

Level of Reading Strategy Use Among Faculty Of Education Students

Nevin AKKAYA²

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the level of using the reading strategies by the students who study in the department of Turkish Language and Literature Teaching in Buca Education Faculty. 200 students, who continue study in Dokuz Eylul University Buca Education Faculty in 2011-2012, participated in the research. Translated by Çöğmen from Taraban, Kerr, Rynearson (2004), MRSS (Meta-Cognitive Reading Strategies Scale) was applied to the students. Reliability coefficient of the scale was obtained as 0,81. For two dimension and whole of the scale of reading comprehension strategies used by the students there is no significant difference between the usage level of MRSS according to their gender, department, level of class and high school graduation of the students on the research. According to the number of books read by each student, a significant difference was obtained.

Key Words: Faculty of Education Students, Reading Strategies, Level of Strategy Use

² Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nevin AKKAYA, Dokuz Eylul University, Buca Faculty of Education, Turkish Language Teaching Department. email: nevin.akkaya@deu.edu.tr

Introduction

One of the most effective ways that a person uses to gather knowledge is reading. There have been a lot of various definitions mentioned about reading. Reading is to recognize a text's letters and words and to conceive their courses (Göğüş, 1978: 60). Reading is an activity based on conceiving and interpreting the printed words (Özdemir, 1990: 13). Reading is the process of seeing, perceiving and conceiving a text with its words, sentences, punctuation and other components (Kavcar and others, 1998:41). And also according to Adalı (2003), for meaningful reading, "reader has to understand the ideas brought forward in the text, conceive the ties between the ideas, setting them in order comparing them to his/her own knowledge background and choose the ones he/she wants to keep in his/her memory". Perceiving by right and quick conception of the meaning is the main purpose of the act of reading. (Sever, 2000). As for Collins and Check, also cited by Çöğmen (2010), so that the main purpose of reading is the communication of ideas with the reader, students must have the skills and the strategy to gather knowledge from the printed source.

Yıldız and others (2006) suggest that in reading, the aim is to interpret the text through various perspectives, to competently govern the texts with regard to its own private purpose, in short, to educate competent readers who have the talent to work on texts both critically and independently.

Karadağ (2003) argues that a fruitful reading is a mental action which is not passive. Every effective reading teaches, gives the feeling and increases creativity.

Yalçın (2002) suggests that in the education of reading, providing the child's self-sufficiency is one of the most vital subjects. The student having trouble in comprehending what is read, will cause him/her to experience hardships throughout all stages of his/her education life and job career.

Besides, not only in Turkish language class but also in all other classes, learning activities are almost all based on comprehension skills, these skills constitute the basis for the student's cognitive behavior for the rest of his/her life (Cemiloğlu, 2001). The fact that reading being learning's main tool has been highlighted in all eras. Knowing the versatile function of the art of reading and its power to shape out human world, Maxim Gorky, in his work "My Universities",

highlights reading as the most effective way of enrichment as follows: ‘Books were displaying various worlds, brand new images like I was in a train that was moving fast.’

When the effective reading process is applied, it is necessary to follow a specific plan. This plan involves pre-reading, during reading and post-reading stages. (Akyol, 2006: 30)

Foreign research based on reading focused on how the text is made sense by the reader in the process of reading (Özbay, 2009). When assessed by means of meaning connection, pre-reading, during and post-reading activities are essential. Research puts forward that in this process, reader goes through “a structuring process” by using a set of mental activities. These are called reading comprehension strategies. (Susar, 2006)

According to Cohen, reading strategies are processes which are chosen by the reader consciously to overcome the reading duties, and these strategies can be divided into three groups in literature.

1. Pre-reading strategies are scanning, determining the purpose of reading, activating the briefing, asking questions and making assumptions.
2. Meaning structuring strategies which are used during the reading are defining words, making a connection, imagination, seeking answers to questions and building up new questions, note-taking and determination of complicated points.
3. Strategies that are applied after the reading involve summarization, answering questions, integration, inferring the text visually and assessment.

