

MULTILITERACIES IN THE LITERATURE CLASSROOM: LITERATURE CIRCLES, CREATIVE WRITING, AND LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN AN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE CLASS

Dwi Firli Ashari

Singapore School, Pantai Indah Kapuk, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: dwi.firli@gmail.com

Paper History

Received: 21 July 2025

Revised: 25 May 2026

Accepted: 23 June 2026

Abstract: Twenty-first-century language education aims to develop competencies such as critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity, and the pedagogy of multiliteracies offers a principled way of pursuing them: it treats reading and writing as active, multimodal meaning-making rather than as the reception of fixed content. Much less is known, however, about how secondary students perceive multiliteracies-based literary activities, particularly in international-school settings where Indonesian is learned as a second or additional language, and about whether they associate such activities with the strategy use and autonomy the framework is intended to promote. To address this gap, the study examined the perceptions and responses of 18 students in the Grade 11 Indonesian B class at Singapore School, Pantai Indah Kapuk, toward two multiliteracies activities, literature circles and creative written assignments, using an adapted Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and semi-structured interviews; questionnaire responses were examined for patterns across the six SILL strategy categories and interview data were coded thematically. Students reported drawing on cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies as they worked with literary texts, and they associated the two activities with more deliberate reading, greater independence in preparation, and richer collaborative discussion, while also reporting difficulty in articulating their ideas and in interpreting Indonesian texts. These findings indicate that multiliteracies-based literary activities can support learner autonomy and selected twenty-first-century competencies in a second-language classroom when the activities are adequately scaffolded, and they suggest a more deliberate role for creative writing as well as the value of pairing students' perceptions with longer-term evidence of their reading and writing.

Keywords: *21st century skills, creative writing, learner autonomy, literature circles, multiliteracies pedagogy*

INTRODUCTION

Along with rapid technological developments in the twenty-first century, the paradigm of learning has shifted significantly, redefining the roles of both teachers and students. This shift extends to language learning, including Indonesian language education, emphasising the importance of preparing students for life beyond the classroom (Chia, 2007; Benson, 2001). In this context, students are expected to actively engage in their learning processes rather than passively receiving information from teachers. Therefore, fostering learner

autonomy becomes essential, enabling students to independently shape and direct their own learning pathways.

This study situates that shift within the pedagogy of multiliteracies, a framework introduced by the New London Group (1996) in response to two developments: the growing linguistic and cultural diversity of classrooms, and the proliferation of communication channels and modes beyond written prose. Cope and Kalantzis (2009) describe multiliteracies as an approach in which learners make meaning across linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and spatial modes, and in which reading and writing are treated as acts of design rather than the reception of fixed content. Within this view, literature instruction becomes an occasion for students to interpret, discuss, and remake texts using a range of semiotic resources, an orientation that aligns with the competencies twenty-first-century language education seeks to develop (Anstey & Bull, 2006; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2009).

This orientation differs in concrete ways from the teacher-centred instruction that has long characterised language and literature classrooms in Indonesia and elsewhere in the region (Dardjowidjojo, 2003). In a teacher-centred model, the teacher is positioned as the principal source of knowledge, a text is read for a single authorised interpretation, and students are receivers whose task is to reproduce that interpretation. A multiliteracies approach redistributes these roles. Following the four components proposed by the New London Group (1996), instruction begins from students' own experience and prior knowledge (situated practice), introduces the concepts and metalanguage needed to analyse texts (overt instruction), invites students to examine the social and cultural purposes of those texts (critical framing), and asks them to apply their understanding in new productions of their own (transformed practice). The teacher functions as a designer of learning experiences and a facilitator of discussion rather than the sole interpreter, and students take a correspondingly more active and self-directed part in making meaning.

Learner autonomy, as promoted in contemporary educational practices, represents an advanced level of learning compared to traditional, teacher-centred methods. Effective implementation of learner autonomy is associated with improvements in the quality of education for teachers, students, and the learning process itself. Grima (2007), Cotterall (1995), and Palfreyman (2003), as cited in Borg and Al-Busaidi (2012), explain that learner autonomy significantly affects language learning quality by making students more independent in collaborative settings, better equipped for lifelong learning, more empathetic toward others, and more capable of taking up learning opportunities.

