 3 (p<.004), public school 3 and 2 (p<.000) were different significantly. In addition, the results of students' PISA reading literacy level were also analyzed. The following table presents the results of students' reading literacy level. The results showed the p-value was higher than 0.05. It means there was no significant difference among students' PISA reading literacy level in all schools participated in this study.

Next, statistical analysis was also conducted to see the mean difference of students' PISA reading literacy performance based on SES. This part presents the results of analysis of variance: (1) students' reading literacy performance in relation to father's occupational status, (2) students' reading literacy performance in relation to father's educational level, (3) students' reading literacy performance in relation to Home possession.

***First***, the results from One-Way ANOVA showed that students' reading literacy score in relation to father's occupational status were different significantly (F-obtained = 6.575, p = 0.000). Knowing that there were significant differences among the results of reading literacy score in relation to father's occupational status, the analysis was then continued by using Post Hoc Test analysis to see father's occupational aspects influenced on *students' PISA reading literacy performance.* Thus, the description of the differences of PISA reading literacy performance in relation to father's occupational status to its total can also be seen in Table 6.

**Table 6**
**Reading Literacy Performance in Relation to**
**Father's Occupational Status**

| Multiple Comparisons | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scheffe | | | | |
| (I) Father's Occupational Status | (J) Father's Occupational Status | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
| **white-collar high skilled** | white-collar low skilled | 2.625 | 1.674 | .484 |
| | blue-collar high skilled | 6.426 | 2.286 | .050 |
| | **blue-collar low skilled** | **8.601*** | 2.404 | **.006** |
| white-collar low skilled | white-collar high skilled | -2.625 | 1.674 | .484 |
| | blue-collar high skilled | 3.801 | 2.650 | .561 |
| | blue-collar low skilled | 5.976 | 2.753 | .197 |
| blue-collar high skilled | white-collar high skilled | -6.426 | 2.286 | .050 |
| | white-collar low skilled | -3.801 | 2.650 | .561 |
| | blue-collar low skilled | 2.175 | 3.162 | .925 |
| **blue-collar low skilled** | **white-collar high skilled** | **-8.601*** | 2.404 | **.006** |
| | white-collar low skilled | -5.976 | 2.753 | .197 |
| | blue-collar high skilled | -2.175 | 3.162 | .925 |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. | | | | |

Table 6 displays the results of Post Hoc Test to see how much the differences of PISA reading literacy performance in relation to father's occupational status. The results show, only students' with *white-collar high skilled* father and *blue-collar low skilled* father ($p<0.006$) were significantly different with their PISA reading literacy score.

***Second***, one Way ANOVA was done to find out whether or not significant difference between students' PISA reading literacy performance and father's educational level did exist. The results of the analysis can be seen Table 7.

**Table 7**
**Reading Literacy Performance in Relation to**
**Father's Educational Level**

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SCORE_READING_LITERACY | | | | | |
| | Sum of Squares | D | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 540.908 | 3 | 180.303 | 1.905 | .129 |
| Within Groups | 23659.928 | 250 | 94.640 | | |
| Total | 24200.836 | 253 | | | |

Table 7 shows that the p-value (sig-two tailed) was higher than 0.05 ($0.129 \leq 0.05$). It means that there was no significant difference in reading literacy between the students whose father level of schooling completed grade 6, 9, 12, Diploma, S1, and Master or Doctor.

***Third,*** in order to find out whether or not significant difference between students' PISA reading literacy performance and households possessions did exist, One Way ANOVA was applied. Table 9 shows the results of PISA Reading Literacy Performance in Relation to SES

(Home Possessions). As shown in Table 8, there is no significant difference between home possessions and students' reading literacy performance since the p-value (Sig-two tailed) was higher than 0.05 (.637 ≥ 0.05).

**Table 8**
**Reading Literacy Performance and Households Possessions**

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum of Squares | D | Mean Square | F | Sig |
| Between Groups | 21.422 | 1 | 21.4 | .223 | .63 |
| Within Groups | 24179.415 | 252 | 95.9 | | |
| Total | 24200.836 | 253 | | | |

**Students' Reading Engagement**

First, students' reading engagement as measured by PISA 2009 Students Questionnaire consists of 25 statements which comprising 4 parts: *(1) Time spent reading for enjoyment, (2) Reading attitude, (3) Reading diversity,* and *(4) Reading online.*

The following section presents the description of the analysis for each part.

***Time Spent Reading for Enjoyment***

This part focuses on the frequency of time which the students spent for reading for enjoyment. Table 9 presents the results of the analysis. First, 47% percent of the students acknowledged that they read 30 minutes less a day and only 2% of the students who stated they read more than 2 hours a day. Meanwhile, 29% of the students informed that they do not read for enjoyment.

