Engagement And Motivation As Literacy Sponsor: A Study Of Junior High School Teachers In Indonesia

Much. Koiri[1]* , Pratiwi Retnaningdyah[2] , Slamet Setiawan[3]

[1,2,3]English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: muchkoiri@unesa.ac.id

Abstract

English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy are important aspects in determining successful school literacy programs. This study aims at revealing teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy and examining the relationship between their engagement and motivation. This study uses a quantitative research approach with a cross-sectional survey research design to address the questions. 170 teachers who taught English at Junior High Schools in Surabaya, Indonesia, voluntarily participated in the study. The questionnaire adapts from Peter Hanon's ORIM Framework and McClelland's achievement motivation theory. Data analysis using descriptive statistics and Pearson r correlation with the assistance of SPSS software. The finding reveals that English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy in Surabaya Junior High Schools have in a very high category. However, the result also depicts a positive and large relationship between teachers' engagement and motivation. This study expects to be useful in maximizing school literacy programs in Surabaya and being a model for further research.

Keywords: engagement, motivation, literacy sponsor, school literacy, Indonesia.

INTRODUCTION

Since 2016, school literacy program has been implemented in Indonesia from elementary to senior high school levels (Septiani, Kristiawan, & Fitriani, 2020). As part of the national literacy agenda, it is objected to elevate student's awareness of the importance of being illiterate along with its practice (Atmazaki et al, 2017; Fakhriyah et al, 2017). Well-known as Gerakan Literasi Sekolah, it comprises holistic competences in reading, writing, critical thinking, autonomous learning, tolerance of ambiguity, effective judgment making, and developing deeper personal identity (Septiani, Kristiawan, & Fitriani, 2020; Leki, 2000; Braine, 2002). It also carries opportunities to direct application and production of literacy artefacts (Wulandari et al, 2020; Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000). In other words, it should be meant of applied learning as

students are conditioned in a theory-to-practice procedure (UNESCO, 2007). Hence, this program should be considered importance to improve the quality of education field as well as its stakeholders (Guthrie, 1996; Teguh, 2020; Khotimah & Sa'dijah, 2018).

There are numbers of factors that might influence the success of the program. Among them, school's capital should be the first considered determiner of successful school literacy program (Loretto, 2015). For example, financial supports are indeed necessary to sustenance the provision of required media, tools, materials, and other literacy products (Wulandari et al, 2020). Education institution cannot resist to such economic capital as it determines a lot to the construction of better school literacy milieu (Loretto, 2015; Özdemir & Uyanik, 2021). However, school's literacy capital does not only refer to economic supports, but also qualified and

integrated stakeholders namely student and teacher (Loretto, 2015; Ahearn, 2001). Their presence and cooperation are the key of implementing as well as ensuing school literacy program (Özdemir & Uyanik, 2021). Therefore, student and teacher are mandated to understand their roles and responsibilities in order to succeed the program.

Student and teacher have profoundly different roles in permeatingliteracy practice in their school environment (Ho & Lau, 2018). For instance, studentsare obliged to read any materials other than their subjects for 15 minutes. They also need to produce literacy products, regardless the literacy modes engaged, that show their involvement in the program, i.e. wall-magazine, scrapbook, and recorded role play or tutorial (Vasilchenko et al, 2017). A set of efforts to put students in a literacy exposure is indeed necessary to give them better habituation, development, and learning process (Retnaningdyah et al, 2016). In the other side, teachers, especially those who teach English subject, are responsible to be a good literacy facilitator, also called as a literacy sponsor, to make school milieu rich of texts (Brandt, 2009; Brandt, 2014; Ho & Lau, 2018). Nevertheless, by the absenteeism of teacher's role as literacy sponsor, the program remains unproductive.

As one of literacy sponsors at school, English teachers serve a very essential assistance in bridging the students, the whole school members rather, to be illiterate of any English texts (Share & Mamikonyan, 2020; Smith, West, & McCarthey, 2020). This responsibility is very vital as in today's Industrial Revolution, everyone is suggested to appropriate English (Share & Mamikonyan, 2020; Turmudi, 2020). Loretto (2015) and Brandt (2007)have positioned English teachers in the coverage of Brandt's conception of sponsors of literacy. English teachers are the agents who have a capacity for action and self-determination toward multicultural mediation (Share & Mamikonyan, 2020; Loretto, 2015; Low, 2020). By having such abilities, they are the ones who can promote multicultural phenomena through the appropriation of English, Indonesian, and local language (O'Neal et al, 2018; Low, 2020). In addition, they can assist the whole school members, students in particular, to be English illiterate.