Duff, 6.6 and others point out that the reading strategies are more trustworthy than reading skills. In such situation, a model which is going to be proposed reading education should take his/her power from the cognitive approaches (Calp, 2010:103). Nowadays, the fact that reading understanding is cognitive is accepted, and research focuses on the functioning types mental processes during reading. A successful reading happens through understanding, critic, questioning and interpretation.

Many research which is done abroad about reading strategies, proves out the existence of positive relation between success and usage of strategy. (Paris and Jacop, 1984; Berkowitz and Cicchelli, 2004; Belet, 2005; Eilers and Pinkley, 2006; Hardebeck, 2006; Canca, 2007; Hess, 2004). Research done in our country on this subject proves out that strategy usage influences success and attitude in a positive way. (Güngör, 2005; Susar-Kırmızı, 2008; Aydoğan, 2008; Kuş, Türkyılmaz, 2010; Akkaya, 2011)

Method

The main purpose of this research is to determine the Turkish Language and Literature department I and IV. grade students' level of strategy use. For this aim, the problem sentence and sub-problems of the research are determined and an answer was sought for those questions: What Is the Reading Strategy Usage Level of Students of the Turkish Language and Literature Department?

Sub-Problems of the Research:

1. Is there a difference between the reading strategy usage levels with respect to the student's gender?
2. Is there a difference between the reading strategy usage levels of the students with respect to their department?
3. Is there a difference between the reading strategy usage levels by means of classes?
4. Is there a difference between the reading strategy usage levels according to the high-school type each graduated from?
5. Is there a difference between the reading strategy usage levels of the students according to the number of books read by each?

Throughout the research, descriptive method was used. Target population of the research is constituted of a total of 320 people who study in first and fourth grades, in Buca Education Faculty Turkish Language and Literature department. First and Fourth grades of both the Turkish Language Teaching department and, Turkish Language and Literature department were chosen as the paradigm. Meta-cognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaire (MRSQ), and Meta-cognitive Reading Strategies Scale (MRSS) which works on Turkish validity and reliability, and also translated by Suna Çöğmen to be used in her postgraduate thesis, were all applied to the students.

Scale is composed of 22 items, the highest score on the test is 110, the lowest score 22. Scale's reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha was gathered as 0.81. Scale is two dimensional including cognitive processes and pragmatic strategies which involve analytic, academic work and success process.

Descriptive method was used in this research. It is a study in the characteristics of scanning, as the research is directed towards determining the reading strategy usage level of Turkish Language Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature Teaching department students. Data of the study which was applied descriptively, was gathered with MRSS. In the analysis of

the data gathered in this research; according to the questions' quality, independent t test, Anova and Scheffe tests along with the descriptive statistics were used.

Results and Discussion

Turkish Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature Teaching department students' frequency of reading comprehension strategy usage is given on Table 1: Analytic Reading Strategies Numbers and Percentages and Table 2 :Pragmatic Reading Strategies Numbers and Percentages

Table 1

Analytic Reading Strategies Numbers and Percentages

| Items | I Never Use Strategies | | I Rarely Use Strategies | | I Sometimes Use Strategies | | I Frequently Use Them | | I Always Use Them. | |
|---------|------------------------|-----|-------------------------|------|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|--------------------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| | Item 1 | 2 | 1,0 | 2 | 1,0 | 43 | 21,5 | 153 | 76,5 | - |
| Item 2 | - | - | 18 | 9,0 | 56 | 28,0 | 91 | 45,5 | 35 | 17,5 |
| Item 3 | 1 | ,5 | 6 | 3,0 | 37 | 18,5 | 84 | 42,0 | 72 | 36,0 |
| Item 4 | 1 | ,5 | 9 | 4,5 | 40 | 20,0 | 98 | 49,0 | 52 | 26,0 |
| Item 5 | 1 | ,5 | 15 | 7,5 | 70 | 35,0 | 84 | 42,0 | 30 | 15,0 |
| Item 6 | 3 | 1,5 | 12 | 6,0 | 78 | 39,0 | 75 | 37,5 | 32 | 16,0 |
| Item 7 | 1 | ,5 | 3 | 1,5 | 42 | 21,0 | 81 | 40,5 | 73 | 36,5 |
| Item 8 | 4 | 2,0 | 12 | 6,0 | 32 | 16,0 | 78 | 39,0 | 74 | 37,0 |
| Item 11 | 4 | 2,0 | 15 | 7,5 | 54 | 27,0 | 63 | 31,5 | 64 | 32,0 |
| Item 13 | 9 | 4,5 | 22 | 11,0 | 54 | 27,0 | 73 | 36,5 | 42 | 21,0 |
| Item 14 | 2 | 1,0 | 11 | 5,5 | 53 | 26,5 | 68 | 34,0 | 66 | 33,0 |

