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ABSTRACT
Technological advances in the digital domain have broadened access to almost every program, allowing children to experience multitask with the media. This condition has been a great opportunity in developing pupils’ better learning. This experimental study is aimed at cultivating 20 fifth graders’ reading habit and develop their English literacy learning using Literature Circles Strategy (LCS) with multicultural materials. The results show that the pupils’ reading habit is significantly developed (mean difference = 10.30; t = 8.837; p<.000) and their literacy learning is enhanced (mean difference = 21.90; t = 16.595; p<.000) as well. Although the mean difference of the pupils’ each literacy sub-skill achievement is significantly higher, in which reading literacy outperforms the others, after the intervention, only productive skills (speaking R.607, R^2.368, p<.050 and writing R.667, R^2.445, p<.021) are influenced significantly by different factors of reading habit. This influence is assumed to be due to the idea that reading habit in this present study is to be cultivated and supposed to be only as the mediator in LCS main focus which is more on productive skills.
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INTRODUCTION
Having avid reading habit from early age seems to be a necessity in this digitization era. It is the behavior which expresses the likeness of reading by sustainably and constantly spending time to read any kinds of reading materials. Children are assumed to be broad minded if they experience more reading, even though in this era, the impact of internet and digital technology make children have little time to read printed sources. Only those who are avid readers will be reading whatever form of sources they can find available. Nowadays, children experience a media-saturated world, from television to Internet and English has become a means for retrieving and acquiring information about the world. Teachers of English as a foreign language should see this condition as a great opportunity for their pupils to develop better learning and to prepare more relevant materials rather than relying only on limited sources. Technological advances in the digital realm have broadened access to almost anything, allowing children to multitask with the media. Therefore, the availability of reading materials may indeed have a certain impact on one’s reading habit (Shen, 2006) including reading in English.

This is in line with The National Languages Strategy (2002, p. 15) which asserts that every child should have the opportunity to study a foreign language and develop his/her interest in the culture of other nations. However, the Progress of International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS, 2006) shows that Indonesia is in the 41st position of the 46 countries. One of the factors that might cause this low progress is probably related to one’s reading attitude and habit itself (Diem, 2012; Diem & Novitasari, 2012) which is respectively still low (Read also Herlianto, 2008).

Furthermore, according to the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) from 2000 to 2009 in terms of international ranking, Indonesia was below average in reading literacy level. In 2000, Indonesia
scored 371, that is, the 39th out of 41 countries. In 2003, it was 382 or the 39th of 40 countries. In 2006, the score was 393 or the 48th out of 56 countries and in 2009 the score was 402 or the 57th out of 65 countries (http://www.scribd.com/doc/62810464/). The 2009 PISA furthermore showed that compared to the average scores of selected countries relative to OECD country average (493), Indonesia is far below the average, while among the East Asian countries which participated in PISA 2009, the highest performance in reading literacy in respective order came from Shanghai-China (556), Korea (539), Hong Kong (533), Singapore (526), and Japan (520) (see The Ministry of Education and Culture Results of PISA 2009 at http://www.minedu.fi/pisa/2009.html?lang=en).

This condition has been very discouraging because English has been formally urged to be even taught as a local content in elementary school beginning from the fourth grade in Indonesia (Depdikbud, 1993). Its aim is to anticipate the needs of communication in the global era (see also Bolster, et al., 2004, p. 35).

According to Constantinescu (2007), this aim could be achieved through reading and vocabulary development. It is good that good readers have rich vocabularies, and similarly, having rich vocabularies will ensure literacy. Palani (2012, p. 94) also states that if teachers can instill and create in children's minds the values of reading, then there is a possibility that they would continue reading with confidence the rest of their life. This will eventually have an impact of one’s literacy achievement. Therefore, being avid readers and being able to construct meaning from various texts can bridge them to be successful learners in the future and reading habit should be cultivated and English as a foreign language should also be learned by Indonesian children living in this era as early as possible but by not neglecting their national language or native tongue.

In line with the above idea, Indonesian Constitution number 20 year 2003 about National Education System, chapter III has long stated that one of the ways to accomplish education goal for all Indonesians is by developing their reading habit and literacy. Hence there must be some efforts to cope with the issue. It is believed that a certain strategy must make a difference. Therefore, in this present study Literacy Circles Strategy (LCS) was assumed to be an appropriate strategy to use to achieve the goal especially in cultivating habit of reading and enhancing literacy achievement of young children.