Being a successful literacy sponsor could be determined byteacher's engagement and motivation (Routman, 2018). The present study refers teacher's engagement to four aspects of Peter Hanon's ORIM Framework consisting of opportunity, recognition, interaction, and model. Teachers are expected to provide development and learning opportunities, recognition over student's achievement, interaction to initiate sharing of ideas, and modelling to be a good literacy agent (Hannon, 1995; Nutbrown, Hannon, and Morgan 2005). This framework was actually introduced for family literacy (Hannon, 1995; Nutbrown & Hannon, 2011). However, the present study uses it in school literacy domain, of course, with careful concern of adaptation. In connection with teacher's motivation, there are three motivation types that can be identified encompassing affiliation, power, and achievement(Lussier & Achua 2007). These motivation types are considered significance in looking for rationales beyond teacher's objectives in being sponsor of literacy(Saeed & Zyngier, 2012; Schlechty, 2001; Woolfolk & Margetts, 2007). Henceforth, high teacher's engagement and motivation is required to ensure successful school literacy program as well as demonstrating better literacy sponsorship (Brandt, 2007).

Many previous researchers have conducted studies on engagement and motivation. Guthrie (2004) found that reading engagement involved motivational inclinations, cognitive strategies, conceptual understanding, and social discourse. Consequently, engaged readers referred to higher achievers than those less engaged readers. This further suggested that engagement was a vital aspect of the learning process and achievement. Similarly, Schlechty (2002) firm conveyed that active engagement could be indicated by one's participatory communication, for example, in-class and attention given to the instructors. This typical person, the student rather, carried out every responsibility with enthusiasm, passion, and diligence. These two researchers, basically, had similar conceptions toward engagement and motivation. Unfortunately, the results were only relevant to their schools, which are definitely

different from the Indonesian context. Moreover, their claim was only noteworthy for the student context, and not the teacher context. Related to the discussion above and with the best of the researcher's knowledge, there has been no study investigating English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy, especially in the Indonesian context. This study aimed at revealing how English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy in Indonesia and examining the relationship between the teacher's engagement and motivation. The results of the present study are expected to be a good portrayal of how English teachers' engagement and motivation as a sponsor of literacy in Indonesian Junior High Schools.

School Literacy Sponsors

School literacy program aims to make school a place for literacy learning (e.g. reading and writing) so that its students can always be literate throughout their lives by involving the public's role (Hu et al, 2018; Ho & Lau, 2018; Septiani, Kristiawan, & Fitriani, 2020). This program must be encouraged because Indonesian people's interest in reading and writing is still relatively minimal (Mayuni et al, 2020). This program is expected to be able to arouse interest in reading and writing from an early age. The goals of the school literacy program are divided into two, namely general and specific goals (Au, 1998). The general goal is to grow and develop the student's character so that they become literate people throughout life through the literacy ecosystem built in the school literacy program (Jayanti et al, 2019; Suryawati et al, 2018; Au, 1998). The specific objectives are to form a literacy culture in the school environment, increase literate school members, improve knowledge management in the school through fun child-friendly schools, and become a forum for growing reading strategies, so that learning continuity can always be presented (Jayanti et al, 2019; Suryawati et al, 2018; Au, 1998).

Indeed, there must be supportive stakeholders to provide facilities and opportunities to run the program. Sponsorisa term to refer to those who have a capacity to provide medium and other relevant facilities (Brandt, 2007; Smith, West, & McCarthey, 2020). Hence, school literacy sponsors can be the school headmaster, teachers, or even peers (Septiani, Kristiawan, & Fitriani, 2020). The tasks of school literacy sponsors encompass providing books and other literacy media (e.g. news and magazine), encouraging students to make literacy products, giving opportunity and experience to take up spaces, directing their discussion and sharing habits, and assisting students to do literacy exhibition (Vasilchenko et al, 2017). Such agendas require teacher's good engagement and motivation, thus, the program can attain the aforementioned goals.

To the best of the researchers' knowledge, studies about school literacy have been widely conducted, whereas, few studies deal with school literacy sponsors. For instance, Wirza (2020) conducted a study on school literacy sponsorship by the aim of revealing EFL learners' identity construction. This study was extraneous to the present study due to the fact that Wirza (2020) referred literacy sponsors to any stakeholders including non-governmental agencies. Meanwhile, the present study focuses on the teacher's capability of being the sponsor. Alexander (2017) also examined literacy sponsors in providing service-learning settings in which the focus laid on the field of teaching and learning field, of which it is absolutely different from the present study. In short, due to the limited previous studies, the present study tries to construct literacy sponsors from their engagement and motivation aspects, therefore, this would be the noble of this study.

