

Analysis of the Relationship between Reading and Writing Attitudes of Teacher Candidates and Their Academic Achievements through the Structural Equation Model

Emre ÜNAL¹

Kamil İŞERİ²

ABSTRACT. Reading and writing skills are the main determinants of individuals' educational lives and many other elements in their lives. The most prominent of the factors directly influencing reading and writing skills is the attitudes towards these skills. The fact that attitudes have determining impact on behaviors has given rise to the idea that suitable educational environments should be provided in order to improve attitudes in the education process. The aim of this research was to investigate the impact of teacher candidates' reading and writing attitudes on their academic achievements. In this study, designed with the survey method which is one of the quantitative research methods, hypotheses were tested through the structural equation modeling. The participants of the research were Classroom Teaching students enrolled at Niğde University, Faculty of Education in the 2009-2010 Academic Year. The data were collected from people who volunteered to fill the reading and writing attitude scale, and the working group of the research consisted of a total of 255 participants. It was concluded after the research that teacher candidates' reading attitudes are significant predictors of their writing attitudes, and that their reading and writing attitudes are not significant predictors of their academic achievements.

Key words: Reading attitude, Writing attitude, Academic achievement, Structural equation model.

INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that language is directly related to the individual, the society and the culture, and thus, it is important in human life; since the individual is in the society and s/he acquires and uses the language within the context of the cultural structure of that society. The individual in the society uses the language as a tool while expressing his feelings and thoughts. This fact demonstrates the importance of language in communication, which is one of the important needs of individuals. The individual, in this process, learns the cultural values of the society he belongs to and perpetuates these values by transmitting them to other individuals through the native language, since he uses his native language as the main instrument of communication. According to Aksan (2007, p.51-54), language is a multifaceted and highly advanced system that enables the transmission of thoughts, emotions and demands to others by the elements and rules that are common among the members of a society in terms of sound and meaning. Accordingly, language is considered to be individuals' certificate of privilege. It is known that there exists a close relationship between this privileged skill to use language and the skill of thinking.

The purpose in language teaching is to ensure the use of four basic language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) in the most effective and ideal manner. Inability to create language awareness brings along numerous problems. According to Karakuş (2000, p. 33), language is an effective tool for an individual from childhood throughout his life span to develop his emotions, thoughts and imagination, to make accurate evaluations, to discipline his emotions, to develop and mature his sense of aesthetics, to adapt into the society and -more simply- to become socialized.

An individual acquires the most important part of his knowledge thanks to his listening and reading skills. In other words, the way an individual perceives the world is directly proportional to the level of his listening and reading habits. Reading, one of the basic language skills, influences individuals' personalities, values and interests. This influence might create affective changes. Individuals' reading of written texts enables them to encounter with various manners of emotion, thought and action (Sever, 2004, p. 16). Özbay (2006, p. 121) points to the fact that the act of writing is a necessity when defining the act of writing, which is one of the four basic language skills as “the narration of

¹ Asst. Prof. Dr., Niğde University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary School, Niğde, dr.emreunal@gmail.com

² Assoc. Prof. Dr., Niğde University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education, Niğde, kamiliseri@gmail.com

emotions, thoughts and events through certain symbols according to certain rules". Kirby and Liner (1998) emphasize that a good writing should be honest by stating that writing is "a complex and advanced human behavior" (Quoted by; Oral, 2008).

In order for the act of writing to be adequately realized, the individual should be improved cognitively, affectively and kinesthetically. Ofsted (1999) characterizes children's writings as short, fragmentary, mostly lacking (unfinished) and as writings whose purposes are not well-defined (Quoted by; Akyol, 2006, p. 93). Akyol (2006) suggests that it is necessary -in order to alleviate this problem- for children to be aware of the existence of different kinds of texts and of the information related to the target audience. Students, in order for them to be able to create different genres of texts, should be confronted with different genres of texts that are capable of representing their genres.

For a child to have positive attitudes towards reading, it is necessary to carefully select books that will provide the child with willingness to read and deliver them to the student (Sever, 2003, p. 20). Attitudes have three elements namely; mental, emotional and behavioral attitudes (Aronson et al., 2004, p. 217). The aesthetic pleasure taken by the individual during the act of reading constitutes the affective element; beliefs and thoughts about the attractiveness or necessity of reading constitute the cognitive element; and the condition of performing the act of reading when the proper conditions are met constitutes the behavioral elements (Özbay and Uyar, 2009, p. 633). Besides, the independent, critical standpoint the student develops with respect to reading other people's works can also help the student frame and revise his or her own writing to be a purposeful and appropriate contribution to an on-going conversation (Bazerman, 1980, p. 660).