**Literacy in the Digital Era**

The rapid changes in the information form have resulted in literacy becoming more technologically oriented. In order to help the learners get information needed, they have to increase their new literacy skills including being familiar with digital sources. Blanchard and Moore (2010, p. 14) state “as literacy skills develop, so will skills in digital literacy, especially as young children become more comfortable using digital media as tools.” To attract the students’ interest in reading, this study used multicultural materials which sometimes are used in the form of books, videos, poems, etc and among those kinds of materials digital sources like videos and e-books are more interesting for them. To facilitate the learners to be more engaged with the materials given, LCS was applied in this study. Although the use of LCS are not mainly aimed at seeing the influence of reading habit on every literacy achievement but the reading habit caused by LCS was also analyzed if it also could eventually enhance learners’ English literacy learning.

Lopez-Robertson (1999) and Schlick-Noe and Johnson (1999) mention that LCS is like a structure for getting students to talk about various books/materials they read based on their own choice as opposed to one core, classroom text or book. In this strategy, teachers are encouraged to look for ways to have learners excited about books making connections to the needs of the learners with diverse reading abilities within a classroom. The small group discussion structure of LCS provides a method to meet both of these goals and expands children’s discourse opportunities. In order to make use of LCS in getting children to talk about what they have read and increase their multicultural awareness, this strategy should be supported by relevant various reading materials. Usually children prefer reading culturally conscious and multicultural materials to other kinds of texts. They are more likely to respond favorably to texts which have illustrations and themes which reflect various cultures. By reading these materials, children as readers can get more information about their own cultures and others’ as well (see also Diem, 2011).

Hill (2008, p. 3) states that “literacy is reading, writing, speaking and listening and involves the knowledge and skill required to engage in activities required for effective functioning in the community.” There are wide varieties of language tasks, games and activities focussing on the level of their skill and knowledge as...
the foundations of their growth in literacy. These integrated activities are meant to develop children’s literacy learning and eventually have better literacy achievement. Therefore, this present study was aimed at finding out whether LCS could make a difference in reading habit and literacy achievement of the fifth grade pupils in an underdeveloped school in Palembang.

**Literature Circles Strategy vs. Multicultural Materials**

In LCS, small groupings of different cultural backgrounds are emphasized. To make them cooperative in learning, the pupils are provided with relevant multicultural reading materials starting from what they are familiar with, which they may identify and relate to their own cultures, backgrounds and present lives, to which are of their common interest.

Multicultural materials here include stories of people from several different races, religions, languages, and national or world traditions. Because this study focused on the use of reading materials, we decided to use multiple genres that contain texts about various different backgrounds. Martinez-Roldan and Lopez-Robertson (1999) found that young children were able to have rich discussions if they had regular opportunities to engage with various materials. Moreover, Ogranovitch and Miller (2001) also said that having pupils become actively engaged in reading is not effective without the help of their peers. It is believed that the chance to interact and collaborate with peers becomes a special motivation for all pupils in this present study to read more often.

**Reading Habit**

Celce-Murcia (2001, p. 154) explained that reading is an interactive, socio-cognitive process involving a text, a reader, and a social context within which the activity of reading takes place. While readers’ expectation and intent is to make meaning or comprehend what they read, habit of reading is the center point among knowledge, skill, and desire. Therefore, Tella (2007) defines reading habit as the behavior which expresses the likeness of reading of individual types of reading. If the habit of reading is formed during an early age, reading soon becomes the person’s hobby. In other words, it is very important to inculcate the habit of reading right from childhood.

Reading during the early years helps children in improving their other language skills (Oak, 2008) because “someone’s reading habit is best formed at a young impressionable age in school, but once formed, it can last one’s life” (see Tella, 2007, p. 118). Furthermore, reading will become people’s habit if they always spend their time reading any kinds of reading materials routinely and continuously.

There are some reasons for the readers to read. They want to get new knowledge, update their information, and or for pleasure. Young learners usually tend to read for pleasure. Therefore, in this study we provided 140 interesting and relevant reading materials in order to attract children’s reading interest. We believed that when they were interested in those materials, it would be easy for us to promote reading habit in their daily life.

