

**MEASURING LANGUAGE OF WIDER COMMUNICATION (L2)
AND LOCAL COMMUNITY LANGUAGE (L1) LITERACY
LEVELS IN A BILINGUAL COMMUNITY OF INDONESIA¹**

Howard Shelden and Kay Ringenberg
SIL International (Indonesia)

ABSTRACT

The Galela people of the Moluccas are bilingual to a certain extent in the national language, Indonesian. They currently receive all education in the national language, though there are recent efforts by local leadership to promote community-based literature production and use. This paper is a report of a baseline study from a selected sample to measure the reading and writing ability in both the national and local languages. The instrument design makes use of some locally authored material and local interviewers.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Galela people of the Moluccas are bilingual to a certain extent in the national language, Indonesian. They currently receive all education in the national language, though there are recent efforts by local leadership to promote community-based literature production and use. This paper is a report of a baseline study from a selected sample to measure the reading and writing ability in both the national and local languages. The instrument design makes use of some locally authored material and local interviewers.

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON READING
INVENTORIES**

The instrument generally used to determine proficiency levels in developed countries is called an informal reading inventory. Informal reading inventories are as numerous as reading publishers. Each publisher in developed countries has a somewhat standardized instrument which guides the assessment of students to tell at what reading level the student functions and thus what book level that student should be placed in for classroom study. The inventories are constructed specific to the publisher's material. Reading inventories are also used to determine what individualized instruction might be needed for a learner not making proper progress. Background reading on inventories can be done in material written by authors Ken and Yetta Goodman, Carolyn Burke, Annabelle Newman or Marie Clay.

What does one do when there is no (or very little) reading material in non-print cultures and one wants to assess the level at which a potential reader of that language functions? Constructing a modified informal reading inventory, a **reading proficiency**

¹This paper was originally presented at the University of the Philippines' Second International Conference on Southeast Asia—Ruptures and Departures: Language and Culture in Southeast Asia, 19-21 January 2000, UP Diliman campus.

survey is one solution that has worked for this field group. The reading inventory contains sound-symbol identification charts, graded paragraph samples with comprehension questions on the contents of the paragraphs, spelling dictation and instructions for collecting writing samples in the language or languages being surveyed along with some basic sociolinguistic background information (questions on a form to fill in during an interview with the head of the household being surveyed by local speakers of the community language) including reading and writing attitudes for those being surveyed about their local language.

Informal reading inventories usually contain assessments of :

2.1 Readiness to deal with printed materials

- a. Directionality (including one-to-one correspondence)
- b. Differentiation and sequencing
- c. Fine motor skill ability

2.2 Letter identification:

- a. Sound (or sounds) connected to that symbol/group of symbols
- b. Letter name recognition which is optional (lower and upper case)

2.3 Vocabulary / sight word inventory

- a. Immediate recall of learned material (sight words)
- b. Analysis of beginning/medial/ending sounds

2.4 Writing samples

- a. Ability to write text legibly such as their full name and simple data (fill in a form)
- b. Ability to construct from memory previously learned words and sentences (dictation)
- b. Ability to create text using proper language syntax (creative writing)

2.5 Reading selections which increase in difficulty (an adapted miscue analysis)

- a. Selections at three or four levels of difficulty (or more for more developed programs)

b. Record errors

✓ = correct word given

— = no response (or circle the omitted word)

SC = self-correction (DS for *Diperbaiki Sendiri* in Indonesian)

R/repetitions = record each try (or underline the repeated portion)

WR/wrong response = record the word which is given (S for *Salah* in Indonesian)

A/appeal for help = TTA/try that again (CL for *Coba Lagi* in Indonesian)

T/told = the word is given to the participant (B for *Beri* in Indonesian)

→← = directionality for attacking words and reading connected text

c. Comprehension check

- retelling (counting the major elements given from the story)

- questions (on explicit and implicit information)

2.6 Listening comprehension level

- a. Measures concentration (attending to task)

- b. Measures potential ability

Knowing the performance level on all of the above items in a reading inventory is of value to people constructing instructional materials or tutoring individuals. However, we focused mainly on points 2.4 and 2.5 above as we constructed a reading proficiency survey. We narrowed our focus even more to measure the ability to read a passage with 90% accuracy, to answer comprehension questions on that passage with 60% accuracy and to collect writing samples. (We did not pay much attention to the recording of errors although that may be of great value to the linguist trying to determine if the orthography is a working orthography or where the breakdown is occurring if fluent reading using that orthography is not easily obtained.)