RESEARCH METHOD

The present study used quantitative approach with cross-sectional survey research design (Battacherjee, 2012). Such survey design was suitable to answer one's construct using appropriate instrument, i.e. questionnaire (Battacherjee, 2012). This study did not appropriate the use of longitudinal survey research design as the current study did not need to reveal one's changeable construct that consequently required more times to examine. There were 170 teachers who taught English at Junior High Schools in Surabaya, East Java Province, Indonesia, involved as the research participants. They voluntarily participated in the studyunder some terms of research concerns, such as the confidentiality. The participants well

represented five regions of Surabaya city, 34 total participants for each region. In other words, there was no region underrepresented. The data were collected using questionnaire appropriating Likert's scaling method with five points (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The questionnaire was developed by adapting Peter Hanon's ORIM Framework and McClelland's achievement motivation theory. The questionnaire was considered valid by three experts and reliable (α= .946). The questionnaire was administered online due to the limitation of social meeting or gathering caused by the high Covid-19 transmission in Surabaya. The obtained data were analyzed using statistical analysis. To know teacher's engagement and motivation, the obtained data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearsonr correlation was undertaken to know the relationship between teacher's engagement and motivation. The leveling method used in the present study employed Swanson's quartile: very low ($<25\%$), low (25% - 50%), high (50% - 75%), and very high ($>75\%$). The data were presented in a form of numbers and supported by interview data as the triangulation. The interview was conducted online via Whatsap Video Call due to the emergence of tremendous Covid-19 pandemic in Surabaya. The interview were conducted with 10 teachers representingfive regions of Surabaya city and those who had very high and very low engagement and motivation as literacy sponsors. The rationales of choosing the maximum and minimum level laid on the absolute contrast of the perspective, so that the data would be varied and more reliable to validate the statistics results. Table 1 depicts the interviewee's eligibility.

Table 1. Interviewee's Eligibility

North Surabaya		South Surabaya		East Surabaya		West Surabaya		Central Surabaya	
Subject	Note	Subject	Note	Subject	Note	Subject	Note	Subject	Note
4	E=VH M=VH	37	E=VH M=VH	70	E=VH M=VH	105	E=VH M=VH	142	E=VH M=VH
16	E=VL M=VL	39	E=VL M=VL	82	E=VL M=VL	133	E=VL M=VL	151	E=VL M=VL

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

At first, it was necessary to portray the demographic data of the study to see the participants' backgrounds. This depiction might help the researchers, also the audiences, to retract the conclusion of the study. Table 2 shows participants' demographic data.

Table 2. Participant's Demographic

Information	Categories	Percentage (%)
Gender	- Male	32.4%
	- Female	67.6%
Education Degree	- Undergraduate	88.8%
	- Master	11.2%
Teaching Experience	- Less than 5 years	10%
	- 5 to 10 years	45.9%
	- 10 to 20 years	29.4%
	- More than 20 years	14.7%
Library Manager	- Yes	98.8%
	- No	1.2%
Literacy Extracurricular	- Yes	95.3%
	- No	4.7%

Information	Categories	Percentage (%)
Literacy Web or Blog	- Yes	25.3%
	- No	74.7%

In accordance with Table 2, the trend showed that the majority of the participants were female with undergraduate degree who had five to ten years of teaching experience. Most of them were involved as school library manager, conducting school literacy program, and literacy extracurricular. However, the majority of them had no literacy website or blog to show off their literacy practices or artefacts.

English Teacher's Engagement and Motivation as Sponsors of Literacy

Descriptive statistics was first carried out to reveal the mean scores of teacher's engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy. To show the robust level depiction of the engagement and motivation, this section showed the mean scores of each engagement (e.g. opportunity, recognition, interaction, and model) and motivation (e.g. affiliation, power, and achievement) sub-skills. Further, the obtained mean scores were transformed using Swanson's leveling method to look at the exact engagement and motivation level. Each mean score of total engagement, total motivation, and every sub-skill was divided by the maximum scores and the results were multiplied with 100% to get Swanson's percentages. The Swanson's percentages were then confirmed into four different categories; very low ($<25\%$), low (25% - 50%), high (50% - 75%), and very high ($>75\%$). Table 3 portrays the results of English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy.

Table 3. English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy in Surabaya Junior High Schools

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Swanson's Percentages	Category/Label
Teacher's Engagement	170	92.57	12.65130	84.15%	Very High
- Opportunity	170	29.14	3.78303	83.26%	Very High
- Recognition	170	21.14	3.07366	84.56%	Very High
- Interaction	170	21.13	3.04395	84.52%	Very High
- Model	170	21.14	3.17665	84.56%	Very High
Teacher's Motivation	170	76.85	7.31025	85.39%	Very High
- Affiliation	170	25.50	2.49556	85%	Very High
- Power	170	25.69	2.62452	85.63%	Very High
- Achievement	170	25.65	2.75231	85.50%	Very High

In accordance with the results depicted in Table 3, English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy were in a very high category with Swanson's percentages of 84.15% and 85.39% respectively. Even the percentage gap was not significant, however, teacher's motivation as sponsors of literacy was higher than their engagement. In other words, regarding the statistical test result, English teachers in Surabaya Junior High Schools were more motivated to be the sponsors of literacy to pursue their affiliation rewards, attain their power at school environment, and obtain various achievements. They were less interested, indeed compared to their motivation, in engaging school literacy practices by looking at their opportunity, recognition, interaction, and modelling.