**Literacy Achievement**

Being literate is more than being able to read the printed or non-printed texts; it is about communication and understanding (Mascle, 2006). Literacy, therefore, comprises not only language skills but also a number of language components, including phonological awareness, decoding, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Mastering all of these aspects is necessary for pupils to become professionally literate because literacy involves a continuum of learning that enables an individual to achieve his or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society in a balanced way.

There are many basic teaching methods for either beginning or experienced teachers that focus on providing balanced literacy instruction. To develop literacy programs, the children are encouraged to read aloud to other children daily, to engage in shared reading and writing activities, and to set aside plenty of time to read books on their own. Furthermore, literacy environment should also be emphasized in a learner-centered manner (Horst, 2003) with a series of direct facilitation and independent activities. This environment will give children the chance to construct meaning, practice language and digital skills, through viewing and representing what they experience in more thoughtful, critical ways (Pitton, 2005), and promote learning for enjoyment and enthusiasm by harnessing the social networks which exist within the peer group (Alan et al., 2005, p. 3). Therefore, relatively free flowing and expressive talks in which pupils articulate both literary and affective responses to their reading must be encouraged. According to Peralta-Nash and Dutch (2000)
these activities contribute to a richer understanding both of the text the pupils are reading and of themselves as readers in which they are able to make use of the linguistic resources and knowledge they possess in order to make sense of the text, to relate it to their life experience, and to participate in the group discussion in meaningful and functional ways.

METHODOLOGY
Design of the Study
In conducting this present study, a pretest-posttest without control group design was used. The pupils experienced the intervention using Literature Circles Strategy (LCS) with multicultural materials. They were observed before and after the intervention. To find out the prior reading habit and literacy achievement of the sample, a reading habit questionnaire and a literacy test were given. Then, based on the results of those pretests, they were taught using LCS with multiple genres of multicultural materials. The children were grouped and read books of their own choice and shared what they had just read in the groups by doing various activities. The intervention was done intensively for 32 meetings, each of which consisted of two times 40 minutes. After the intervention was completed, the pupils were also given a post-observation in the form of a literacy test and a reading habit questionnaire to see the progress of their learning during the study.

Population and Sample
The population of this study was all the 76 fifth grade pupils of one underprivileged state elementary school in Palembang. The entire population was firstly pre-tested using the sight words test and a reading comprehension test to select for the sample which had the same level of reading ability. The results of the two tests showed that most of the pupils were in very poor level whose score ranging from 30 to 38 from which we took 20 of them randomly (10 boys and 10 girls) for the sample.

Literacy Instruction
In developing the literacy programs, the children in this present study were encouraged to read aloud daily, to engage in shared reading and writing activities, and to set aside plenty of time to read books on their own for pleasure. Furthermore, literacy environment that we facilitated was a series of direct instruction and independent activities that gave children the chance to construct meaning and practice to build their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills by viewing and presenting. We encouraged relatively free flowing expressive talk, in which pupils articulated both literary and affective responses to their reading. These contribute to a richer understanding both of the texts they were reading and of themselves as readers. Therefore, in selecting the materials, we had to use interesting themes for young learners.

Adapting Daniels (1994), practically the key features of LCS applied in this study are as follows.

- Pupils chose their own reading materials.
- Small temporary groups were formed, based upon book choice.
- Different groups read different books.
- Groups met on a regular, predictable schedule to discuss their reading.
- Pupils used written or drawn notes to guide both their reading and discussion.
- Discussion topics come from the pupils.
- Group meetings aimed to be open, natural conversations about books, so personal connections, digressions, and open-ended questions were welcome.
- The researchers/teachers served as facilitators, not group members or instructors.
- Evaluation was done by researchers/teachers’ observation and pupil self-evaluation.
- A spirit of playfulness and fun pervaded the room.
- When books were finished, pupils shared their reading with their classmates, and then new groups were formed around new reading choices.