3. SURVEY RESULTS USED AS DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE FOR BASELINE STUDY

We have constructed a generic informal instrument for the Indonesian language which is a collection of graded paragraphs to read and answer questions on the contents. We work with those fluent in the local language to construct a similar instrument for the local language. We have included instructions for collecting writing samples to survey the reading - writing proficiency of participants in the national language, (Indonesian, here referred to as L2) and a similar set of instruments for use in the local language (Galela, here referred to as the local community language, L1) found in the northern part of Halmahera Island, North Maluku. (In section 4, the constructing of the instrument will be explained in detail.) L2 has a body of literature that can serve as resource data when constructing a survey instrument. However, the written literature for L1 is limited to a total of 13 titles, consisting of some health booklets, small scripture portions, and folk literature transcribed from oral texts.

Sociolinguistic information on the newly researched language was included to gather those items which are critical for an evaluation of the level of motivation and literateness for the language group involved. This generic list is found below. It should be customized so that it fits each cultural group, but such a list can serve as a starting point for gathering data. Breaking down baseline data for literacy, one finds two major approaches for any survey:

- a. Those items that could be collected through survey questions at the time of another baseline study data collection (such as an anthropology survey or an economic survey: see items below)
- b. A significant sampling of the level of reading - writing proficiency in both Indonesian (L2) and the local language (L1)

It may take a little longer to do the reading assessment portion than to do the background questionnaire unless key L1 speakers are taught to administer the components. Actually, both parts are more accurate samples if they are administered by local people who know the community and the language well and can keep confidences.

3.1 Background questions to be included with a reading proficiency survey (see sample form attached):

- 3.1.1 What literature is present in the area? (This includes a survey of the types of literature and the costs of the various components of the literature. It also includes a survey of the types of literature desired by the target group.)
- 3.1.2 What is the level of education (years in school) for the target audience (adults 12+)?
- 3.1.3 How many people have left the area to obtain schooling and where are they now located?
- 3.1.4 What interest is there in the vernacular language? What usage does it have in the target group?
- 3.1.5 What position of importance does the vernacular play in that group?
- 3.1.6 What do people write? What language do they use to write?
- 3.1.7 What are the stated goals for literateness by the target group?
- 3.1.8 What if the local language is lost?
- 3.1.9 How strong is the use of the local language?
- 3.1.10 How would it be if the spiritual leadership and government officials used the local language?
- 3.1.11 Why must we gain skills in reading and writing?

SHELDEN AND RINGENBERG

3.1.12 Why should we study the local language?

One might ask, "Why include these background questions as part of a reading proficiency survey?" The answer is clear: research has proven that success in reading and writing has much to do with the desire to learn. Thus, the above assessment of basic background information will be good support for the reading - writing proficiency portions that follow. By combining information from all three portions, reading, writing, and attitudes, a good baseline for future research, measuring progress, or designing a program will be possible.

3.2 A few key factors should be kept in mind:

- 3.2.1 Each reading selection (except at the very lowest levels) should contain at least 100 words of narrative or descriptive text.**
- 3.2.2 It is best to begin with simple text and syntax with one sentence per line then to move up to paragraph format and later to more complex formats like graphs, tables, and charts.**
- 3.2.3 The reading accuracy rate should be 90% of the material read correctly with a comprehension score of 60% or higher for those passages considered in the participant's ability range.**

It doesn't take reading specialists to conduct reading proficiency surveys. Local language speakers can learn to use such instruments with a minimum of training and practice. Safeguards can be built into the data collecting so that results are reliable enough for decision-making at the local levels. Village leaders can be involved in identifying a selected sample of participants. And, by involving those village leaders, the proficiency survey can be a tool for change. As community people and community leadership work together gathering data on proficiency, they are more easily convinced of the need for future action. All those involved in such data gathering need to maintain a positive, non-threatening demeanor; it is better to move on to another participant rather than to embarrass a person not able to perform. Likewise, all involved need to guard carefully the information collected in order to protect the privacy of individual participants. The following describes in-depth the procedure used in one such survey which was conducted primarily by local people.