In addition, there were two interesting finding on teachers' opportunity and their power motivation. Based on the results in Table 3, teachers were less engaged, compared to other sub-skills, in habituating 15-minutes reading, providing printed materials, providing reading books, providing art works, providing audio and audiovisual media, encouraging students to argue, and giving students space to show off their literacy products (Swanson's percentage = 83.26%). On the contrary, they likely aimed at

gaining more power as their motivation of being sponsors of literacy (Swanson's percentage = 85.63%). This unique finding would be addressed in the following details how came teachers less engaged in providing the opportunity for school literacy practices, whereas, they expected of gaining more power.

> "I always try to support my students and habituate them reading a book per day for about 15 minutes. Unfortunately, the resources are limited. So, I decide to only use what is available. It's impossible for me to spend my own." (Interview 5, S 142).

In accordance with the interview conducted with S 142, she realized that the book resources were limited and financial supports to renew the book collection was also still unavailable. The situation compelled her to switch a book for different students. She also did not have significant efforts due to financial self-incapacitation. However, she conveyed efforts to give opportunity and still tried her best to give different reading experience for her students. This showed her very high engagement to give opportunity in succeeding school literacy practices. Moreover, her stagnancy in giving various reading-topic opportunity might make the opportunity aspect in engagement lower than the other three aspects.

In addition, the fact was that S 142 taught English in a school located in Central Surabaya, where lots of literacy accesses were exist. Her school was also more favorable than others as most schools at Central Surabaya were good both in infrastructure and media supports. This condition created further question how her engagement in giving opportunities was still lower than the other engagement aspects. This would be revealed in connection with her motivation doing such practices as literacy sponsors.

> "The most important thing is not how many reading topics we give to the students. It's important to make students read." (Interview 4, 133)

Another similar practices as literacy sponsors were undertaken by S 133. She realized that reading practices, in her case as literacy activities, were indeed unnegotiable. This obligatory literacy practice seemed understood differently by S 133 since she claimed that the most important thing was making students read for about 15 minutes. She, further, added that students did not need various reading topics, even dissimilar media forms. This understanding reflected that she might blame the students' needs of experiencing kinds of reading topics and heterogeneously innovative literacy practices. Such understanding made her get very low level of engagement for her misconception of giving literacy opportunities. In addition, her school was located at the western edge of Surabaya, where the region was the most likely suburban area. This might the rationale of her very low engagement due to various difficulties accessed by suburban schools. Her old age might be another consideration why she looked like a careless teacher in giving various media forms, books, artworks, and letters.

By referring to the two examples of interview data, it was necessary to unravel their motivation, especially on investigating their very-high power motivation.

> "I am one of the youngest English teachers here. Thus, the school considered me that I can accomplish the task. I need to prove to get their trust. Maybe I can get more, here." (Interview 5, S 142)

S 142 considered herself as the youngest English teacher at her school. She was appointed to run school literacy practices by her school with the hope that she could live literacy within the school environment. She accepted the challenges due to the fact that she wanted something more. Eventhough she did not specify the things she wanted to get the most from the school, she might get the trust from the school. Getting trust could be considered as gaining power at her school so that other colleagues would look at her unbelievable performance. Moreover, regardless job promotion, addition working hours, and financial rewards, S 142 aimed to get her power at the school. Therefore, S 142 always tried her

best to give students better literacy opportunities in the midst of financial obstacles to receive revenge from the school.

What had been conducted by S 142 was justified by her colleagues S 16and S 37, where all implied that gaining power was their motivation to deal with different aspects of literacy engagement.

> "Usually, when teachers can accomplish the big task, there would be more promotion and respect. So that I need to do the best." (Interview 1, S 16)

> "The task is my responsibility so that I need to execute it better. This does not only benefit the school but also myself in a form of both financial and nonfinancial reward." (Interview 2, S 37)

Generally, the teachers were considered having a high self-awareness as literacy sponsors where they had to provide opportunity, reward, interaction, and model. Consequently, they manifested their awareness in real actions, which were different realizations between one to another. Their very-high engagement was conveyed by the teachers due to the fact that, mostly, they aimed to gain power as the most influential factor they became the literacy sponsors in their school. This was, moreover, also caused by the fact that being literacy sponsors or members of school literacy task force was exclusive in which they aimed power at the respective school's functional position.