**Table 9**
**Students' Time Spent for Reading for Enjoyment**

| Activity | % of students |
|---|---|
| Do not read for reading for enjoyment | 29 |
| Reading for enjoyment 30 minutes or less a day | 47 |
| Reading for enjoyment more than 30 minutes to less than 60 minutes a day | 17 |
| Reading for enjoyment 1 to 2 hour a day | 5 |
| Reading for enjoyment more than 2 hours a day | 2 |

The analysis of time the students' spent for reading for enjoyment was also conducted for each school (see Table 10). There was one school that had 33% of the students who did not read for enjoyment, while the other two schools had 23% and 20% students who did read for enjoyment.

**Table 10**
**Students' Time Spent for Reading for Enjoyment based on School**

| Districts | School | N | I do not read for enjoyment | | 30 minutes or less a day | | More than 30 to a less than 60 minutes a day | | 1 to 2 hours a day | | More than 2 hours a day | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Kemuning | 1 | 84 | 23 | 9 | 33 | 13 | 21 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2 | 94 | 31 | 12 | 48 | 19 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Plaju | 3 | 76 | 20 | 8 | 39 | 15 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| School total | | 254 | 74 | 2 | 120 | 47 | 43 | 17 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

Next, the results of students' time spent reading for enjoyment were categorized by 3 aspects of socioeconomic status, which are *father occupational status, father educational level,* and *home possessions.* The findings showed that the students whose father were grouped into white-collar low skilled category (N=179) stated that they spent time read for enjoyment. However, in terms of level of schooling, students whose father completed grade 6 stated that they spent more time reading for enjoyment. Meanwhile, in relation to home possession assets, students' who were in more affluent category stated that they spent time reading for enjoyment.

The next analysis was conducted to see whether or not there was a significant difference of the students' Reading Engagement based on school and socioeconomic status. Since the data of students' reading engagement in ordinal data, for the statistical analysis, the K-Independent test was conducted to see the mean difference of students' reading engagement in the three schools. Further details about student' reading engagement and its statistical analysis are shown in the following part. ***First***, nonparametric test was conducted to see whether or not there was a significant difference in students' time spent reading measured by each school. Table 11 shows the results of the analysis for students' reading engagement (*students' time spent reading for* enjoyment) by using K-independent test.

**Table 11**
**Students' Time Spent for Reading for Enjoyment by Each School**

| | School | N | Mean Rank | Test statistic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Time spent reading for enjoyment | |
| Time spent reading for enjoyent | 1 | 84 | 137.80 | Chi-Square | 4.182 |
| | 2 | 94 | 116.98 | Df | 2 |
| | 3 | 76 | 129.13 | Asymp. Sig. | .124 |
| | Total | 254 | | a. Kruskal Wallis Test | |
| | | | | b. Grouping Variable: school | |

As shown in Table 11, the results showed that the p-value was higher than 0.05. It means that students' time spent reading for enjoyment in all schools participated in this study were not different significantly.

***Second,*** to find out whether or not significant difference between students' time spent reading for enjoyment and socioeconomic status did exist, K-independent sample was applied due to the data were ordinal. The results are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12**
**Students' Time Spent for Reading for Enjoyment and Socioeconomic Status**

| SES | | N | Mean Rank | Chi. | Df | Asymp. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Father Occupational Status | white-collar high skilled | 179 | 124.62 | 1.116 | 3 | .773 |
| | white-collar low skilled | 39 | 134.03 | | | |
| | blue-collar high skilled | 19 | 132.68 | | | |
| | blue-collar low skilled | 17 | 137.06 | | | |
| Father Educational Level | Grade 6 | 2 | 175.25 | 2.947 | 3 | .400 |
| | Grade 9 | 11 | 155.32 | | | |
| | Grade 12 | 71 | 125.44 | | | |
| | Diploma, S1, Master/Doctor | 170 | 126.00 | | | |
| Home Possessions | Less affluent | 43 | 121.90 | .348 | 1 | .555 |
| | More affluent | 211 | 128.64 | | | |

As shown in Table 12, the results of K-independent test showed that the p-value was higher than 0.05. It means that there was no significant difference between students' socioeconomic status and the time spent reading for enjoyment.

***Students' Reading Attitudes***

The students had four options and they had to select one response that described them well. The responses were Agree Strongly which was represented by number 4, followed by Agree (3), Disagree (2), and Disagree Strongly (1). Since the statements containing positive and negative statements, so the responses were reversed. The responses for negative statements were Agree Strongly was represented by number 1, followed by Agree (2), Disagree (3), and Disagree Strongly (4). Furthermore, since, those responses were basically similar, then the 4 responses were divided into two big groups in which Agree Strongly and Agree were classified as 'Agree' while Disagree and Disagree Strongly were put into 'Disagree' group. Table 13 presents the description of the students' reading attitude based on school. It is found that students' attitude towards reading in all schools participated in this study were positive (96%).