3.3 One sample survey: Galela

The linguist who has lived in the language area for over three years, a literacy specialist, and two national consultant trainees (BiLit Team) went to the location in April of 1998. After meeting with village leaders in a general discussion, it was decided by an ad hoc committee composed of representatives from government agencies, the local church, and schools to survey the communities to see what level of proficiency the general population had obtained both in the national language and in the local language. Linguistic communities tend to polarize around religious differences. Thus, the data was gathered from both Christian and Muslim communities. Because the time was short and data was desired from four villages (one 100% Christian, one 100% Muslim and two mixed villages), it was agreed that a team of local speakers could be engaged to help. Those trained were from both major religions.

The goal was to train eight teams of two individuals for each team. Four teams would conduct reading proficiency surveys and four teams would fill in the questionnaire on sociolinguistic matters. All sixteen administrators were trained in both forms, beginning with the questionnaire. First, the questionnaire was read orally with the group and several minor wording changes were made. The scale of income was created specific to the cash income for the area. However, since most families grow their own food, cash income is not a true reflection of the livelihood for the area. But cash income

MEASURING L2 AND L1 LITERACY LEVELS

will be a factor in the ability to purchase books, construct library buildings, or hire outside specialists to come give seminars on life-long learning in the area. Thus, cash income information per household was included on the questionnaire.

After reading and revising the questionnaire, teams were divided into pairs to practice filling in the questionnaire. While the teams interviewed their teammate, the BiLit consultants provided support and answered questions. Notes were made on common errors. Later, those errors were brought up for the recombined group so that all could learn to fill in the questionnaire in an accurate, consistent manner. This took one half-day, three hours.

Then, the group was given the reading proficiency survey instrument and asked to make revisions as needed. Several good suggestions came from the general group. One suggestion which was immediately incorporated (because the BiLit Team had along a laptop computer and portable printer and there was a photocopy store close by) was to include in very small print the essence for each correct answer on the administrator's copy. Also, to make scoring easier, six questions were included for each reading selection. On the retelling selections, the minimum numbers of concepts needed to advance to a higher level were also printed. Thus, as administrators used the forms, they were easily able to see if a reader needed to advance a level or was at his/her optimum level. Again the teams were divided and given the opportunity to practice on each other. After a time of practice, the teams went into the local community for trial interviews. These first attempts were not included in the statistics. After this trial time, the group came back together for a debriefing. This took one full day, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The teams then, on the third day, were ready to go to a village for assessment. It is important to note many details that were followed:

3.3.1 No team member went into a home alone. Always two members of the survey team traveled together. When assigning team members, we tried to have a representative of each religion in each pair. One observed while the other interviewed. For the questionnaire teams, one interviewed while the other wrote the answers given. Then, in the next home, they switched roles. One of the team members knew the local language so that if a person could not understand the question in Indonesian, the local language was used to explain the question. However, the interviews were conducted in Indonesian and the answers were recorded in Indonesian. By sending two team members into the homes, the business of survey was more easily followed. Each head of household interviewed received a small gift, in this instance, a short storybook in the local language.

3.3.2 A pre-selected list according to set criteria was prepared. Thus, the homes knew that the survey team was coming, when the team would arrive, and what the team would be doing. Because the communities surveyed are subsistence farmers, only one-half day was lost from garden work. Each village mayor and his staff were asked to select ten families from three levels of income and three levels of education. Thus, in each village, thirty families were interviewed. Once in the home, the reading proficiency team asked for an adult volunteer from that home to be the reader. It is assumed that the best reader from that home was selected to participate.

3.3.3 The reading proficiency team contained one person fluent in the national language, Indonesian, L2, and one person fluent in the local language, L1. First the participant was given the national language paragraphs administered by the person fluent in Indonesian and then the same person was given the local language paragraphs administered by the person fluent in the local language. Thus, two scores were recorded for each participant: L2 and L1. Again, a token gift was given to each participant.