Relationship between English Teacher's Engagement and Motivation as Sponsors of Literacy

The second question of this study aimed at investigating the relationship between teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy in Surabaya Junior High Schools. Therefore, this study used Pearson r correlation to reveal the relationship. This study also conducted Pearson r correlation to reveal the relationship among sub-skills of engagement and motivation. Before undertaking such statistical test, preliminary assumption was performed to ensure no violation of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity by using scatterplot analysis. This study suggested that the data were normal as the scatterplot showed a straight line and a fairly even cigar shape along its length. Moreover, the trend of the plots made a straight line and positive relationship.

Table 4. Relationship between engagement and motivation (aggregate)

Correlation		Total Motivation	Label
Total Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.759*	Statistically significant with positive and large relationship
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	170	

Table 4 explains that there was a strong, positive relationship between two variables, r = .759, N = 170, p< .001, with very high level of teacher's engagement associated with very high level of teacher's motivation. Moreover, this study also investigated the relationship between engagement (e.g. opportunity, recognition, interaction, and model) and motivation (affiliation, power, achievement) sub-skills. Table 5 shows the results of the relationship between the two variables' sub-skills.

Table 5. Relationship between engagement and motivation sub-skills

Correlation		Sub-skill 1 of Motivation (Affiliation)	Sub-skill 2 of Motivation (Power)	Sub-skill 3 of Motivation (Achievement)	Label
Sub-skill 1 of Engagement (Opportunity)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.683* .000 170	.631* .000 170	.662* .000 170	Statistically significant with positive and large relationship
Sub-skill 2 of Engagement (Recognition)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.724* .000 170	.665* .000 170	.716* .000 170	Statistically significant with positive and large relationship
Sub-skill 3 of Engagement (Interaction)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.691* .000 170	.642* .000 170	.672* .000 170	Statistically significant with positive and large relationship
Sub-skill 4 of Engagement (Model)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.704* .000 170	.660* .000 170	.731* .000 170	Statistically significant with positive and large relationship

Table 5 shows that the relationships between engagement and motivation sub-skills were positive and strong. The relationship between engagement sub-skill 4 and sub-skill 3 motivation was the strongest relationship among other relationships (r = .731, N = 170, p< .001) with very high level of model associated with very high level of achievement. By looking at the trend, the relationship between teacher's engagement and motivation, regardless being tested aggregately or each sub-skill, was strong and positive.

To confirm the aggregate statistical test, several teachers were asked their opinions regarding the predictive relationship of engagement and motivation as literacy sponsors. In short, most of the interviewees agreed that the higher the motivation, the higher the engagement. The following interviews conducted with S 142 and S 151 shared similar understanding.

"No option for me. That is my job and I have to be responsible for that. I try to do my best to get the best result of the program objectives. So that, I always feel motivated." (Interview 5, S 142)

"On my opinion, when you have no sincere heart, positive thinking, and good motivation, you will not have good and persistent efforts to do the program and to get good results." (Interview 5, S 151)

S 142 conveyed that she understood that the program assigned to her namely school literacy program was important. She had no reasons to refuse the task as it was part of her job as an English teacher at her school. By the new responsibility, she tried to initiate innovative procedures to attain best program outcomes. She believed that when she did the best, she would get the best result, too. This self-notification seemed to be her general motivation in order to run the program well. Her statement implied that engagement and motivation must positively relate each other. The higher the engagement she did covering providing opportunity, recognition, interaction, and model, the higher her motivation as literacy sponsor. This was statistically evidenced by her very-high level of engagement and motivation. In addition, S 151 had an in-line perspective where she believed in higher

motivation resulting on higher engagement. Uniquely, she, on the contrary, perceived a very-low engagement and motivation even if in the same region with S 142. Her very-low level of engagement and motivation might have no relation with her perspective about the predicting relationship of both variables. Therefore, it was necessary to unravel the factors predicting teacher's engagement and motivation level.

In connection with the case of the strongest relationship between model of engagement and achievement motivation, the teachers were likely to choose to be a model to gain achievement. To succeed the school literacy practice, the teachers constructed an image that they were the best reference for students to imitate the literacy activities. This effort would ease the students to conduct similar activities and achieve the goals of the school literacy program.

> "Yes, if we cannot give the example, how will our students do literacy? If they cannot do, the goal of the program is difficult to attain." (Interview 3, S 70)

In accordance with S 70's opinion, being a teacher was about to be a good role model. In other words, as a good literacy sponsor, she must convey good modelling of conducting literacy activities. She needed to create good visualization so that the students would see and imitate her actions. For instance, she could give an example of scanning and skimming reading strategy. She also believed that such procedure was able to drive the students into a good literacy mastery and habituation, in which finally it would end with a successful literacy performance at the school. Similar idea was also uttered by S 82, a teacher with very-low engagement and motivation working at the similar region to S 70's.