**Table 13**
**Students' Attutude towards Reading Measured by School**

| Districts | School | St. Dev | Mean | N | Categor | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Positive Attitudes towards Reading | | Negative Attitudes towards Reading | |
| | | | | | N | % | N | % |
| Kemuning | 1 | 4.072 | 29.61 | 84 | 82 | 97.7 | 2 | 2.4 |
| | 2 | 3.942 | 29.52 | 94 | 87 | 92.5 | 7 | 7.4 |
| Plaju | 3 | 3.519 | 29.53 | 76 | 75 | 98.7 | 1 | 1.3 |
| School Total | | | 29.55 | 254 | 244 | 96 | 10 | 3.9 |

To see whether or not there was a significant difference in the students' attitude towards reading among the schools, nonparametric test was conducted. The results of K-independent tests can be seen in Table 14. Based on the results of Kruskal Wallis tests, the p-value of students' reading attitude was higher than 0.05 (0.979 ≥ 0.05). Therefore, there was no significant difference in students' reading attitude in all schools participated in this study.

**Table 14**
**Results of Analysis on Significant Difference among Students' Attitude towards Reading based on School**

| | School | N | Mean Rank | Test Statistics[a,b] Attitude towards Reading | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attitude towards reading | 1 | 84 | 127.39 | Chi-Square | .042 |
| | 2 | 94 | 126.53 | Df | 2 |
| | 3 | 76 | 128.82 | Asymp. Sig. | .979 |
| | Total | 254 | | a. Kruskal Wallis Test | |
| | | | | b. Grouping Variable: school | |

A closer investigation about the students' attitude toward reading is presented in Table 15. It was found that students' responses to item asking *if reading is one of their favorite hobbies* showed that 57% agreed to this statement. Then, the item asking *if students enjoy going to a bookstore or a library* showed that 52% of them agreed strongly to this statement. The students' responses to negative item asking whether or not they thought *reading is a waste of time* showed that 49% disagree with it. In addition, students' responses to item *I cannot sit still and read for more than a few minutes* fell into 'Disagree Strongly' (69%).

**Table 15**
**Students' Attitude towards Reading**

| Statements | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | | | |
| I read only if I have to | 7 | 48 | 40 | 5 |
| Reading is one of my favourite hobbies | 9 | 45 | 37 | 9 |
| I like talking about books with other people | 18 | 26 | 55 | 2 |
| I find it hard to finish books | 4 | 15 | 33 | 48 |
| I feel happy if I receive a book as a present | 43 | 17 | 24 | 16 |
| For me, reading is a waste of time | 2 | 3 | 49 | 46 |
| I enjoy going to a bookstore or a library | 52 | 31 | 15 | 2 |
| I read only to get information that I need | 6 | 48 | 42 | 4 |
| I like to express my opinion about books I have read | 53 | 33 | 11 | 3 |
| **I** like exchange books with my friends | 37 | 43 | 14 | 6 |

The analysis was also conducted to see the students' attitude towards reading in relation to their socioeconomic status. It was found that the highest mean score (29.97) was from the students whose fathers belonged to the *white-collar low skilled.* Meanwhile, in terms of level of schooling completed by father, the responses from the students whose father completed grade 9 gave the highest mean score (30.00). Another aspect of socioeconomic -*home possessions*- showed that the responses from the students who were in more affluent category gave the highest mean score which was 29.58.

The analysis K-independent test was applied in order to find out whether or not significant difference between students' attitude towards reading and socioeconomic status did exist. The results are presented in Table 16.

**Table 16**
**Results of K-Independent Test (Students' Attitude towards Reading based on SES)**

| SES | | N | Mean Rank | Chi. Square | Df | Asymp. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Father Occupational Status | white-collar high skilled | 179 | 126.63 | 1.865 | 3 | **.601** |
| | white-collar low skilled | 39 | 137.91 | | | |
| | blue-collar high skilled | 19 | 130.37 | | | |
| | blue-collar low skilled | 17 | 109.56 | | | |
| Father Educational Level | Grade 6 | 2 | 111.75 | **.48** | **3** | **.922** |
| | Grade 9 | 11 | 140.95 | | | |
| | Grade 12 | 71 | 127.77 | | | |
| | Diploma, S1, Master/Doctor | 170 | 126.70 | | | |
| Home Possessions | Less affluent | 43 | 124.52 | **.08** | **1** | **.770** |
| | **More affluent** | 211 | 128.11 | | | |

***Students' Reading Diversity***

The statement in this section asked students to indicate how often students read magazine, comic books, fiction (novels, narratives, stories), non-fiction, and newspaper (specifically the reading materials are in English language). Students were also given 5 choices and had to choose one. The five choices were *Never or almost never, A few times a year, About once a month, Several times a month,* and *Several times a week.* Table 17 shows students' responses towards the aspects of the diversity of reading material.