Table 2

Pragmatic Reading Strategies Numbers and Percentages

| Items | I Never Use Strategies | | I Rarely Use Strategies | | I Sometimes Use Strategies | | I Frequently Use Them | | I Always Use Them. | |
|---------|------------------------|-----|-------------------------|------|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|--------------------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| | Item 9 | 3 | 1,5 | 9 | 4,5 | 39 | 19,5 | 77 | 38,5 | 72 |
| Item 10 | 4 | 2,0 | 15 | 7,5 | 59 | 29,5 | 70 | 35,0 | 52 | 26,0 |
| Item 12 | 1 | ,5 | 12 | 6,0 | 47 | 23,5 | 84 | 42,0 | 56 | 28,0 |
| Item 5 | 1 | ,5 | 1 | ,5 | 23 | 11,5 | 68 | 34,0 | 107 | 53,5 |
| Item 16 | - | - | 4 | 2,0 | 23 | 11,5 | 76 | 38,0 | 97 | 48,5 |
| Item 17 | 16 | 8,0 | 36 | 18,0 | 56 | 28,0 | 52 | 26,0 | 40 | 20,0 |
| Item 18 | 11 | 5,5 | 24 | 12,0 | 42 | 21,0 | 54 | 27,0 | 69 | 34,5 |
| Item 19 | 18 | 9,0 | 35 | 17,5 | 56 | 28,0 | 52 | 26,0 | 39 | 19,5 |
| Item 20 | 11 | 5,5 | 28 | 14,0 | 36 | 18,0 | 56 | 28,0 | 69 | 34,5 |
| Item 21 | 3 | 1,5 | 23 | 11,5 | 57 | 28,5 | 67 | 33,5 | 50 | 25,0 |
| Item 22 | 1 | ,5 | 5 | 2,5 | 32 | 16,0 | 60 | 30,0 | 102 | 51,0 |

Of the respondents are the most commonly used analytical reading strategies; “As I am reading, I evaluate the text to determine whether it contributes to my knowledge/understanding of the subject.”, “While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my prior questions about the topic, based on the text’s content.”, “After I read a text, I consider other possible interpretations to determine whether I understood the text.”. Students are never used in the analytical strategies; “While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my prior questions about the topic, based on the text’s content.”, “I anticipate information that will be presented later in the text..”, “I try to draw on my knowledge of the topic to help me understand what I am reading..”

Of the respondents are the most commonly used pragmatic reading strategies ; “While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my prior questions about the topic, based on the text’s content..”, “When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text..”, “I note how hard or easy a text is to read..”. En az kullandıkları pragmatik okuma stratejileri ise; “While

reading, I write questions and notes in the margin in order to better understand the text.”, I make notes when reading in order to remember the information.”, “While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on.”, “I try to underline when reading in order to remember the information..”

Concerning the first sub problem; for the comparison of reading strategies according to gender, an independent t test was applied and results were presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Reading Strategies Comparison According To Gender

| Gender | N | \bar{x} | Ss | Sd | t | P |
|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Female | 123 | 85,024 | 9,568 | | | |
| | | | | 198 | 0,008 | 0,993 |
| Male | 77 | 85,013 | 9,519 | | | |

When Table 3 is analyzed, it can be claimed that both male and female students are equivalent to each other by means of reading strategy, almost the same. ($t(198)= 0,008$, $p=0,993$). This situation can be explained by the similar education process gone through by the female and male student.

Concerning the second sub problem, inter-departmental reading strategies were compared, and for that, an independent t test was applied and the results were presented on Table 4.