> "It is important to give example first, and then let the students explore the literacy activities. Finally, this determination might give good achievement." (Interview 3, S 82)

In accordance with S 82's opinion, she had a similar idea to S 70's where a good model could direct her and the students to succeed the school's literacy practices. Unfortunately, such idea had not been used by S 82 in a real-life implementation so that she conceived very-low engagement and motivation. Moreover, by the thoughts, she actually knew how to lead the program into a good realization. Unfortunately, she might need more exposures in her self-efficacy in accomplishing the task as literacy sponsors, of which it became a good topic for further research.

Discussion
This study revealed that English teachers' engagement and motivation were in a very high level. They showed a very high practice of opportunity, recognition, interaction, and modelling. Meaning that, these teachers were actively engaged in habituating 15-minutes reading, providing printed materials, providing reading books, providing art works, providing audio and audiovisual media, encouraging students to argue, and giving students space to show off their literacy products. They were also categorized as those who rewarded students' increasing literacy performance, progressive reading habits, initiation in benefitting art works, utilization of audio/audiovisual materials, and braveness in giving opinions. In addition, they were active in interacting with their students such as discussing the given printed materials, school books, art works, audio/audiovisual materials, and any topics related to the specified literacy materials. These teachers involved themselves as modelling how to benefit or use printed materials, school's reading books, art works, audio/audiovisual materials, as well as delivering opinion. There were several previous studies conducted to examine teacher's engagement (Han & Xu, 2021; Ho & Lau, 2018). Ho & Lau (2018) studied how teachers' engagement in providing relevant reading materials so that the students obtained better learning performance. In their study, teachers were highly engaged to providing authentic reading materials for elementary students. Ho & Lau (2018) conducted a study on teacher's engagement in elevating student's literacy skills by giving literacy artefacts as the example, doing literacy exhibition, and providing autonomous literacy learning. The teachers were highly engaged with several literacy activities even if they have

several program challenges. At last, in the field of teachers' engagement level, there were lots of studies on it eventhough they had not dealt with literacy due to very limited studies on revealing teacher's engagement as literacy sponsor.

In connection with the present study, the teachers' motivation to be the sponsors of literacy was as great as their engagement level. They were motivated to be involved in implementing school literacy programs, providing literacy facilities, making teacher-student relationship, and giving a modelhow to perform school literacy. Also, they were eager to provide literacy competition atmosphere, show their leadership and management skills, encourage their students' literacy skills, and enforce their students to use school's literacy facilities. At last, as their achievement motivation, they rewarded the students' good performance, enabled students to read/write, got school's financial rewards, got school's non-financial rewards, and enabled the students to be the next literacy agents. There were several studies showing similar findings with the present study. Bernaus & Gardner (2008) depicted that teachers' motivation was higher in providing reading materials, as part of literacy practice. Han & Yin (2016) also showed that teachers had a high motivation in supporting literacy practice. Due to limited studies on teacher's motivation as literacy sponsors, similar findings on higher teacher's motivation in accommodating student's needs in the other fields of study were widely conducted (Richardson & Watt, 2010; Septiani, Kristiawan, & Fitriani, 2020; Erickson & Wharton-McDonald, 2019; Watt & Richardson, 2013).

In regard to the relationship of teachers' engagement and motivation, the present study suggested that there was a positive and large relationship. Meaning that, when their engagement as the sponsors of literacy was high, their motivation would be high too, and vice versa. Similarly, Galloway (2016) and Saeed and Zyngier (2012)have examined the relationship between workers'engagement and motivation in the context of professional working performance, of which the result showed positive relationship. Further, numbers of researchers have examinedone's motivation and actions in accomplishing working tasks (Kular et.al 2008; Sequeira, Mohanan & Kumar 2012; Masvaure,

Ruggunan & Maharaj 2014). The result showed that one's lower motivation in accomplishing works could be manifested in his less actions to finish the job responsibility. Rabideau (2005) stated that one's higher motivation can be indicated by some relevant actions showing the efforts to achieve the objectives. For instance, when an English teacher is motivated to facilitate digital-based learning activities, he might provide good internet bandwidth, supporting devices, and tutorials related to utilizing numbers of learning media.

In addition, the present study also pointed that the relationship between modelling (as one of engagement sub-skills) and achievement (as one of motivation types) indicated the biggest relationship among other correlation modes. This finding implies that someone with this category normally (1) has a robust motivation to set and attain difficult goals, (2) takes risks to attain their goals, (3) accepts feedbacks on achievements, and (4) frequently loves to work alone. As motivated by achievement, these typical persons would convey significant modelling to support them achieving the desired goals. They thrive on overcoming hard troubles or conditions, so that they can be engaged in modelling way. They also work very efficiently both on their own and with different high achievers.