**Table 17**
**Diversity of Students' Reading Material**

| Reading material | Never or almost never | A few times a year | About once a month | Several times a month | Several times a week |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | | | | |
| Magazine | 9 | 37 | 31 | 21 | 3 |
| Comic | 18 | 35 | 27 | 17 | 4 |
| Fiction | 23 | 33 | 29 | 16 | 3 |
| Non-fiction | 22 | 31 | 34 | 12 | 1 |
| Newspaper | 54 | 27 | 17 | 2 | 0 |

The students' responses about the frequency with which they read various types of materials fell into 'A Few Times a Year'. On the other hand, students' choices showed that they (54%) never or almost never read newspaper in English language. However, there were a few (4%) students who read various types of materials in several time a week, specifically comic.

**Table 18**
**Diversity of Students' Reading Material based on School**

| District | School | N | Mean | Std Dev | 0 | | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | N | % | N | % |
| Kemuning | 1 | 84 | 12.50 | 4.049 | 62 | 24 | 22 | 9 |
| | 2 | 94 | 10.93 | 3.526 | 82 | 32 | 12 | 5 |
| Plaju | 3 | 76 | 12.58 | 3.503 | 61 | 24 | 15 | 6 |
| | | 254 | 11.94 | 3.768 | 205 | 80 | 49 | 20 |

Note :
1. Category 0 = students do not spend or rarely spend time reading various books in English
2. Category 1 = students have enough time reading various books in English

Table 18 presents the results of the analysis concerning the reading materials that the students read. The finding showed that 80% of the students of the three schools involved in this study did not spend or rarely spend time reading various books in English. The results presented in Table 18 also showed that the students' responses were classified into two categories. These classifications were in line with OECD (2010) which stated that students who read either in *several times a month* or *several times a* week were classified as students who read various materials regularly. Thus, students who choose 'never or almost never', 'a few times a year', and 'about once a month' were classified into 'category 0' (*students do not spend or rarely spend time reading various books in English*), while students who choose 'several times a month' or 'several times a week' were classified into 'category 1' (*students have enough time reading various books in English*).

The students' reading diversity was also classified based on socioeconomic aspects. The results showed that the students with *white-collar high skilled* father had highest mean score (13.26) in terms of the amount of time students spent reading various types of text. In relation to the aspect of socioeconomic *father's education level*, the students whose father completed Grade 12 had highest mean score (12.92). Last, reading diversity in relation to home possession showed that the highest mean score (11.97) was demonstrated by the students with more affluent category.

Next, a further analysis was conducted to see whether or not there was a significant difference in the students' reading diversity based on school and socioeconomic status. ***First,*** the results of K-independent test showed that there was significant difference in students' reading diversity in those three schools ($0.008 \leq 0.05$). Knowing that there were significant differences, the analysis was then continued to Mann-Whitney test. Table 19 presents the description of the difference in students Reading Diversity based on school.

**Table 19**
**Diversity of Students' Reading Material based on School**

| | School | N | Mean Rank | | School | N | Mean Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reading diversity** | **1** | 84 | 136.66 | **Reading diversity** | **3** | 76 | 97.19 |
| | **2** | 94 | 109.06 | | **2** | 94 | 76.05 |
| | **3** | 76 | 140.18 | | | | |
| | **Total** | 254 | | | **Total** | 170 | |

| **Test Statistics[a,b]** | |
|---|---|
| | **Reading Diversity** |
| **Chi-Square** | 9.557 |
| **Df** | 2 |
| **Asymp. Sig.** | **.008** |
| a. Kruskal Wallis Test | |
| b. Grouping Variable: school | |

| **Test Statistics[a,b]** | |
|---|---|
| | **Reading Diversity** |
| **Mann-Whitney U** | 2683.500 |
| **Wilcoxon W** | 7148.500 |
| **Z** | -2.795 |
| **Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)** | **.005** |
| a. Grouping Variable: school | |

The p-value of students' reading diversity between school 3 and 2 was .005 which was lower than 0.05. It could be concluded that the students' reading diversity of schools 3 and 2 were significantly different. ***Second,*** the result of the K-independent test showed p-value which was higher than 0.05m suggesting that students' reading materials were not significantly different in terms of SES (see Table 20).