3.3.4 All materials were numbered and passed out in waterproof bags. Each team was responsible to turn in all forms, even those with errors and discarded. In this manner, the privacy of the materials could be guarded. The privacy of each individual was also carefully guarded. Each participant began by filling in a name strip with important information. This was the first writing sample. Each name strip contained a number unique for this village. On all other forms for this individual, only the number was used, not the name. If the person completed this form without assistance, some level of skill in reading and writing was already known by that individual. Thus, the sound-symbol chart was not used. The graded word lists were used to attempt to place the individual into the proper paragraph level for beginning paragraph reading. If the level was too easy, he/she was quickly advanced. If the level was too difficult, the level was dropped.

For this survey trip, four villages were surveyed with 120 reading samples collected and over 150 head of households interviewed. Some of the data needed to be discarded because it was not recorded accurately. For instance, if a person received a passing score but was not given the next higher selection, that score is not valid for that individual. Another cause for discarding the results is if the participant did not pass a level but the next lower level was not given to him/her. Thus, we do not know the proficiency level of that individual. Also, in one instance, no writing sample was collected from an individual. Thus that person's data was not complete.

4. CREATING THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument design called for an alphabet chart along with a short wordlist and a simple story in each of five levels of reading difficulty. The alphabet chart consists of each of the upper and lower case letters randomly ordered on a single page, along with any digraphs and diphthongs that occur in the language. Adapting the Indonesian chart for Galela was a simple matter of deleting eight characters and adding two more.

4.1 Linguistic distinctives of the five levels

Level One

The level one story is familiar material such as might be found in a first grade reader. Each sentence starts a new line and is preferably limited to one line only. Words have as little affixation as possible. Words used for the wordlist are mostly limited to two-syllables, and mostly nouns, since in Galela verbs have obligatory affixation. The only punctuation marks used are periods and one comma. The font is from 16 to 18-point size. The writing exercises for levels one and two involve taking dictation of single words, shorter for level one than for level two.

Level Two

The level two native-authored story consists of a single paragraph of easy narrative with some embedded dialogue. All words selected for the wordlist have complex morphology², but the affixes are the most common ones. Single and double quotes are used. The point size should be from 14 to 16.

Level Three

The level three story is slightly more difficult, such as might be found in readers for the older elementary grades, and formatted into several paragraphs. It adds Arabic numerals that must be read in the vernacular. The wordlist contains words with both prefixes and suffixes, requiring whole-word recognition in order to correctly pronounce word stress, a feature that is unmarked in the orthography. It includes both words with

²Galela is a Papuan language with a highly complex verb morphology.

MEASURING L2 AND L1 LITERACY LEVELS

semivowels marked and words with glottal stop (unmarked) in inter-vocalic stressed position. The font is 12 to 14-point size. The writing exercise for level three involves taking dictation of whole sentences.

Level Four

This level four story was written (not spoken) by a Galela person with an earned doctorate. It narrates a foreign trip that is packed with culturally new information and experiences. The wordlist includes words which are tongue twisters or in some way more difficult to pronounce. The comprehension questions for this level require the reader to think critically and to use deductive reasoning in order to make inferences from the text. The font is 10 to 12-point size. The writing exercise for level four involves writing freely about the story they have just read.

Level Five

Level five has no wordlist since completing level four successfully is the criterion for being given level five. It is translated material of a more complicated nature in order to present some degree of challenge to even the most literate Galela reader. (The Galela portion was excerpted from a government document.) At this level the questions are not read by the administrator, but rather by the participant. He or she is asked to read each question (silently, not out loud), writing answers in full sentences. A further feature of this level is that the questions and space for written answers are on the back of the story sheet in order to discourage rote copying.

4.2 Sources of text material and questions

Native-authored literature is a good source of text material for all but the highest level. Narrative or descriptive passages of 100-200 words are best. Words used in the wordlists must occur, though perhaps with different affixation, in the respective text selection. More common vocabulary items should be used in the lower levels and less common items in the higher levels. A frequency count on a larger text corpus can help determine the relative frequency of vocabulary items.

Levels four and five introduce concepts new to the culture. At level five, the material may be translated. Examples might be unfamiliar expository material or unknown agricultural techniques. It takes a very fluent reader to prepare the questions at this level. Most expatriate facilitators are either not bilingual enough to independently translate material this complicated, or not bilingual enough to understand whether certain questions are appropriate.