Within a multiliteracies framework, this autonomy is not pursued in isolation but through structured, collaborative activities in which students gradually assume responsibility for selecting texts, preparing their contributions, and evaluating their own learning. One way of designing such activities is to integrate literary study with multiliteracies principles. Traditional methods of literature instruction often led to limited student engagement; Hermarita (2018) notes that many students show little interest in literary activities at school, largely because instruction frequently relies on passive, teacher-directed reading and interpretation. Incorporating multiliteracies activities is therefore one means of fostering more active, student-centred literary learning.

Designing engaging literary learning matters because of the role literature plays in students' personal and academic growth. Literature helps students cultivate sensitivity, creativity, and

critical perspectives. Imron (2007) highlights the often-overlooked function of literature in fostering cultural appreciation, and Lazar (1993, as cited in Imron, 2007) identifies literature's capacity to stimulate self-expression, develop emotional and intellectual competencies, and support language acquisition. Imron (2007) further groups literature's functions into psychological, ideological, educative, moral, and cultural dimensions. Realising these outcomes, however, requires active student participation rather than passive reception.

Although multiliteracies pedagogy has attracted growing attention in Indonesian education, existing work has tended to focus on English-language and writing instruction rather than on the teaching of Indonesian literature (see, e.g., Nabhan, 2019). Comparatively little research has examined multiliteracies-based literary activities in the teaching of Indonesian itself, and fewer studies still have considered the international-school context, where Indonesian is frequently learned as a second or additional language by linguistically diverse students. How such students perceive and respond to multiliteracies activities, and whether they associate these activities with the strategy use and autonomy the framework is intended to promote, remains underexplored. The present study addresses this gap by documenting students' perceptions and responses in a Grade 11 Indonesian B class in which literature circles and creative written assignments served as the principal multiliteracies activities.

Accordingly, the study is guided by two questions. First, how do students of Grade XI B Indonesian language class perceive their use of language learning strategies after participating in literature circles and creative written assignments? Second, how do these students perceive the contribution of these activities to their autonomy, engagement, and collaboration in learning literature? The study is qualitative and interpretive in design, and its findings are intended to inform the wider use of multiliteracies activities in second-language and international-school settings.

The Multiliteracies Framework

The term "multiliteracies" was coined by the New London Group (1996) in a manifesto published in the *Harvard Educational Review*. The group argued that a conception of literacy limited to reading and writing standard prose no longer matched the conditions in which young people communicate. Two arguments anchored the proposal. The first concerned the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity of classrooms and societies, which makes a single standard form of literacy insufficient. The second concerned the growing range of modes through which meaning is made, including image, sound, gesture, and spatial arrangement, especially in digital environments (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000).

Central to the framework is the notion of meaning-making as design. Learners draw on available designs (existing conventions and resources), engage in the work of designing, and produce the redesigned, a transformed text that also transforms the designer (New London Group, 1996). Meaning is understood to be distributed across six design elements: linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and spatial meanings, together with the multimodal patterns that relate them. Literary texts, and the responses students make to them, can therefore be treated as multimodal designs rather than as fixed objects to be decoded.

The framework translates this view into four pedagogical components. Situated practice grounds learning in students' lifeworld experience and prior knowledge. Overt instruction

equips students with an explicit metalanguage for analysing how texts work. Critical framing leads students to interpret the social and cultural context and purpose of texts. Transformed practice asks students to apply and recreate meaning in new contexts of their own (New London Group, 1996; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). These components are not strictly sequential; they describe complementary kinds of work that a well-designed activity can move among.

The competencies the framework cultivates correspond closely to what is commonly called twenty-first-century skills, in particular the four Cs of critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2009). Anstey and Bull (2006) argue that a multiliterate learner is flexible, strategic, and able to interpret and produce texts across modes and contexts. This is the sense in which the present study treats literature circles and creative written assignments as multiliteracies activities: the former emphasises collaborative interpretation and critical framing, while the latter emphasises transformed practice through students' own multimodal production.

Learner Autonomy

The concept of learner autonomy emerged prominently in the 1960s, as highlighted by Gremmo and Riley (1995). Initially arising from movements for minority rights and evolving paradigms in educational philosophy, learner autonomy also responded to the limitations of behaviourism, the growing influence of linguistic pragmatism, expanding educational access, increasing globalisation, commercialisation in language education, and technological advancements in educational tools. The concept gained significant traction in language learning contexts by the early 2000s, defined as the ability to take charge of one's own learning by Holec (1981, as cited in Gardner, 2011).