**Table 20**
**Results of K-Independent Test (Students' Reading Materials based on SES)**

| SES | | N | Mean Rank | Chi. Squar | Df | Asymp. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Father Occupational Status** | white-collar high skilled | 179 | 119.84 | 7.315 | 3 | **.062** |
| | white-collar low skilled | 39 | 139.54 | | | |
| | blue-collar high skilled | 19 | 155.84 | | | |
| | blue-collar low skilled | 17 | 148.91 | | | |
| **Father Educational Level** | Grade 6 | 2 | 86.00 | **1.202** | **3** | **.753** |
| | Grade 9 | 11 | 143.23 | | | |
| | Grade 12 | 71 | 128.69 | | | |
| | Diploma, S1, | 170 | 126.47 | | | |
| **Home Possessions** | Less affluent | 43 | 127.80 | **.** | **1** | **.976** |
| | More affluent | 211 | 127.44 | | | |

***Students' Reading On-Line***

This part of the questionnaire asked the students about their on-line reading activities. The students selected one of the given responses: *I don't know what it is, never or almost never, several times a week,* and *several times a day.* The result of the analysis presented in Table 21 showed that the students did on-line reading 'several times a month'.

**Table 21**
**Students' On-line Reading Activities**

| On-line reading activities | *I don't know what it is* | *Never or almost never* | *Several times a month* | *Several times a week* | *Several times a day* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | | | | |
| Reading e-mails | 6 | 24 | 41 | 20 | 9 |
| Chatting on-line | 5 | 29 | 31 | 18 | 17 |
| Reading on-line news | 6 | 22 | 40 | 19 | 12 |
| Using on-line ... | 3 | 15 | 41 | 33 | 8 |
| Searching on-line ... | 2 | 12 | 34 | 38 | 13 |
| Taking part in on-line ... | 10 | 34 | 35 | 18 | 3 |
| Searching for practical ... | 5 | 20 | 30 | 34 | 11 |
| Text messaging | 2 | 15 | 31 | 29 | 23 |

The analysis on the students' on-line reading activities was also conducted interms of school. Table 22 presents the the results of students' reading online based on 2 categories: *have enough time reading online* and *never or rarely reading online.* As shown in Table 22, 67% of the students of the schools participated in this study did not spend or rarely spend time to do on-line reading in English.

**Table 22**
**Students' On-line Reading Activities based on School**

| Districts | School | Mean | Category | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Students never or rarely have time to read online | | Students have enough time to read online | |
| | | | N | % | N | % |
| Kemuning | 1 | 26.86 | 28 | 33.3 | 5 | 66.7 |
| | 2 | 26.14 | 18 | 23.7 | 5 | 76.3 |
| Plaju | 3 | 27.75 | 39 | 41.5 | 5 | 58.5 |
| School total | | 26.86 | 85 | 33 | 1 | 67 |

Next, the results of the students' on-line reading were categorized based on SES. The findings showed that the highest mean score (27.90) was for the students' whose father belonged to the category *skilled* father. Then , in terms of level of schooling, the highest mean score (27.00) shown by the students' whose father had D3, S1, Master or Doctoral qualifications. Meanwhile, reading online in relation to home possession showed that the highest score (27.05) demonstrated by the students who were in more affluent category.

A further analysis was conducted to see whether or not there was a significant difference of the students'

online based on school and socioeconomic status. Since the data of students' reading engagement in ordinal data, for the statistical analysis, the K-Independent test was conducted to see the mean difference of students' reading diversity in the three schools. Further details about student' reading diversity are shown in the following part.

***First***, One-Way ANOVA analysis was conducted to see the mean difference of students' reading online. Table 23 shows the results of students' reading online.

**Table 23**
**Results of Analysis on Significant Difference among Students' On-line Reading based on School**

| **Ranks** | | | | **Test Statistics[a,b]** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **School** | **N** | **Mean Rank** | | **Reading Online** |
| **Attitude towards reading** | **1** | 84 | 126.49 | Chi-Square | 4.153 |
| | **2** | 94 | 117.73 | Df | 2 |
| | **3** | 76 | 140.70 | Asymp. Sig. | .125 |
| | **Total** | 254 | | a. Kruskal Wallis Test | |
| | | | | b. Grouping Variable: school | |

As shown in Table 23, the results of K-independents test showed that there was no significant difference in the students' reading online of all participated schools in this study ($0.125 \geq 0.05$).

***Second***, K-independent test was applied to see the mean difference of students' reading online in relation to students' socioeconomic status. Table 24 displays the information about the analysis of variance. The results of the analysis showed that there was no significant difference between students' socioeconomic status towards students' reading online

**Table 24**
**The Results of K-Independent Test**
**(Students' On-line Reading based on SES)**

| **SES** | | **N** | **Mean Rank** | **Chi. Squar** | **Df** | **Asymp. Sig.** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Father Occupational Status** | white-collar high skilled | 179 | 123.59 | 1.849 | 3 | .604 |
| | white-collar low skilled | 39 | 138.81 | | | |
| | blue-collar high skilled | 19 | 131.76 | | | |
| | blue-collar low skilled | 17 | 137.97 | | | |
| **Father Educational Level** | Grade 6 | 2 | 107.50 | .259 | **3** | .968 |
| | Grade 9 | 11 | 125.14 | | | |
| | Grade 12 | 71 | 125.52 | | | |
| | Diploma, S1, | 170 | 128.71 | | | |
| **Home Possessions** | Less affluent | 43 | 113.30 | 1.942 | **1** | .163 |
| | More affluent | 211 | 130.39 | | | |