4.3 Process of editing, polishing, and validating

After text portions are selected, several native speakers must edit them. It is surprisingly easy for typographical and grammatical errors to slip into an otherwise good text. These become problems for readers through no fault of their own. It is important for a linguist or detailed person who is familiar with the practical orthography to proofread the texts for compliance.

The administrator trainees read the texts for grammatical naturalness and made suggestions for improvement. Group consensus helped polish the texts. They could easily handle beginner and intermediate levels, but in this community, most were not really fluent enough in L1 to confidently handle level five. It can be difficult to find administrator trainees literate at level five.

Comprehension questions that require short answers are best. When a yes/no question was used, it was followed up by an open-ended question such as, "Why or why not?" In order both to validate the instrument and to familiarize the administrators with the instrument, those who were fluent in Galela read the texts, answered the questions (in writing), and then came together to discuss their answers. Some questions polarized the

SHELDEN AND RINGENBERG

administrator trainees, even though we thought they should have been straightforward. Those questions were dropped, since there was apparently more than one perspective on the correct answer.

5. CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

Although the BiLit Team was in the area for three weeks, the actual work took two weeks. Constructing the instrument took three days. The Community discussions took place over a two-day span. Following that, the recruiting and training of local interviewers/administrators took three days. The trips to the four villages covered four days.

The government employees from the district office were pleased with the skills in collecting data that they had learned and thought the same techniques would be useful in other situations. Because they had been involved in creating the instrument, they felt they would be able to do something similar for other purposes.

Because of the initial discussions, the local district head asked the BiLit Team to hold an informational forum on the bilingual teacher training materials available through SIL. Two people from each school district were invited to attend. The result from that forum is that a group of teachers would like to try bilingual materials in their classrooms in the near future.³

When local leaders found that the comprehension level in the national language was lower than they expected it to be, they commented that literacy in the local language is needed.

Thus, using a modified informal reading inventory has proven valuable to motivate local leadership towards action plans for literacy in both L1 and L2. Furthermore, using informal tools like the reading proficiency survey described in this paper give credible data for use with funding agencies to obtain the needed resources for improving the current situation. It also provides a baseline for measuring future progress. Although it is not a standardized test and thus is not hard data, it has a useful function for community development workers by providing them with an accurate picture of the local community's ability to obtain new information through the printed page.

[Following is a sample of the data form used to collect information from heads of households where readers were measured for proficiency.]

HEAD-OF-HOUSEHOLD SURVEY FOR THE BILITERACY PROJECT LANGUAGE: SANDI*

1. Name of Head-of-household: _____
Village : _____
2. Religion : Islamic ___ Protestant ___ Catholic ___ Buddhist ___ Hindus ___
Suburb : _____
Date : _____ Administrator : _____

³ Since 1998, the Galela communities have begun bilingual literacy programs and have added traveling village libraries.

MEASURING L2 AND L1 LITERACY LEVELS

READING AND WRITING CONDITION

3. Record the name of each family member and anyone else who lives in this house	Age	m/f	4. Year left school / still in school? Yes or no	5. Can this person write? - write well? y/n y/n	6. What does this person usually write?	7. In what language is the writing? English / Local	8. Is there reading material in the home? ___Yes ___No	9. Type of reading material? 10. Total quantity?	11. Comments about the reading materials:
1) Head-of-household			/	/				School Books /	
2) Wife/husband			/	/				Al'Quran / Bible /	
3) Child # 1			/	/				Book on religion /	
4) Child #2			/	/				Short stories /	
5) Child #3			/	/				Newspapers /	
6) Additional residents:			/	/				Magazines /	
7)			/	/				Comics /	
8)			/	/				How-to Books /	
9)			/	/				Health Books /	
10)			/	/				Dictionaries /	

12. What do you think about reading and writing in your language? ___ Like very much
 ___ Like ___ Like a little ___ Do not like

Why did you select your choice?: _____

13. What literature topics do you want in your community? (You can list any topic and if there is no book on that topic, the BiLit Team will try to develop a book on that topic.)