Pearson (2004, as cited in Noviana, 2020) describes learner autonomy as the capability of students to set personal developmental goals. Autonomous learners do not merely rely on classroom instruction; they independently establish and manage learning objectives as part of their daily routines. This approach encourages students to engage proactively by formulating questions and relating their personal experiences to classroom content (Chusanachoti, 2009).

Implementing learner autonomy may encounter challenges, such as confusion among students when conducting tasks independently outside the classroom. Thanasoulas (2000) suggests mitigating such issues through clear guidelines, structured instructions, and scaffolding provided by teachers, particularly in complex, group-orientated activities. Over time, out-of-class activities become habitual, fostering continuous learning and helping students grow more confident in their abilities.

Despite these challenges, promoting learner autonomy benefits students academically and personally. Noviana (2020) argues that autonomy enhances students' independence and makes them more conscious of learning's intrinsic value when encountering new information. Neupane (2010) clarifies that autonomy does not eliminate teacher assistance; rather, it encourages independent exploration alongside continuous teacher and peer engagement through active questioning and dialogue. Such interactions support two-way communication and promote knowledge exchange among students rather than teacher-centred dissemination alone.

Benson (2001) emphasises that autonomy is developed progressively, through sustained effort and habitual practice, and that it shapes students' learning methods, styles, and goals. Read through the multiliteracies framework, this gradual assumption of responsibility maps onto the movement from situated and overtly instructed practice toward critical framing and transformed practice, in which students increasingly direct their own meaning-making (New London Group, 1996).

Literature Circles and Creative Writing

Literature circles are small, structured discussion groups led by student participants. A group collaboratively selects reading material such as short stories, poems, or articles, and although the activity traditionally centres on literary texts, Daniels (2002) notes its adaptability to non-literary material, including articles, infographics, videos, and academic texts. Each member shares responsibility for reading the agreed material and preparing points for regular discussion sessions.

Daniels (1994) outlines a sequence for implementation: selecting suitable reading material, forming groups, scheduling regular discussions, and assigning roles such as discussion leader, character analyser, literary illuminator, vocabulary enhancer, and illustrator. Role-specific worksheets guide preparation, and the teacher acts primarily as a facilitator who evaluates progress through observation and through students' self-assessment. Daniels (2002) frames eleven "key ingredients", including temporary, choice-based groups, regular meetings, student-generated discussion topics, and a teacher-as-facilitator stance, that distinguish literature circles from teacher-led reading lessons.

These features can be read directly through the four multiliteracies components. The freedom to choose texts and connect them to personal experience enacts situated practice; the explicit roles and their accompanying metalanguage of analysis enact overt instruction; the interpretive discussion of a text's meaning and purpose enacts critical framing; and, when students respond to their reading through their own writing, they enact transformed practice (New London Group, 1996; Daniels, 2002). The rotation of roles also distributes the planning, monitoring, and evaluating functions that Benson (2001) associates with autonomy.

The creative written assignments examined alongside literature circles in this study extend the same logic into students' own production. Asking students to respond to a literary text by composing a new piece, for example, a continuation, a reimagined scene, a poem, or a multimodal text combining writing with image, positions them as designers who recombine available linguistic and visual resources into a redesigned work (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). Creative writing of this kind is the clearest classroom expression of transformed practice, and it complements the interpretive emphasis of the discussion groups.

METHODS

Research Design

The study adopts a qualitative case-study design focused on a single class, aimed at understanding how students perceive and respond to multiliteracies-based literary activities

rather than at measuring causal effects. It draws on two complementary sources of perception data: a strategy self-report questionnaire that surfaces students' reported use of language learning strategies and semi-structured interviews that explore their experience of literature circles in greater depth. Both sources were analysed qualitatively, the questionnaire for overall patterns of reported strategy use and the interviews through thematic coding.

Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in the Indonesian B programme at Singapore School, Pantai Indah Kapuk, an international school in Jakarta, where Indonesian is studied as a second or additional language by a linguistically diverse cohort. The participants were the 18 students enrolled in the researcher's Grade 11 Indonesian B class, all of whom took part in the literature circles and creative written assignments as part of regular instruction and completed the questionnaire. Nine of the 18 students subsequently took part in individual semi-structured interviews, and all of them gave their consent to be interviewed.