## DISCUSSION

This study shows that the students PISA reading literacy performance in Kemuning and Plaju districts in Palembang are still very low, and if the researcher crosschecks their PISA reading literacy performance with the minimum standard score for English subject which is 75, it is found that 99% students have failed in achieving the minimum score set by their own school. When the data were collected these students had already learned English for almost ten years, but why they could not achieve the targeted score in learning this language. Thus, what is wrong with the students?. It is assumed that the low result was not merely students' fault, but it also has something to do with teachers' competency.

The teacher's quality is probably one of the reasons that cause the students' horrible performance. Srie (2013) mentioned that the teachers' competency test (Uji Kompetensi Guru), which is a standard of teachers' qualification status, was only 42.25 out of 100. Therefore, it makes sense if the students' PISA reading literacy performance was very low. On the other hand, the findings of this study also reveals that in terms of school location, students' reading literacy performance were significant different. It is in line with the study conducted by Mirizon, Diem, and Vianty (2018) about students' specific comprehension skills in terms of their school location, found that students' comprehension achievement in City-based District school (80.5) is higher than those in Underprivileged District school (56.1). It can be said that school location plays important role in students' reading English performance. Thus, it makes sense if school 1 and 2 in Kemuning district had higher reading score than school 3 in Plaju district. It is assumed that the closer the location of the schools from the city center, the higher students' reading English achievement. It is probably due to the facts that many English courses are available in the city center of Palembang or CBD (City-based District) areas.

In terms of test items, it is logical that students would likely to have difficulty in answering essay questions. It has been outlined by Pepple, Young, and Carrol (2010) that students tend to be outperformed in multiple choices than in essay test. This study also reveals that students have difficulty either in answering continuous and non-continuous text, particularly description, instruction, exposition, and description text. This infers that the government as the stakeholder should provide students more with those texts.

Regarding to the PISA reading level, this study reveals that all of the participated schools were in the same level of reading, which was level 3. As stated in OECD (2018) students who fell into level 3 are able to recognize the relationships between several pieces of information, integrate several parts of a text to identify a main idea, understand relationship construe the meaning of a word or phrase. It can be said that

the high order thinking skill among the students in those three schools are the same. Another interpretation that could be presented was that the time for students to answer the questions are probably limited. In the other words, it might be also related to the reading strategy used by the students. Students who aware how effective reading strategies are and know well which strategies to use in answering the reading test, tend to be more proficient reader as well as independent of the teacher. This is in line with the study from OECD (2010), which proved that an individual's ability to control his or her comprehension strategies could be robust predictors of reading achievement.

Furthermore, this study shows that, of all aspects students' reading engagement, only one aspect (*reading diversity*) in school 3 and school 2 showed significant difference ( .005). It can be said that, although all of the students both in school 3 and school 2 read kinds of books (*magazine, comic, fiction, non-fiction, and newspaper*), the type of the books they read is probably different. In addition, students' reading diversity might be related to their school's library. Although both schools the writer studied have library, the condition of the library in one school was not in excellent quality. It is outlined by the data from Departement of Education and Culture (2018) that the condition of the library in school 3 is not in bad quality. The lack of the books especially English books, the competency of the librarians, and also the visitation of the students to the libraries are likely still the problem. This is a big homework for the government as stakeholder to make it better since powerful library which provides wide variety of English books makes powerful learners. It is proven by another study, Kirsch et al (2003) found that students who read a wide variety of materials perform better in reading print texts. On the other hand, in terms of reading online, this study reveals that all of the participated students in this study were categorized engaged in online reading. It is probably due to the fact that accessing the information in this global era almost through online media.

This study also reveals among students' socioeconomic status, *father occupational status* gives the contribution to their reading literacy performance. It is logical if students whose father from *white-collar high skilled* category (civil servant, teacher, lecturer, lawyer) were different significantly from those whose father from *blue-collar low skilled* category (cleaners, drivers) as Midrag and Midraj (2011) said in their study that parents with high-status job are more likely to be able to identify and help their children in their homework as well as motivating them to have better education. In other words, the higher-status occupations of the parents, the greater parents involve in their children education.