The main focused activity in this present study was discussion. Within the small groups, the pupils discussed, responded, and reflected on their reading. According to Schlick-Noe and Johnson (1999) a literature circle comprised reader-response criticism, independent reading, and student-centered. It provided
an opportunity for pupils to control their own learning, to share thoughts, to concern and understand the events of the materials that they read. Therefore, we guided the sample to a deeper understanding of what they read so that it allowed them to become critical thinkers as well. The aim of using this strategy was to encourage pupil-choice and a love of reading in these young people. The true intent of using this LCS was to allow English learners to practice and develop the skills and strategies of good readers (read DaLie, 2001). In addition, we also emphasized the use of collaborative learning among the learners to see whether it would result in a positive effect on pupils’ learning performance and improvement of their comprehension of content-knowledge as well. Therefore, based on the discussion above, we hypothesized that the combination of multicultural materials and LCS would not only inculcate reading habit but also improve literacy skill.

The teaching and learning procedures in the intervention were: (1) (researchers/teachers) showing the materials (children’s books, poems, videos, etc.) and giving brief explanation to motivate the children to read; (2) (pupils) selecting own reading materials by themselves; (3) (we) dividing children into small groups of 4 to 5 each based on the topics of the materials chosen; (4) (pupils) reading together within the group; (5) (pupils) talking about reading materials with friends during reading the materials; (6) (pupils) sharing after reading the materials through presentations, reviews, dramatizations, book chats, or other media; (7) (pupils) taking part in the discussion; (8) (we) concluding or giving comments about what had been discussed.

Techniques for Collecting the Data

**Literacy Achievement Test**

The literacy test given to the sample of this study, as has been mentioned above, was done twice, at the beginning and at the end of the study. Since literacy includes all language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—then all the four sub literacy skills were pretested and measured. We used Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) (see Burns & Roe, 1985) for the receptive skills. Before the pretest, the pupils were firstly given the *sight words test* to see their appropriate reading level. We assumed that the pupils were in level 2. Therefore, we gave them 100 words to be pronounced. Those words were in 5 levels: primer level, level 1, level 2, level 3 and level 4. Each level consisted of 20 words. While the pupils were pronouncing those words, we recorded them. The highest level at which the pupils know all of the words on the list should be the starting point for administration of the passage for reading comprehension. The results showed that their reading level was in level 2. Therefore, the passages used for reading and listening tests started from two levels below level 2 to two levels above the level. Thus the levels of the tests were Primer level, Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4.

For conducting the *reading test*, we also used the passages excerpted from Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) (Burns & Roe, 1985). This test was in multiple choice forms which consisted of five passages with 31 questions. The questions are of detail, sequence, main idea, compare and contrast, inference, and theme. For conducting the *listening test*, we gave the pupils questions in the form of multiple choices which consisted of five passages and 30 questions. Each question has four options (A, B, C, D). The passages were read aloud and the pupils answered it directly on the answer sheet. Meanwhile, the *speaking test* was conducted in the form of one to two minute talk. The pupils talked about their personal data (name, age, parents, siblings, address, etc.) during the test and were recorded. For the *writing test*, we asked the pupils to write a short paragraph also about themselves.

**Reading Habit Questionnaire**

To measure the pupils’ *reading habit*, we used the questionnaire of Reading Interest Survey (Hill, 2006 in Hill, 2008, pp. 388-389). This questionnaire was factor analyzed and it consisted of three factors. It was translated into Indonesian in order to make it easier for the pupils to answer.

**Reliability and Validity of the Instruments**

To find out the reliability and the validity of the instruments, the reading comprehension test, the listening test, and the questionnaire were tried out to 40 pupils of another school. There were 31 items for reading comprehension test and 30 items for listening comprehension test and all of the items were valid. The reliability coefficients of *listening test* was 0.81, of *reading test* was 0.88, and of the *reading habit questionnaire* was 0.74. Based on factor analysis the reliability of each factor of the reading habit is as
follows: (1) RH--Reading Practice/Experience was 0.74, (2) RH--Interest of Reading Resources was 0.71, and (3) RH--Accessibility of Information was 0.75. For speaking and writing tests, interrater reliability was used. The data were taken after the pupils took the test. The pupils’ performance on these productive skills literacy was rated by two raters. Based on the calculation, the reliability coefficient of speaking test was 0.87 and of writing test was 0.76.