Table 4

Reading Strategies Comparison by means of Departments

| Dept. | N | \bar{x} | Ss | Sd | t | P |
|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|--------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Turkish Language | 100 | 86,220 | 9,962 | | | |
| Turkish Language and Literature | 100 | 83,820 | 8,958 | 198 | 1,791 | 0,075 |

When Table 4 is assessed, although Turkish Language department students average scores ($\bar{x} = 86,220$) were high, the difference was not significant ($t(198) = 1,791$ $p=0,075$). Turkish Language department students' scores being high can be explained by the intensity of the basic talent skills lessons in the education program of Turkish Teaching. Students of both departments, having the same entrance scores, and confronting similar or close lessons in the education process of the program, caused them to use mutual strategies.

Concerning the third sub problem, reading strategy scores according to class level were compared, results were given on Table 5.

Table 5

Comparison of Reading Strategies According to Class Levels

| Class | N | \bar{x} | Ss | Sd | T | P |
|--------|-----|-----------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| First | 100 | 84,290 | 9,889 | | | |
| Fourth | 100 | 85,750 | 9,139 | 198 | 1,084 | 0,280 |

When Table 5 is assessed, reading strategies don't generate a significant difference according to class level ($t(198) = 1,084$ $p=0,280$). In this case, it can be claimed that the education given in the university does not differentiate the reading habits of the students. This process gone through in the program, by means of using the reading strategies in the group participating to the research, is not efficient. This result is thought-provoking; since with the new changes (2006) made in the program of Turkish Language Teaching, regarding basic skills classes education, the credits for classes were increased. For instance, comprehension and narrating techniques (reading, listening, speaking and writing education). These classes don't bring any high level skills about strategy usage to the candidates for being a Turkish Language Teacher.

Regarding the fourth sub problem, an Anova test was applied to the students whether the type of high school which is graduated makes a difference or not by means of reading strategies, and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

According to type of high school which is Graduated from, the Comparison of Students Scores of Reading Strategy Usage

| Graduated From: | N | \bar{x} | Ss | Sd | F | P | Difference |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Anatolian | 54 | 85,518 | 10,485 | | | | - |
| Anatolian | | | | | | | |
| Teacher High School | 50 | 83,360 | 11,030 | 2 | 1,014 | 0,365 | |
| General and Vocational | 96 | 85,604 | 8,003 | | | | |

When Table 6 is analyzed, there is no difference observed by means of reading strategies according to graduated high school type ($F(2-197)= 1,014, p=0,365$). This situation is supported by the result gathered from the interdepartmental comparisons. In other words, it is the result of students having the same reading comprehension skills as the ones taught in a faculty of elementary school and high school teachers education. It can also be said that they cause the same effect on the students re-positioned by them as in the places that they are assigned.

In the sub problem 5, whether or not students' reading comprehension skills differ regarding the number of the books read is tested and the Anova Test's results are listed in Table 7.

Table 7

Comparison of the Reading Comprehension Skills Usage of the Students Regarding the Number of the Books Read.

| Number of Books Read | N | \bar{x} | Ss | Sd | F | P | Difference |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| None Read | 47 | 81,489 | 9,472 | | | | 3-None |
| 1-2 | 93 | 84,440 | 10,110 | 2 | 8,421 | 0,000 | 3-1,2 |

When Table 7 is analyzed it can be seen that there is a significant difference between applying reading comprehension strategies and the number of books read. ($F(2-197) = 8,421$, $p < 0,001$). According to the result of the Scheffe Test, which shows the group in which the significant difference is seen; it is understood that there is a significant difference between the ones reading 0 to 3 books and the ones reading more than three books and one or two books when none is seen between the ones reading one or two books and the ones who don't read. Therefore it can be said that there is a reading comprehension strategies of the ones who read very little and the ones who don't read are similar. Students having advanced reading skills indicates that students develop strategies of their own while executing the ones taught, and perform them.