Next, the contribution of *father's educational level* to students' reading performance and reading engagement are really understandable. This kind of socioeconomic aspect can support students' development in terms of education. Well-educated parents likely influence to students' reading literacy and reading engagement because high educated parents are more likely to engage children with

literacy activities in their everyday life as Myrberg and Rosen (2006) described in their study about students reading literacy levels. They said that parents' educational level gives a strong relationship with third graders reading achievement regardless of school form. Moreover, the effect of father's education is more important than mother's as it is mentioned in previous chapter. However, this study reveals that both students whose father completed the highest educational level (D3, S1, Master or Doctoral qualifications) and the lowest one (grade 6), their reading literacy performance and reading engagement are not different significantly. The limited access and less awareness from the parents (high-educated and low-educated parents) to create an educational environment for their children where reading is an important activity are probably the main reasons. This is a big homework for the parents as the stakeholders at home to start to read with child and share the enjoyment of reading with words and texts.

About *home possession* as the aspect of socioeconomic which does not contribute to students' reading literacy performance and reading engagement is a bit peculiar since *home possession* specifically *home educational resources* (such as a desk to study at, a computer for school work, classic literature, dictionary, books, etc) is an important mediator to inspire students' reading. Myrberg and Rosen (2006) in their study found that household possessions specifically books influence students early reading activities and affect their reading abilities. It can be concluded that even though the majority of students of school 1, 2 and 3 are more affluent, the existence of *home possessions* to support their education is not enough to inspire them to read. It is also probably because their parents' own reading interest and the value parents place on reading, even though their parents have provided them with complete facilities. Parents who have high interested in reading not only have more books but they also use their knowledge of books and written language to create an educational environment.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results and interpretation presented in previous chapter, several conclusions can be drawn. First, students' PISA reading literacy performance was below the Indonesian standard of National Education (KKM), which is 75 and it was at level 3 based on PISA level. Second, there was significant difference in students' PISA reading literacy performance based on school. Third, there was no significant difference in 4 aspects of students' reading engagement, however there was a significant difference in types of materials students read (*reading diversity*). Fourth, *father occupational status* is the aspect of socioeconomic status giving contribution to students' reading literacy performance.

## SUGGESTION

There are several factors which play a significant role to contribute to students' better achievement in reading. As shown by the findings of this study, school location, types of reading text, various types of reading materials, and father's occupational status have made a difference in students' English reading

performance. In terms of school location, it is an advantage for those schools located at the CBD areas due to accessing information is easier than those in UBD area. On the other hand, one thing proposed to schools is that adding necessary facilities such as library, multimedia, and books is also important so that students could be prepared to participate well in their teaching and learning process though their school location is not in UBD area.

Regardless of where students' school location is, it is also a challenge for the teachers to make the students learn equally well. Therefore, one thing proposed to the teacher is that students' reading materials should be provided more based on students' interest in reading. Teachers are the backbones of education, in which the future of our country lies. Thus, teachers should understand students' needs in learning, especially in reading in order to create the lesson plan and classroom environment that fully support the students. Teachers also required in making anything available to improve the success of teaching and learning activities by implementing various innovating teaching strategies.

Lastly, the result of the study is expected to be beneficial reference for other related researchers. The writer suggests for further researchers who are interested in conducting related study to use bigger number of sampling as well as using different approach to improve students' reading literacy performance. Although the three schools were accredited A, the writer found that there were unequal amount and quality of facilities owned by the schools. The future researchers are also suggested to do experimental studies to help them by finding good way of teaching and learning based on their condition, needs, and even interests. On the other hand, this study will be much better if there is more data to support the findings, specifically in terms of online reading. Thus, the writer suggests for further researchers to do qualitative research such as interview and questionnaire so that future study could see from the side of online reading.

## REFERENCES

Alexander, P.A. (2002). *Profiling the developing reader: The interplay of knowledge, interest, and strategic processing.* Oscar Causey address presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.

Alexander, P.A. (2005). *The path to competence: A lifespan developmental perspective on reading*. White Paper. Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.

Broadfoot, P. (2007). An introduction to assessment. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Cree, A., Kay, A., & Steward, J. (2012). *The economic and social cost of illiteracy: a snapshot of illiteracy in a global context.* Retrieved from http://www.worldliteracyfoundation.org/The_Economic_&_Social_Cost_f_Illiteracy. pdf.

Cunningham, A., & Zibulsky, J. (2013). *Book Smart. How to develop and support successful, motivated readers.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Department of Education and Culture. (2016). *The Indonesian Government Regulation No.23 year 2015.* Jakarta: The Department of Education and Culture.

Department of Education and Culture. (2016). *Data sekolah (DAPODIK).* Retrieved from: http://sekolah.data.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/chome/profil/657EA020-290A-4574- 929D-5E169A3152BD

Devarajan, G. (1979). Reading Habits secondary school students in Trivandrum. *ASLIB bull, 6, I93-94.*

Diem, C. D. (2012). How the presence of a technologically supported library influences high school students' reading habit and skill. *Global Advance Research & journal of Library. Information and archival studies, 1* (1), 1-5.