CONCLUSION

By referring to the present study's findings, English teachers' engagement and motivation as sponsors of literacy in Surabaya Junior High School, Indonesia, are very high. The sub-skills of the engagement are also in a very high category. This means that the teachers are actively engaged and consciously realized the importance of being a facilitator in succeeding school literacy practices. Moreover, their affiliation, power, and achievement motivations are also in a very high category. This implies that the teachers' engagement and motivation have a positive relationship, therefore, when their engagement is high, their motivation will be high too, and vice versa. The results of this study are only relevant to Surabaya Junior High School setting and cannot be generalized in Indonesia context. Hence, this study suggests further research on examining teacher's engagement and

motivation as sponsors of literacy in other cities of Indonesia due to the fact that different geographical locations might produce dissimilar portrayals. Finally, this study is expected to be useful as a reference for Surabaya education service to maximize the school literacy programs, for instance by giving a form of affiliation rewards to the best sponsor practice.

References

1. Ahearn, L., M. (2001). Language and Agency.Annual Review of Anthopology, 30, 109-137.
2. Alexander, K. P. (2017). Reciprocal Literacy Sponsorship in Service-learning Settings. Literacy in Composition Studies, 5(1), 21-48.
3. Atmazaki et.al. (2017). Panduan Gerakan Literasi Nasional. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan
4. Au, K. H. (1998). Social Constructivism and the School Literacy Learning of Students of Diverse Backgrounds. Journal of literacy research, 30(2), 297-319.
5. Barton, D., Hamilton, M., Ivanic, R. (2000). Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context. London: Routledge.
6. Battacherjee, A. (2012). Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices, 2nd edition. Open Access Textbooks. Book 3.
7. Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2008). Teacher Motivation Strategies, Student Perceptions, Student Motivation, and English Achievement. The Modern Language Journal, 92(3), 387-401.
8. Braine, G. (2002). Academic Literacy and the Non-native Speaker Graduate Student. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1(1), 59-68.
9. Brandt, D. (1994). Remembering Reading, Remembering Writing.College Composition and Communication, 45(4), 459-479.
10. Brandt, D. (2007). Sponsors of Literacy. LITERACIES IN CONTEXT, 12.
11. Brandt, D. (2014). Sponsors of Literacy:Writing About Writing, 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St.Martin, 43-61. Print.
12. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Literacy and Intrinsic Motivation. Daedalus, 115-140.
13. Erickson, J. D., & Wharton-McDonald, R. (2019). Fostering autonomous motivation and early literacy skills. The Reading Teacher, 72(4), 475-483.
14. Fakhriyah, F., Masfuah, S., Roysa, M., Rusilowati, A., & Rahayu, E. S. (2017). Student's Science Literacy in the Aspect of Content Science?. Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia, 6(1), 122870.
15. Galloway, S., M. (2016). Motivation or Engagement? What's the Difference?Retrieved from: https://proactsafety.com/articles/motivation-or-engagement-whats-the- difference.
16. Guthrie, J., T. (1996). Educational contexts for engagement in literacy. The Reading Teacher, 49(6), 432.
17. Guthrie, J., T. (2004). Teaching for Literacy Engagement.Journal of Literacy Research, 36(1), 1-30. doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3601_2
18. Han, J., & Yin, H. (2016). Teacher Motivation: Definition, Research Development and Implications for Teachers. Cogent Education, 3(1), 1217819.
19. Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2021). Student Feedback Literacy and Engagement with Feedback: A Case Study of Chinese Undergraduate Students. Teaching in Higher Education, 26(2), 181-196.
20. Hannon, P. 1995. Literacy, Home, and School: Research and Practice in Teaching Literacy with Parents. London: Falmer Press.
21. Ho, E. S. C., & Lau, K. L. (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.
22. Hu, X., Gong, Y., Lai, C., & Leung, F. K. (2018). The Relationship between ICT and Student Literacy in Mathematics, Reading, and Science across 44 Countries: A Multilevel Analysis. Computers & Education, 125, 1-13.
23. Jayanti, M., Dewi, R. M., & Salimi, M. (2019, January). School Literacy Movement through Reading Angle Optimization in Classes to Improve Student Reading Interest. In Social, Humanities, and Educational Studies (SHEs): Conference Series (Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 280-285).

24. Khotimah, K., & Sa'dijah, C. (2018). Pelaksanaan Gerakan Literasi Sekolah. Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan, 3(11), 1488-1498.

25. Kular, Sandep et.al. (2008). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. Working Paper Series No. 19. London: Kingston University.