To score the pupils’ speaking achievement, we used a speaking rating scale which covered pronunciation, loudness, rate, and word usage and to score the pupils’ writing achievement, we used a writing rating scale which covered ideas, organization, language, and mechanics. The scoring system as suggested by Hill (2008, p. 292) is as follows: 1 never, 2 sometimes, 3 half the times, 4 mostly, and 5 always. Thus the maximum possible total score for each of the productive skills is 20 (100%) and the lowest possible is 5 (20%). For the purpose of the description of the pupil’s achievement, the obtained data were categorized into 5 categories: 86 – 100 (excellent); 71 – 85 (good); 56 – 70 (average); 41 – 55 (poor); ≤ 40 (failed) (Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Manual, Sriwijaya University (Buku Pedoman FKIP UNSRI), 2004, p. 26)

RESULTS
Score Distribution of Pupils’ Literacy Skill
The results of the pretest and posttest of literacy total (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and reading habit questionnaire will be discussed below. Table 1 shows the achievement of literacy total of the pupils. The pre-test shows that there are 6 pupils (30%) in very poor category, 12 pupils (60%) in poor category, 2 pupils (10%) in average category, and none (0%) in good or excellent category. However, the post-test scores show a significant progress. Although there is still no student in excellent category, yet there is no pupil in very poor category. Instead there is only 1 pupil (5%) in poor category, 12 pupils (60%) are in average category, and 7 pupils (35%) are in good category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score Distribution of Pupils’ Reading Habit
The results of the pupils’ reading habit are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Distribution of Pre-Test and Post-Test Raw Scores of Reading Habit Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It shows that there is no pupil (0%) in a very poor category or an excellent category. Only 1 pupil (5%) is in poor category, 13 pupils (65%) are in average category, and 6 pupils (30%) are in good category. However, in the post-test, the results show that there are 12 pupils (60%) in good category and the rests (40%) are in average category. This means that there is no one either in very poor, poor, or excellent category.

**Statistical Analyses**

There were two statistical analyses used: (1) paired samples t-test to see the progress of both pupils’ reading habit and literacy achievements, and (2) Pearson product moment to see the correlation coefficient between the means of both the students’ reading habit and that of their literacy achievements followed by regression analysis between the two to see the influence of reading habit on literacy achievements.

**T-Test Analysis**

Table 3 shows that the mean of the post-test in each variable significantly increased. The literacy achievement increased from 44, 80 in the pretest into 66, 70 in the posttest. The most significant increase among those four skills was in reading skill. It increased for 37, 20 points. The mean of reading pretest was 22, 50 and in the posttest was 59, 70. Both speaking and listening increased for 17 points. In speaking pretest, the mean of this group was 56, 65 and for the posttest it increased into 73, 95. For listening, the mean of the pretest was 39, 35 while in the posttest it was 56, 60. The mean of writing pretest was 60, 20 and the posttest 76, 20. The mean of reading habit of this group increased from 64, 55 to 74, 85. Based on the paired samples t-test it was found out that there is a significant difference between the pupils’ achievement between the means of the pre-test and post-test. Table 3 also shows that the value of $t_{count}$ of literacy test total and its subskills and reading habit were higher than that of the $t_{table}$ 2.093 at the $p<0.000$ level of significance with df = 19. For literacy total the value of $t_{count}$ is 16, 595, listening is 9, 566, speaking is 7,280, reading is 24,456, and writing is 6,178. For the reading habit, the value of the $t_{count}$ is 8,37.

**Regression Analysis**

Based on the result of the regression analysis, it is found that there is a correlation between the pupils’ reading habit (R .165) and their literacy achievement total but there is no significant influence of reading habit on the literacy total (R² .027). When reading habit was correlated with each of the literacy sub-skills then it is found only speaking (R .607, R² .368, p<.05) and writing (R .667, R² .445, p<.02) subskills were influenced by the pupils’ reading habit. The other two subskills were not influenced by the reading habit total. (for the listening, R .457, R² .209, p<.276; and for reading literacy the R .454, R² .206, p<.283). To be clear, see Table 4.