Diem, C.D., Purnomo, M.E., Ihsan, D., Sofendi, & Vianty, M. (2015). *Students' literacy quality in Bahsa Indonesia: Functional reading achievement and attitude towards and interest in reading.* Paper presented at the 2nd International Seminar on Literacy and Language Teaching, Ambon, Maluku, Indonesia.

Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. (2008). *Data Pokok Pendidikan tahun 2007/2009 Provinsi Sumatera Selatan.* Palembang. Dinas Pendidikan provinsi.

Diknas Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. (2010). Nilai rata-rata ujian nasional mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris tahun ajaran 2009-2010. Palembang: Diknas Sumsel.

EPI, (2016). EF EPI indeks kecakapan Bahasa Inggris EF. Indonesia : Education First Ltd.

Hartley, R., & Horney, J. (2006). Social economic benefits of improved adult literacy: Towards a better understanding. *National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER).* Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED495174.pdf

Hirawan, D. (2012). *The use of guided reading strategy in improving the eight grade students' reading comprehension achievement of narrative text and reading interest at SMP Negeri 1 OKU.* (Unpublished Magister's Thesis in Education), Sriwijaya University, Palembang.

Ibrahim, I. S., & Suranto, H. (1998). Wanita dan media: *Konstruksi ideologi gender dalam ruang public Orde Baru.* Bandung: Rosda.

Kern, R. (2000). Literacy and language teaching. Oxford: Oxford UniversityPress.

Kirsch, I., de Jong, J., Lafontaine, D., McQueen, J., Mendelovits, J., & Monseur, C. (2002). *Reading for change: Performance and engagement across countries: Results from PISA 2000*. Paris: OECD.

Lone, F.A. (2011). Reading habits of

rural and urban college students in the 21st century.Library and Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). 709.

McKenna, M. C., & Robinson, R.D. (1993). *Teaching through text: A content literacy approach to content area reading.* New York: Longman Publishing.

Midrag., & Midraj, S. (2011). Parental involvement and grade four students' Arabic reading achievement. *European Journal of Educational Studies 3*(2)*,* 245-260.

Mirizon, S., Diem, C.D., Vianty, M. (2018). Students' specific comprehension skills in English based on school locations, grades, and gender. *7*(3), 538-548.

Myrberg, E., & Rosen, M. (2006). Reading achievement and social selection into independent schools in Sweden – results from IEA PIRLS 2001. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 50*(2), 185–205.

OECD. (2002). Reading for change: Performance and engagement across countries. Results from PISA 2000. New York: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

OECD. (2009). *PISA 2009 results: what students know and can do: students performance in reading, mathematics, and science (Volume 1).* OECD, Paris, France.

OECD. (2010). *PISA 2009 results: Executive summary.* Retrieved from http://www.dx.doi.org/10.1787/2

OECD. (2018). Draft analytical frameworks. New York: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Rahmi, R.A., & Diem, C, D. (2014). Junior High School Students' Perception of Classroom Environment and Their English Achievement. *International Journal or Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3*(3). *41-47. Doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.3p. 41.*

Rosnawati. (2009). Enam Tahapan Aktivitas Dalam Pembelajaran Matematika Untuk Mendayagunakan Berpikir Tingkat Tinggi Siswa. Yogyakarta: UNY

Sanford, K.L., (2015). *Factors that affect the reading comprehension of secondary students with disabilities.* Doctoral Dissertations. 125.

Sarier, Y. (2016). The factors that affects students' academic achievement in Turkey: A meta-analysis study. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *31*(3), 609-627. doi:10.16986/HUJE.2016015868

Smith, M.C., Mikulecky, L., Kibby, M.W. & Dreher, M.J. (2000), What will be the demands of literacy in the workplace in the next millennium? Reading Research Quarterly, *35*(3), 378-383.

Srie. (2013). Hasil UKA dan UKG kompetensi guru lebih buruk dari laporan Aljazeera? [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.srie.org/2013/02/hasil -uka-dan-ukg- kompetensi-guru-lebih.html.

The US Department of Education.

(2005). *Helping Your Child Succeed in School.* Washington, DC: ED Pubs.

Uno, H.B. (2009). Model Pembelajaran: Menciptakan Proses Belajar Mengajar yang Kreatif dan Efektif. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.

Vellymalay, S. N. (2012). Parental Involvement at Home: Analyzing the Influence of Parents' Socioeconomic Status. *Studies in Sociology Of Science*, *3*(1), 1-6.

Yusuf, S. (2013). International students assessment in Indonesia. Washington, DC: HD Learning Week.

**About the authors:**
**Gita Realita Chintia** was the graduate of English Education Study Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University
**Dr. Machdalena Vianty, M.Ed., M.Pd** and **Ida Rosmalina, M.Pd** are the lecturers at the English Education Study Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University