14. In the years to come, will children here speak your language or will they not?

15. Will your language be lost in the future? ___ yes ___ no Why?

16. Can your language be developed? yes no How?

17. What language do you like best? ___ Bahasa Indonesia ___ Bahasa Sandi ___
 Other Why? _____

18. What language do you usually use every day? ___ Bahasa Indonesia ___ Bahasa
 Sandi ___ Other Why? _____

19. What language is most important? ___ Bahasa Indonesia ___ Bahasa Sandi ___
 Other Why? _____

20. What language is most beautiful? _____
 Most refined/soft? _____

*Name changed to maintain privacy for the local communities.

SHELDEN AND RINGENBERG

**THE ECONOMIC CONDITION of the FAMILY and the SOCIAL CONDITION
of the VILLAGE of _____**

Types of work in this household (link to the number of the family member in column #1, page 1 on this form)	Garden or ocean products sold to add to family cash income in this household	Cash income for all the members of this household (average per month)	Elementary School Activities	Youth Activities	NGOs, social organizations, government agencies, or other voluntary groups active in this village	Comments
		_____ Rp 100.000,00 or under _____ Rp 100.000,00 to Rp 150.000,00 _____ Rp 150.000,00 to Rp 200.000,00 _____ Rp 200.000,00 to Rp 250.000,00 _____ Rp 250.000,00 or more [\$1 USD = Rp 8,000,00]				

**SUMMARY DATA – PROFICIENCY INSTRUMENT
(Reading Levels in Bahasa Indonesia, L2, and Bahasa Galela, L1)**

Village of Duma

Number	L2	L1	Date	Comments
1	3.2	3.2	21 April 1998	
2	2.1	-	21 April 1998	
3	3.2	3.2	21 April 1998	
4	2.2	2.3	21 April 1998	
5	3.2	-	21 April 1998	
6	2.3	-	21 April 1998	
7	2.2	2.2	21 April 1998	
8	1.2	1.1	21 April 1998	
9	2.3	2.2	21 April 1998	
10	3.2	3.2	21 April 1998	
11	2.1	2.2	21 April 1998	

MEASURING L2 AND L1 LITERACY LEVELS

12	3.1	3.2	21 April 1998	
13	2.2	2.2	21 April 1998	
14	3.2	3.1	21 April 1998	
15	3.1	3.2	21 April 1998	
16	1.3	1.3	21 April 1998	
17	2.2	2.2	21 April 1998	
18	2.1	2.2	21 April 1998	
19	1.2	1.2	21 April 1998	
20	2.2	2.2	21 April 1998	
21	2.2	2.2	21 April 1998	
22	4.1	2.3	21 April 1998	
23	2.3	2.3	21 April 1998	
24	1.1	1.1	21 April 1998	
25	4.3	4.2	21 April 1998	
26	2.3	2.2	21 April 1998	
27	3.2	3.2	21 April 1998	
53/56	2.1	2.2	21 April 1998	no data for #1
57	3.3	3.2	21 April 1998	
59	3.3	4.2	21 April 1998	
60	1.1	2.1	21 April 1998	
64	3.2	3.3	21 April 1998	
66	2.2	1.2	21 April 1998	

Village of Igobula

Number	L2	L1	Date	Comment
101	1.1	1.2	22 April 1998	
102	1.1	1.1	22 April 1998	
103	1.1	1.1	22 April 1998	
104	1.1	1.1	22 April 1998	
105	2.2	1.1	22 April 1998	
107	1.1	1.2	22 April 1998	
108	5	4.1	22 April 1998	
109	2.1	2.1	22 April 1998	
110	2.1	2.1	22 April 1998	
111	2.1	2.1	22 April 1998	
112	1.1	1.1	22 April 1998	
113	3.2	3.2	22 April 1998	
114	3.2	3.2	22 April 1998	
115	2.1	2.2	22 April 1998	
116	3.3	3.2	22 April 1998	
117	4.2	4.2	22 April 1998	
118	3.1	3.1	22 April 1998	
119	1.2	1.3	22 April 1998	
120	4.1	4.2	22 April 1998	
121	3.1	1.1	22 April 1998	anak
122	3.2	3.1	22 April 1998	
124	1.2	1.2	22 April 1998	