**Table 3. Summary Statistics of Pupils’ Literacy Total and Its Each Sub-skill Achievement and Reading Habit based on Paired Sample T-test (N= 20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>T-value Pre Post-test</th>
<th>Mean Difference Pre and Post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Literacy Total</td>
<td>44, 80</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>66,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Listening</td>
<td>39,35</td>
<td>8,798</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>56,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Speaking</td>
<td>56,65</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>73,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reading</td>
<td>22,50</td>
<td>7,871</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>59,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Writing</td>
<td>60,50</td>
<td>7,164</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>76,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading Habit Total</td>
<td>64,55</td>
<td>6,947</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>74,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 Summary Statistics for Correlation and Influence of Reading Habit and Literacy of Its Literacy Sub-skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>P&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Habit</td>
<td>Literacy Total</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.276 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.283 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.021**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * significant at 0.05 level of significance  
** significant at 0.02 level of significance

When we looked at the correlation and contribution of each factor of reading habit to each literacy skill, then each of the three factors of reading habit also has correlation with only two sub-skills—speaking and writing. Speaking was influenced by Factor 2 (R .440, R² .194, p<.052) and Factor 3 (R .450, R² .203, p< .046) while writing was influenced by factor 1 (R .444, R² .197, p<.05) and factor 2 (R .485, R² .235, p<.03). See also Table 5 below.

### Table 5 Correlation and Regression Analysis between Reading Habit Factor and Literacy Sub-skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH 1: Reading Practice/Experience</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 2: Interest of Reading Resource</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 3: Access of Inform</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

That every variable has a significant increase in the means shows that Literature Circles Strategy is one of the effective strategies in cultivating pupils’ reading habit and enhancing their literacy learning regardless their coming from underdeveloped school environment. By using this strategy, the pupils in this present study became more active and very eager to learn and seemed to have so much fun that finally made them more confident and cooperative with one another during the process of teaching and learning. The strategy is also proven to be interactive, in that during or after experiencing English language lessons, the pupils could gradually express their minds by giving opinions and or asking one another during the discussion about the content of the materials covering various cultures. In this present study, this condition has been justified by the significant influence of the pupils’ reading habit on their speaking and writing skills in which prior to the presentation or the talking, they first of all discussed the texts with their peers in the group and made an outline what to talk about or present later on.

In this study, pupils’ literature circles were supported by multicultural materials. Because the pupils were surrounded by selective reading materials, these materials had attracted them to read to learn. The function of the materials is as a mediating device for having smooth discussions about them in a relaxed manner in addition to having cultural knowledge, not only about their own culture but also others’. That the posttest results show that among those four literacy sub-skills, pupils’ reading achievement exceeded those of the other skills’ has proven that this Literacy Circles Strategy with the use of multicultural materials could enhance the pupils’ interest towards reading and literacy as well. There must have some reasons for this fact. First, the pupils were curious and enthusiastic in learning and reading about cultures. Most of the pupils said that they could get more new information and know about the
world outside their own through reading multicultural materials in various forms (short stories, children’s books either printed or non-printed, poems, games, songs, and videos) that we provided during the study (140 reading materials).

The reasons above are assumed to have given an effect on the readers’ reading habit and comprehension. Whether they were aware or not, the use of this strategy and their reading practice or language experiences had resulted in their reading not only for the EFL learning but also for the content of other disciplines.

Furthermore, the result of the reading habit questionnaire has also shown that one of the factors of their reading habit progress, that is they always found interesting materials to read and when they did they did not want to stop. It is proved that before the intervention there were only 15% of the pupils who said that they would read if the materials were interesting; but after the intervention, 70% of them admitted that they would very much do so if the reading materials are available and of their interest. This finding is in line with what was found by Diem (2012) that the students would visit the library to read if the school provides enough interesting and current collections. This means that the availability of interesting and relevant materials have appealed to the learners’ reading habit. This eventually has an impact on their productive skills in that in the academic field someone cannot write or speak without reading.

CONCLUSION
Creating enjoyment, pleasure, and enthusiasm with the use of interesting multicultural materials in teaching English to young learners (TEYL) has proved to be quite effective in inculcating pupils’ reading habit and enhancing their literacy achievement. It is, therefore, concluded that Literature Circles Strategy (LCS) could create such conditions. It can not only motivate the children to do the reading activities for writing and speaking but also promote love of reading in their daily life in the future. The teachers of English and the schools should therefore be creative to enhance better learning by providing more relevant instructional materials based on pupils’ needs either in the form of printed or non-printed texts. To make the pupils involved with the discussion to promote productive skills, the teachers have to have several techniques related to Literature Circles Strategy that can stimulate and attract the pupils to participate more by having various interesting topics to discuss and facilitating them with constructive feedbacks.
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