Human beings exhibit a complex character due to their behaviors, emotions and thoughts, to the place they occupy in the society, and to the fact that they are the essential material in the socialization process. There exist several main concepts influential in the processes of the formation of this complex structure and of the continuation of its existence (Temizkan and Sallabaş, 2009, p.155). Attitudes are one of these main concepts. The word attitude, which comes from the Latin word "aptus" meaning suitability or adaptation, means behavior, state and line of conduct. There exist different definitions of the term "Attitude", which is characterized as learned tendencies that prompt an individual to exhibit certain behaviors in front of certain people, things and situations (Demirel and Ün, 1987, p. 94). According to Tavşancıl (2002), attitude is the state of emotional and mental preparation, which is formed through experiences, that has a directive or dynamic influential power on an individual's behaviors towards all things and situations. According to İnceoğlu (2004, p. 19), it is a mental, emotional and behavioral reaction and pre-tendency organized by an individual against himself or any object, social issue or event; based on his experiences, knowledge, emotions and motivations. While attitudes play a significant role in student success, it is highly difficult to develop an attitude in an individual towards an object or to alter the existing attitude. In order to be able to alter students' attitudes, it is primarily necessary to reveal the characteristics of the intended group and the factors that pave the way for the formation and development of their attitudes. Attitudes, which are of dynamic, continuous, incentive and motivative character, influence an individual's emotions, thoughts and behaviors by rendering them compatible to each other (İskender, 2007, p. 632).

Students' academic achievements are affected by numerous factors. It is suggested that there exists a positive correlation between students' academic achievements and their study habits (Atılğan, 1998), book-reading habits (Güngör, 2009; Acıyan, 2008), their levels of reading comprehension and attitudes towards the Turkish language course (Ateş, 2008), and levels of their written expression skills (Kaleağası, 2009). Therefore, it is necessary to consider numerous factors in order to obtain a high level of academic achievement. Reading and writing are connected, according to such views, because they depend on identical or similar knowledge representations, cognitive processes, and contexts and contextual constraints. Therefore, we should expect reading and writing to be quite similar, their developments should parallel each other closely, and some type of pedagogical combination may be useful in making learning more efficient. This idea of common or shared knowledge or process has been explored for several decades, though often with the theory more

implied than stated. Researchers sought correlations among measures of reading and writing, and these connections were often put forth as evidence that reading and writing could be taught better or that they reflected common cognitive resources underlying reading and writing. As the “cognitive revolution” proceeded, and the notion of active learners or active readers became more widely held, the metaphor of a reader composing a text in his or her mind encouraged greater attention to the cognitive and linguistic similarities of reading and writing (Tierney&Pearson, 1983) and to intensified efforts to pursue such correlations (Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000, p. 40). At present the teaching of literature and composition are characterized by an artificial separation between the activities of reading and those of writing.1 Although there is no question that a number of conveniences attend this separation, the division can be dangerous if it seems to suggest that the processes of the one activity, in theory and in practice, are antithetical to the teaching of the other, and if it implicitly sets up a qualitative and value-laden distinction between the reading of inexperienced and experienced readers (Salvatory,1983, p. 657-658).

In this study, the relationship between classroom teacher candidates' reading and writing attitudes and their academic achievements is investigated. Reading and writing skills are the main determinants of individuals' educational lives and many elements in these lives. The most prominent of factors directly influencing reading and writing skills is the attitudes towards these skills. The fact that attitudes have determining impact on behaviors has given rise to the idea that suitable educational environments should be provided in order to improve attitudes in the education process. One of the most important steps of this process of change is the measurement of attitudes. This measurement is used both at the beginning and at the end of the process in order to determine the level of change of attitudes (Balci, 2009, p. 1313). The aim of this research is to investigate the impact of teacher candidates' reading and writing attitudes on their academic achievements.

METHOD

In this study designed with the survey method that is one of quantitative research methods, hypotheses were tested through the structural equation model.