Conclusion

According to the results of the groups participated in the research there is no significant difference between male and female students' reading comprehension skills. These findings contradict with some of the research on the said field (Lee, 2000; Güngör, 2005; Kuş and Türkyılmaz, 2010; Akaya, 2011). Except for Kuş and Türkyılmaz (2010) researches were conducted among elementary school and junior high school students. This result from The Faculty of Education can be explained by both sexes being in the field of verbal line of business which requires the same amount of intelligence. There is no difference of the strategy usage between teaching Turkish language and literature. It is notable that no difference is seen between the strategy usage of first graders and fourth graders. It is expected to gain certain basic strategic skills in the senior year of the Turkish language teaching programme. No significant difference relevance in usage of reading strategies was detected between students graduated from different types of high schools. Significance of the difference is in proportion with the number of the books read. Students reading three or more books became more distinct in comparison to the others. In the light of these results the following suggestions can be made:

1. Using reading strategies is of importance in order to read efficiently and productively. The teacher applicants who will give the basic skills to the students should understand the importance of the matter. Therefore reading comprehension and commentary lessons should be taught more efficiently and productively. Strategic methods should be taught within applied courses.

2. Basic skill lessons such as basic documentary narration should also focus on the matter of Reading comprehension strategies.

3. Reading strategies used by students while studying can be examined and awareness can be occurred.

References

- Adalı, O. (2003). *Comprehending and Narrating*. İstanbul: Pan Publishing.
- Akkaya, N. (2011). *Effects Of Using Reading Comprehension Straregies On The Attitudes And Success At Elemntary School 8th Grade Turkish Course*, Nova Science Publishers.
- Akyol, H. (2006). *Turkish Language Teaching Under The New Regulations*. Ankara: Kök Publishing.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Data Analysis Handbook for Social Sciences*. Ankara: Pegem Publishing.
- Calp, M. (2010). *Turkish Language Teaching as a Private Field*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Cemiloğlu, M. (2001). *Turkish Language Teaching In Elementary Schools*. İstanbul: Alfa Publishing.
- Çöğmen, S., & Saracaloğlu, S. (2010). *Adaptation Studies of Meta-cognitive Reading Strategies in Turkish Language*. Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Press.
- Doğan, B. (2002). *Literature Scanning on Teaching of The Reading Comprehencion Tecniques*. Uludag University Faculty of Education Journal, 2002, Cilt 15, Sayı 2, ss. 97-107.
- Güngör, A. (2005). *Understanding The Level of Reading Comprehencion Exercise of Junior High School Students*. Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal, 28, 101-108.
- Göğüş, B. (1978). *Turkish and Literature Education on Secondary School*. Ankara: Gül Publishing.
- Ertekin, S. (2010). *A Study On The Use Of Reading Strategies By Students In Science And Social Science Departments*. Published Doctorate Thesis, Dokuz Eylul University, Enstitute Of Educational Sciences.
- Karadağ, M. (2003). *Written and Oral Expression, Lecture On Theory-Methods* , Urun Publishing.
- Karasar, N. (2002). *Scientific Research Method*, Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Kavcar and Others. (1998). *Study of Turkish Language Learning*. Ankara: Engin Publishing.

- Özbay, M. (2009). *Study of Reading*. Ankara: Öncü Publishing.
- Özdemir, E. (1990). *The Art of Reading*. İstanbul: Inkilap Publishing.
- Sever, S. (1997). *Teaching Turkish and Complete Learning*. Ankara: Anı Publishing
- Sever, S. (2002). *Children and Literature*. Ankara: Engin Publishing.
- Susar, K. (2006). *Multiple Intelligence Theory Based Cooperative Learning Method's Goal and Effect on Attitude, Learning Strategies an Multiple Intelligence Field in Primary 4th Grade Turkish Teaching*, Unpublished Doctorate Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, Enstitute Of Educational Sciences
- Taraban, R., Kerr, M. & Rynearson, K. (2004). Analytic and pragmatic factors in college students' metacognitive reading strategies. *Reading Psychology*, 25, 67-81.
- Temizkan, M. (2007). *Reading Strategies' Effect on Comprehension on Elementary Second Stage Turkish Language Courses*. Doctorate Thesis, Gazi University Social Sciences Journal.
- Yalçın, A. (2002). *Turkish Language Learning in The New Approach*. Ankara: Akçay Publishing.
- Yıldız & Others. (2006). *Theory-Methods On Turkish teaching*, Ankara: Pegem Publishing,