Instruments

Two instruments were used. The first was an adapted form of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), here adapted for Indonesian second-language learners (cf. Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; Benson, 2001). Students responded to 50 items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or almost never true of me) to 5 (always or almost always true of me). The 50 items correspond to Oxford's six strategy categories, reflected in the six parts of the questionnaire: memory strategies (Part A, items 1–9), cognitive strategies (Part B, items 10–23), compensation strategies (Part C, items 24–29), metacognitive strategies (Part D, items 30–38), affective strategies (Part E, items 39–44), and social strategies (Part F, items 45–50); the first three are direct strategies and the latter three are indirect strategies (Oxford, 1990). Naming these categories explicitly allows the questionnaire findings to be interpreted against an established taxonomy rather than reported part by part.

The second instrument was a set of semi-structured interview questions. Drawing on O'Malley and Chamot's and Oxford's accounts of language-learning strategies (as cited in Benson, 2001), the questions probed changes in students' metacognitive, affective, and social strategies arising from participation in literature circles, and invited students to describe how they prepared for, took part in, and reflected on the activity. The full interview protocol appears in Appendix 2.

Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaire was administered in class after students had completed the literature-circle and creative-writing unit, and the interviews were conducted individually with the nine volunteers shortly afterwards. The interview responses were transcribed for analysis. Consistent with the qualitative design, questionnaire responses were examined for overall patterns of reported strategy use across the six SILL categories rather than subjected to statistical testing, given the descriptive aims of the study and the size of the class. The interview transcripts were read closely, coded, and grouped into recurring themes relating to students' perceptions of the activity, their preparation, their participation, their use of

feedback, and the difficulties they encountered. Themes were derived inductively from repeated readings of the transcripts.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Students' Reported Language Learning Strategies (Questionnaire)

Across the six SILL categories, students' responses pointed to consistent engagement with cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies as they worked with literary texts, alongside more selective use of memory and affective strategies. Table 1 summarises the categories, the strategies students reported drawing on, and their connection to the multiliteracies framework; the paragraphs that follow interpret each category in turn.

Table 1. Students' Reported Language Learning Strategies by SILL Category and Their Connection to the Multiliteracies Framework.

SILL category	Strategies students reported drawing on	Connection to multiliteracies and autonomy
Memory (Part A)	Linking new vocabulary to prior knowledge; remembering words through context and the places they were encountered	Situated practice: meaning anchored in students' own experience
Cognitive (Part B)	Practising with proficient speakers; reading beyond set texts; writing notes, messages, and reports	Transformed practice: producing as well as interpreting texts
Compensation (Part C)	Inferring meaning from context; using synonyms and paraphrase; reading on without a dictionary	Sustained, collaborative negotiation of meaning
Metacognitive (Part D)	Seeking opportunities to use the language; attending to usage; setting goals and monitoring progress	Learner autonomy: planning, self-direction, and self-evaluation
Affective (Part E)	Managing anxiety; encouraging oneself to speak; noting progress	Affective regulation that supports risk-taking in discussion
Social (Part F)	Asking for clarification; preparing questions; practising with peers; engaging with culture	Critical framing through dialogic, social meaning-making

Memory strategies (Part A). Students reported recognising relationships between their first-language knowledge and newly acquired second-language vocabulary, and they frequently reinforced new words through everyday contexts such as reading books and noticing signs and notices. They less often reviewed lessons independently or used visual aids such as flashcards or pictures. In Oxford's (1990) terms, this points to reliance on contextual and associative memory strategies rather than on deliberate rehearsal aids, consistent with learners who meet the language in a rich environment but have limited routines for independent review, and it reflects the situated grounding of meaning that the multiliteracies framework emphasises (New London Group, 1996).

Cognitive strategies (Part B). Students described actively processing and producing the language: many engaged in conversation with proficient speakers, read literary texts beyond the prescribed materials, regularly wrote notes, messages, letters, or reports, and looked for first-language words embedded in the second language. These behaviours align with the cognitive category in Oxford's (1990) taxonomy and, more specifically, with the multiliteracies emphasis on producing as well as interpreting texts; reading beyond set materials and composing one's own writing are the acts of design that transformed practice envisages (New London Group, 1996; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009).