SHELDEN AND RINGENBERG

Village of Mamuya

Number	L2	L1	Date	Comment
151	2.1	1.2	23 April 1998	
152	1.1	1.2	23 April 1998	
153	5	3.3	23 April 1998	
154	2.2	2.3	23 April 1998	
155	2.2	1.3	23 April 1998	
159	5	- no #3	23 April 1998	incomplete
160	2.2	- no#2	23 April 1998	incomplete
161	1.2	1.1	23 April 1998	
162	-	-	23 April 1998	Eye problem
164	1.1	1.1	23 April 1998	
165	2.1	1.1	23 April 1998	
166	2.2	2.2	23 April 1998	
167	1.3	1.2	23 April 1998	
168	4.2	4.2	23 April 1998	#4 was blank
169	1.1	1.1	23 April 1998	
170	3.2	3.2	23 April 1998	
171	1.1	1.2	23 April 1998	
172	1.1	1.2	23 April 1998	
173	2.2	2.2	23 April 1998	
174	2.2	2.2	23 April 1998	
175	4.2	4.2	23 April 1998	
176	3.2	4.2	23 April 1998	
177	1.2	4.1	23 April 1998	
178	3.2	1.1	23 April 1998	
179	3.2	1.2	23 April 1998	
180	1.2	1.2	23 April 1998	
181	1.2	1.3	23 April 1998	

Village of Lalonga

Number	L2	L1	Date	Comment
251	2.1	1.2	27 April 1998	
252	3.1	2.2	27 April 1998	
253	2.1	1.2	27 April 1998	
254	1.2	1.3	27 April 1998	
255	2.1	1.1	27 April 1998	
256	1.2	1.2	27 April 1998	
257	1.2	1.3	27 April 1998	
258	-	-	27 April 1998	Below level 1
260	1.1	1.2	27 April 1998	
261/276	1.2/1.2	1.1/1.2	27 April 1998	
262	2.1	1.2	27 April 1998	
263	2.1	1.2	27 April 1998	
265	2.2	2.2	27 April 1998	
266	4.2	2.2	27 April 1998	
268	1.2	1.1	27 April 1998	
269	2.2	2.2	27 April 1998	
270	3.2	3.2	27 April 1998	

MEASURING L2 AND L1 LITERACY LEVELS

271	1.2	1.2	27 April 1998	
272	1.2	1.1	27 April 1998	
273	1.1	1.1	27 April 1998	
274	1.2	1.1	27 April 1998	
275	1.2	1.2	27 April 1998	
277	3.2	3.2	27 April 1998	
278	1.2	1.2	27 April 1998	
279	1.2	1.2	27 April 1998	
281	1.2	1.1	27 April 1998	
282	1.3	1.1	27 April 1998	
284	2.1	1.1	27 April 1998	
285	1.2	1.1	27 April 1998	
286	1.2	1.1	27 April 1998	

Table 1. Keadaan Keluarga Pada 4 Desa Di Kecamatan Galela-Maluku Utara

Tim	Village	Family	Children	Grand-children	Other family members
Tim 5,6,7	Duma	26 org	71 org	1 org	3 org
Tim 5,6,7	Igobula	22 org	80 org	3 org	1 org
Tim 5,6,7	Mamuya	40 org	124 org	15 org	3 org
Tim 5,6,7	Lalonga	48 org	171 org	5 org	2 org
Total		136 org	446 org	24 org	9 org

Table 2. Economic condition of 4 villages, subdistrict Galela, North Maluku

Village	Type of work							Approximate income for a month (in thousand rupiahs)				
	Govt. employee	Teacher	Farmer	Day laborer	Army	Independent business	Factory employee	≤ 100	100-150	150-200	200-250	≥250
Duma		2 org	40 org	-	2 org	-	13 org	12 org	2 org	5 org	4 org	2 org
Igobula	1 org	1 org	37 org	8 org	-	3 org	2 org	6 org	5 org	3 org	1 org	7 org
Mamuya	1 org	4 org	77 org	6 org	1 org	5 org	1 org	8 org	5 org	1 org	3 org	5 org
Lalonga	-	2 org	81 org	6 org	-	1 org	7 org	33 org	5 org	3 org	1 org	2 org
Total	2 org	9 org	235 org	20 org	3 org	9 org	21 org	59 org	17 org	12 org	9 org	16 org
Percent	0.7%	3.0%	78.6%	6.7%	1.0%	3.0%	7.0%	62.3%	15.0%	10.6%	8.0%	14.2%