26. Leki, I. (2000). Writing, Literacy, and Applied Linguistics.Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20, 99-115.

27. Loretto, A. (2015). How Sponsors Influence Students' Writing Practices in An Eight Grade English Language Arts Classroom.Dissertation. Ann Arbor: ProQuest.

28. Low, E. L. (2020). English Language Teacher Education for Multilingual Singapore: Responding to the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Multilingual Education Yearbook, 129-148.

29. Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2007). Leadership: Theory Application, Skill Development (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

30. Masvaure, P., Ruggunan, S., Maharaj, A. (2014). Work Engagement, Intrinsic Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Employees of a Diamond Mining Company in Zimbabwe.Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies. 6 (6),

31. Mayuni, I., Leiliyanti, E., Agustina, N., & Antoro, B. (2020). The Praxis of Literacy Movement in Indonesian Context. KnE Social Sciences, 897-909.

32. Nutbrown C., Hannon P., and Morgan A. 2005. Early Literacy Work Families: Policy, Practice & Research. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

33. Nutbrown, N. (1999). Situated Lives: of Mothers and Literacy.Pedagogy, Culture &Society, 7:1, 175-183.

34. O'Neal, C. R., Goldthrite, A., Weston Riley, L., & Atapattu, R. K. (2018). A Reciprocal, Moderated Mediation Model of Grit, Engagement, and Literacy Achievement among Dual Language Learners. Social Development, 27(3), 665-680.

35. Özdemir, B., & Uyanik, G. K. (2021). Evaluation of a Financial Literacy Program Developed for High School Students. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 11(3), 26-33.

36. Rabideau, S., T. (2005). Effects of Achievement Motivation on Behavior.Retrieved from: http://www.personalityresearch.org/papers/rabideau.html.

37. Retnaningdyah, P., et.al. (2016). Panduan Gerakan Literasi Sekolah di Sekolah Menengah Pertama. Jakarta: DP SMP Dirjen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Kemendikbud.

38. Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M. (2010). Current and Future Directions in Teacher Motivation Research. In The Decade Ahead: Applications and Contexts of Motivation and Achievement. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

39. Routman, R. (2018). Literacy Essentials: Engagement, Excellence, and Equity for All Learners. Stenhouse Publishers.

40. Saeed, S., & Zyngier, D. (2012). How Motivation Influences Student Engagement: A Qualitative Case Study.Journal of Education and Learning, 1 (2), 252-267.DOI: doi:10.5539/jel.v1n2p252.

41. Schlechty, P. C. (2001). Shaking Up the Schoolhouse. San Fransisco, USA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

42. Septiani, S., Kristiawan, M., & Fitriani, Y. (2020). School Literacy Movement, Providing Solution. Education Journal, 3(2), 43-52.

43. Sequeira,A., H., Mohanan, M., Kumar,M., S., S. (2012). Employee Engagement and Motivation: A Case Study.SSRN Electronic Journal.

44. Share, J., & Mamikonyan, T. (2020). Preparing English Teachers with Critical Media Literacy for the Digital Age. Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 20(1), 37-54.

45. Smith, A., West, A. J., & McCarthey, S. J. (2020). Literacies across Sponsorscapes: Mobilising Notions of Literacy Sponsorship. Literacy, 54(2), 22-30.

46. Suryawati, E., Suzanti, F., Suwondo, S., & Yustina, Y. (2018). The Implementation of School-Literacy-Movement: Integrating Scientific Literacy, Characters, and HOTS in

Science Learning. JPBI (Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi Indonesia), 4(3), 215-224.

47. Teguh, M. (2020). Gerakan Literasi Sekolah Dasar. Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Flobamorata, 1(2), 1-9.

48. Turmudi, D. (2020). English Scholarly Publishing Activities in the Industrial Revolution 4.0: What, Why, and How?. English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 3(1), 52-63.

49. UNESCO. (2007). Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

50. Vasilchenko, A., Green, D. P., Qarabash, H., Preston, A., Bartindale, T., &Balaam, M. (2017, June). Media Literacy as a By-product of Collaborative Video Production by CS Students. In Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (pp. 58-63).

51. Watt, H., &Richardson, P. (2013). Teacher Motivation and Student Achievement Outcomes. International Guide to Student Achievement, 271-273.

52. Wirza, Y. (2020). Literacy Sponsorship, Language Ideologies, and Identity Construction of EFL Learners and Users. In Localizing Global English (pp. 125-138). Routledge.

53. Woolfolk, A., & Margetts, K. (2007). Educational Psychology. NSW, Australia: Pearson. Prentice Hall.

54. Wulandari, N., Hendratno, H., & Indarti, T. (2020). Development of Pop-Up Book Media based on Balanced Literacy Approach to Improve Skills of Reading Class 1 Students Basic School. International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 7(5), 619-627.