Compensation strategies (Part C). When confronting unfamiliar vocabulary, students regularly inferred meaning from context, sought definitions through online resources, used

familiar synonyms or paraphrases, and read extensively without pausing for every unknown word. A readiness to compensate in this way is commonly reported among second-language learners (Oxford, 1990) and fits the literature-circle design, which encourages students to keep reading and to negotiate meaning collaboratively rather than to halt at every difficulty.

Metacognitive strategies (Part D). Students reported seeking out opportunities to use the language beyond the classroom, attending to how proficient speakers used it, trying alternative approaches, and setting explicit goals at each stage of their learning. Goal-setting, planning, and self-monitoring of this kind are the metacognitive functions that Benson (2001) places at the centre of learner autonomy, and they are the clearest questionnaire indication that students were taking charge of their own learning.

Affective strategies (Part E). Students described managing anxiety and encouraging themselves to use the language despite a fear of error; they rarely kept a language-learning diary but did record their progress through structured note-taking. The reported willingness to speak despite anxiety matters for collaborative work, since affective regulation supports the risk-taking that group discussion requires; the limited use of reflective journaling, by contrast, points to an area that scaffolding could strengthen (Oxford, 1990).

Social strategies (Part F). Students reported asking for clarification, preparing questions about points they found difficult, practising with peers, and connecting language learning to cultural engagement drawn from varied texts and audiovisual materials. This emphasis on learning with and from others is the questionnaire counterpart to the collaborative discussion at the heart of literature circles, and it reflects the social, dialogic view of meaning-making that underlies the multiliteracies framework (New London Group, 1996; Neupane, 2010).

Students' Perceptions of Literature Circles (Interviews)

The interview responses converged on several themes. Together they indicate that students regarded literature circles and creative writing as activities that deepened their reading and supported more independent, collaborative learning.

Deeper analysis and richer interaction. Students regarded literature circles as effective in supporting closer literary analysis and stronger group interaction. Regular discussion helped them make sense of challenging texts and sustained their motivation to read, and the collaborative format drew their attention to textual details they might otherwise have passed over. This pattern echoes findings from reading- and literature-circle studies in second-language settings, where collaborative discussion is associated with improved comprehension, engagement, and autonomy (Kang et al., 2023). Interpreted through the framework, the discussions functioned as critical framing, with students examining meaning collectively rather than receiving a single authorised interpretation (New London Group, 1996).

Preparation and self-direction. Students identified consistent preparation as essential, completing assigned readings so that they could contribute meaningfully and deliberately linking current chapters to earlier ones to deepen their comprehension. Taking responsibility for preparation in this way is a concrete instance of the planning and self-management that define learner autonomy (Benson, 2001; Noviana, 2020), and it shows the activity shifting the locus of effort from teacher to student.

Working within and across roles. For role-specific preparation, students consulted teachers or peers who had previously held a given role, sought feedback on their preparatory work, and reread the text with their assigned role in view, so that, for example, a character analyser concentrated on passages bearing on characterisation. The defined roles supplied the metalanguage and focus associated with overt instruction (New London Group, 1996; Daniels, 2002), while the practice of seeking feedback before and after sessions illustrates the dialogic, two-way engagement Neupane (2010) describes.

Reflection and use of feedback. After each session, students incorporated teacher and peer feedback into their subsequent preparation, treating constructive criticism as a resource for improving later contributions. This reflective use of feedback is characteristic of autonomous learners, who monitor and evaluate their own performance over time (Benson, 2001), and it indicates that the activity supported an iterative rather than one-off engagement with the texts.

Challenges and Discussion

Students also reported difficulties: structuring and articulating their ideas clearly, interpreting Indonesian reading materials accurately, which sometimes led to misreading, and the time required to respond thoroughly to demanding discussion questions. These difficulties are consistent with a well-documented tension in learner-centred designs, namely that autonomy must be deliberately supported rather than assumed. Thanasoulas (2000) argues that independent and group tasks require clear guidelines and scaffolding, and the interpretive difficulties students reported point specifically to a need for overt instruction in reading strategies before and during the circles (New London Group, 1996). The strain of articulating ideas also suggests that the affective and social strategies identified in the questionnaire, while present, would benefit from further support, for instance through structured talk frames and modelled responses.