Table 3. Type of literature for 4 villages for subdistrict Galela, North Maluku

Type of literature	Village				Total
	Duma	Igobula	Mamuya	Lalonga	
School books	228 buah	174 buah	388 buah	285 buah	1075 bh (50.0%)
Bible	71 buah	-	36 buah	-	107 bh (5.0%)
Al'Quran	-	44 buah	38 buah	50 buah	132 bh (6.1%)
Religious book	67 buah	110 buah	125 buah	77 buah	379 bh (17.6%)
Story book	26 buah	18 buah	35 buah	30 buah	109 bh (5.1%)
Newspaper	13 buah	9 buah	18 buah	13 buah	53 bh (2.5%)
Magazine	18 buah	11 buah	18 buah	6 buah	53 bh (2.5%)
How-to book	27 buah	12 buah	22 buah	37 buah	98 bh (4.6%)
Comic	7 buah	12 buah	17 buah	3 buah	39 bh (1.8%)
Health book	14 buah	12 buah	8 buah	11 buah	45 bh (2.1%)
Dictionary	14 buah	20 buah	16 buah	6 buah	56 bh (2.6%)
Total	489	421	721	518	2149

SHELDEN AND RINGENBERG

Table 4. Attitudes towards reading and writing in 4 villages of subdistrict Galela, North Maluku

Questionnaire	Village				
		Duma	Igobula	Mamuya	Lalonga
Can write	yes	110 org	110 org	167 org	184 org
	Can write well	96 org	79 org	132 org	132 org
Usually write		letters	letters	Daily devotions	School lessons
		School work	School work	Admin for church	messages
		Reports of activities	Activities of organizations	letters	Financial reports
		Devotions, messages	drawings	Counting things	Admin of village
		Financial reports	Admin office	School work	Notes and memos
		recipes	messages	Preparing to teach	Activities of organizations
		Preparing to teach	Math lessons	Receipts	Outlines
		Admin for office	Poems	Shopping list	Preparing to teach
		Church bulletin	Cake recipe	Songs	Math lessons
		Math lessons		Cake recipes	Songs
		Praise songs			
Write in what language? Bahasa Indonesia	483 org (93.1%)	105 org (20.2%)	103 org (19.8%)	156 org (30.1%)	119 org (22.9%)
Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Galela	36 org (6.9%)	5 org (1.0%)	7 org (1.3%)	11 org (2.1%)	13 org (2.5%)
Level of education - Drop outs : 400 people		64 org (16.0%)	81 org (20.2%)	123 org (30.7%)	132 org (33.0%)
- SD (elementary)	215 org (53.7%)	22 org (5.5%)	38 org (9.5%)	59 org (14.7%)	96 org (24.0%)
- SMP (middle school)	96 org (24.0%)	25 org (6.2%)	12 org (3.0%)	35 org (8.7%)	24 org (6.0%)
- SMA (high school)	73 org (18.2%)	13 org (3.2%)	26 org (6.5%)	25 org (6.2%)	9 org (2.2%)
- Above SMA	16 org (4.0%)	4 org (1.0%)	5 org (1.2%)	4 org (1.0%)	3 org (0.7%)
- Still in school : 217 people		35 org (16.1%)	43 org (19.8%)	71 org (32.7%)	68 org (31.3%)
- SD	138 org (63.6%)	21 org (9.8%)	26 org (12.0%)	30 org (13.8%)	61 org (28.1%)
- SMP	48 org (22.1%)	5 org (2.3%)	11 org (5.1%)	26 org (12.0%)	4 org (1.8%)
- SMA	27 org (12.4%)	8 org (3.7%)	6 org (2.8%)	11 org (5.1%)	2 org (0.9%)
- Above SMA	6 org (2.8%)	1 org (0.5%)	-	4 org (1.8%)	1 org (0.5%)
Attitude towards bahasa Galela :					
- Very positive	55 org (44.3%)	9 org (7.2%)	8 org (6.4%)	16 org (12.9%)	22 org (17.7%)
- Positive	66 org (53.2%)	14 org (11.3%)	12 org (9.7%)	18 org (14.5%)	22 org (17.7%)
- Negative	3 org (2.4%)	2 org (1.6%)	1 org (0.8%)	-	-