Taken together, the questionnaire and interview findings suggest that literature circles and creative written assignments, designed as multiliteracies activities, were perceived by these Grade 11 Indonesian B students as supporting more deliberate reading, greater self-direction, and richer collaboration, the metacognitive, cognitive, and social capacities that both Oxford's (1990) taxonomy and the multiliteracies framework foreground. The findings are perceptual and self-reported, and they describe a single class; they therefore indicate how such activities are experienced rather than establishing gains in achievement. They nonetheless offer concrete, theory-linked evidence that a multiliteracies approach can reshape the roles of teacher and student in a second-language literature classroom in the direction the framework intends.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to document how students in a Grade 11 Indonesian B class perceived literature circles and creative written assignments designed according to multiliteracies principles. The questionnaire data, read against Oxford's (1990) six strategy categories, showed that students drew on cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies as they worked with literary texts, with the metacognitive and social categories most directly reflecting the planning, monitoring, and collaborative learning that learner autonomy involves. The interview data indicated that students attributed deeper textual

analysis, more consistent preparation, and more productive discussion to the activities, while also reporting genuine difficulties in interpreting Indonesian texts and in articulating their ideas.

These results give modest but specific support to the claim that a multiliteracies approach can shift a second-language literature classroom away from teacher-centred transmission toward situated, collaborative, and productive meaning-making (New London Group, 1996; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). The contribution lies less in demonstrating that literature circles work in general, which earlier studies have already suggested, than in showing how students in an international-school, Indonesian-as-a-second-language setting perceive and take up such activities, and in connecting those perceptions to an established account of language learning strategies.

The study's limitations should temper its conclusions. It examined one class at a single school, relied on self-reported perception data rather than measures of learning outcomes, and was conducted by the students' own teacher, which may have shaped responses. The difficulties students reported also indicate that the benefits of these activities depend on adequate scaffolding rather than following automatically from a learner-centred format.

Two implications follow for practice. First, the interpretive and expressive difficulties students described suggest that literature circles should be paired with explicit instruction in reading and discussion strategies, in keeping with the overt-instruction component of the framework. Second, because creative writing functioned as the point at which students became designers of their own texts, it deserves a more deliberate place in the activity cycle rather than a supplementary one. For future research, the perception-based findings reported here could be extended through a longer, design-based or participatory study that pairs students' perceptions with evidence of their reading and writing over time, and that compares multiliteracies-based instruction with more conventional approaches in comparable Indonesian-language classes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by Singapore School, Pantai Indah Kapuk. I thank Dr Daniel Hyde (Head of School), Mr Gareth Rogers (Head of High School), and Ms Celia Tanzil (Head of Operations) of Singapore School, Pantai Indah Kapuk, who provided insight and support during the research, although they may not agree with all of the interpretations and conclusions of this paper. I also thank Nurul Noviana and Nurkholis Ainunnajib, whose earlier research inspired this study, and the Indonesian B students who participated; without them this research would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

- Anstey, M., & Bull, G. (2006). *Teaching and learning multiliteracies: Changing times, changing literacies*. International Reading Association.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Pearson Education.
- Borg, S., & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). *Learner autonomy: English language teachers' beliefs and practices* (ELT Research Paper 12–07). British Council.

- Chia, C. (2007). *Autonomy in language learning: The use of IT and internet resources*. McGraw-Hill Education (Asia).
- Chusanachoti, R. (2009). *EFL learning through language activities outside the classroom: A case study of English education students in Thailand* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University). ProQuest LLC.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Routledge.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800903076044>
- Daniels, H. (1994). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in the student-centered classroom*. Pembroke Publishers Ltd.
- Daniels, H. (2002). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups* (2nd ed.). Stenhouse Publishers.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2003). Cultural constraints in the implementation of learner autonomy: The case in Indonesia. In K. E. Sukanto (Ed.), *Rampai bahasa, pendidikan dan budaya: Kumpulan esai Soenjono Dardjowidjojo*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Gardner, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Fostering autonomy in language learning*. Zirve University.
- Gremmo, M. J., & Riley, P. (1995). Autonomy, self-direction, and self-access in language teaching and learning: The history of an idea. *System*, 23(2), 151–164. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00002-2)
- Hermarita, I. (2018). *Efektivitas model lingkaran sastra (literature circles) dalam pembelajaran apresiasi cerita pendek pada siswa kelas XI Teknik Instalasi Tenaga Listrik (TITL) 1 SMK Negeri 2 Purwodadi Grobogan* [Master's thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta]. UMS Institutional Repository. <https://eprints.ums.ac.id/id/eprint/59649>
- Hsiao, T.-Y., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 368–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00155>
- Imron, A. A. M. (2007). Pembelajaran sastra multikultural di sekolah: Aplikasi novel *Burung-Burung Rantau*. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 19(1), 60–75.
- Kang, A., Lim, Y., & Murdoch, Y. D. (2023). The value of reading circles in EMI class: Engagement, usefulness, and outcomes. *SAGE Open*, 13(2), Article 21582440231179681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231179681>
- Nabhan, S. (2019). Bringing multiliteracies into process writing approach in ELT classroom: Implementation and reflection. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 4(2), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.4.2.156-170>
- Neupane, M. (2010). Learner autonomy: Concept and consideration. *NELTA Journal*, 15, 114–120.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92.
- Noviana, N., & Ardi, P. (2020). Investigating learner autonomy in a TOEFL preparation program. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 3(1), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v3i1.612>
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2009). P21 framework for 21st century learning. *Partnership for 21st Century Skills*.

Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(11). <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Autonomy.html>

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

This form of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) is for students of a second language (SL). Please read each statement and cross (X) in the column that indicates your response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) that tells HOW TRUE THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. **There are no right or wrong answers** to these statements.

Part A

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in the SL.					
2	I use new SL words in a sentence so I can remember them.					
3	I connect the sound of a new SL word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.					
4	I remember a new SL word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.					
5	I use rhymes to remember new SL words.					
6	I use flashcards to remember new SL words.					
7	I physically act out new SL words.					
8	I review SL lessons often.					
9	I remember new SL words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.					

Part B

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
10	I say or write new SL words several times.					
11	I try to talk like native SL speakers.					
12	I practise the sounds of SL.					
13	I use the SL words I know in different ways.					
14	I start conversations in the SL.					
15	I watch SL language TV shows spoken in SL or go to movies spoken in SL.					
16	I read for pleasure in the SL.					
17	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in the SL.					

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
18	I first skim an SL passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.					
19	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in the SL.					
20	I try to find patterns in the SL.					
21	I find the meaning of an SL word by dividing it into parts that I understand.					
22	I try not to translate word for word.					
23	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in the SL.					

Part C

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
24	To understand unfamiliar SL words, I make guesses.					
25	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in the SL, I use gestures.					
26	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in the SL.					
27	I read SL without looking up every new word.					
28	I try to guess what the other person will say next in the SL.					
29	If I can't think of an SL word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.					

Part D

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
30	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my SL.					
31	I notice my SL mistakes and use that information to help me do better.					
32	I pay attention when someone is speaking SL.					
33	I try to find out how to be a better learner of SL.					
34	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study SL.					
35	I look for people I can talk to in SL.					
36	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in SL.					
37	I have clear goals for improving my SL skills.					
38	I think about my progress in learning SL.					

Part E

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
39	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using SL.					
40	I encourage myself to speak SL even when I am afraid of making a mistake.					
41	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in SL.					
42	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using SL.					
43	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.					
44	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning SL.					

Part F

No.	Question	1	2	3	4	5
45	If I do not understand something in SL, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.					
46	I ask SL speakers to correct me when I talk.					
47	I practise SL with other students.					
48	I ask for help from SL speakers.					
49	I ask questions in SL.					
50	I try to learn about the culture of SL speakers.					

Appendix 2: Interview Questions

1. What do you think about the implementation of the literature circle in this study?
2. What strategies do you use to fully participate in this activity?
3. What do you prepare and do when you get a different role in the implementation of the literature circle?
4. Do you have something special to focus on your role that makes it easier for you to do literature circles?
5. After participating in a discussion session, have you ever planned to make improvements to the next session of the literature circle? What do you do to make it happen?
6. Have you found any difficulties during the literature session, either before or during the discussion? Explain!

BIO STATEMENT

Dwi Firli Ashari holds a bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching from Sampoerna University and a master's degree in Cultural Studies from Universitas Indonesia. He serves as a teacher and Head of the High School Indonesian Department at Singapore School, Pantai Indah Kapuk, Jakarta, Indonesia, where he promotes innovative language learning practices. His research interests include learner autonomy, multiliteracies, and the integration of technology in language education.