The hypotheses of the research are presented below:

1. Teacher candidates' reading attitudes are significant predictors of their writing attitudes,
2. Teacher candidates' reading attitudes are significant predictors of their academic achievements,
3. Teacher candidates' writing attitudes are significant predictors of their academic achievements.

Participants

The participants of the research were Classroom Teaching students enrolled at Niğde University Faculty of Education in the 2009-2010 Academic Year. The data were collected from people who volunteered to fill the reading and writing attitude scale, and the working group of the research consisted of a total of 255 people (91 males and 164 females). Of the participants, 53 are freshman, 63 sophomores, 67 juniors and 72 seniors.

According to Hair et al. (1998, p. 604), in the calculation of the adequate scale size in order for the data to exhibit normal distribution, each parameter in the scale should be answered by minimum ten respondents. Hoyle (1995), on the other hand, suggests that the minimum sample size should be 250 individuals or more for confirmatory factor analysis. Şimşek (2007) argues that the minimum sample size in the structural equation model should be $k(k+1)/2$ [k denotes the number of variables]. Since the data in this study have been collected from a total of 255 participants, it is evident that the normality of the distribution of the data is ensured.

Procedure

The reading and writing attitude scale used in the research, after the written permission of the developers (Temizkan and Sallabaş, 2009) had been obtained, was administered to the teacher candidates in 2010 Spring Term and the data were collected. Teacher candidates were asked to write down their names and surnames on the scales they filled. Since each academic year consists of two terms, general academic averages of each teacher candidates for the last grade levels were obtained from the student affairs unit at the end of the academic year.

Data collection

The reading and writing attitude scale used in the research was developed by Temizkan and Sallabaş (2009). The “Reading Attitude Scale” and “Writing Attitude Scale” were used after taking the written permissions of their developers. Both scales are of five-point Likert types consisting of 25 items. The responses given to the expressions in the scale are scored as follows: “Strongly Agree” 5, “Agree” 4, “Neutral” 3, “Don't Agree” 2, “Strongly Disagree” 1 points. Negative expressions in the scale were scored inversely. According to the analyses carried out by the developers of the scale, the threshold value was determined to be .50 for the factor loading, and the Cronbach's alpha value, the internal consistency coefficient, was found for each scales to be .842 (Temizkan and Sallabaş, 2009, p. 159-160).

Findings Related to the Explanatory Factor Analysis and Reliability Level of Reading and Writing Attitude Scales

In order to test whether both of the scales are suitable to explanatory factor analysis or not, KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity were performed. In this respect, it is required that the KMO test result is .60 and above and Bartlett's sphericity test result is statistically significant (Büyüköztürk, 2010). In this study, the KMO test result of the reading attitude scale was found to be .850, and that of the writing attitude scale was found to be .834. The Bartlett's sphericity test was found to be statistically significant for both scales at the ($P < 0.01$) level, and it was concluded that the explanatory factor analysis could be performed on the scales. In the explanatory factor analysis, the threshold value for the load values in the factor the items were located in was taken as .40, and the varimax rotation technique through the principal components method was used in order to be able to determine the items highly correlated with the factors and to be able to interpret the factors easier. The findings related to the explanatory factor analysis of the reading attitude scale are presented in Table 1, and the findings related to the writing attitude scale are presented in Table 2.

Table 1. Reading Attitude Scale Factor Analysis Results

Item No	Factor Covariance	Factor-1 Loading	Factor Loadings After Rotation			Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alfa Level
			Factor-1	Factor-2	Factor-3		
r21	,479		,626			,541	
r22	,741	,692	,844			,762	
r23	,871	,721	,925			,856	.886
r24	,827	,681	,902			,801	
r25	,711	,624	,834			,727	
r1	,669	,638		,715		,652	
r2	,372			,569		,435	
r15	,599	,658		,723		,565	.776
r17	,589	,663		,677		,600	
r18	,514	,526		,710		,511	
r3	,612				,723	,574	
r5	,522				,586	,505	
r14	,675				,818	,467	.725
r16	,520				,611	,519	

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the entire scale was found to be .816.

Table 2. Writing Attitude Scale Factor Analysis Results

Item No	Factor Covariance	Factor-1 Loading	Factor Loadings after Rotation			Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alfa Level
			Factor-1	Factor-2	Factor-3		
w21	,647	,595	,771			,682	.923
w22	,801	,709	,884			,825	

w23	,856	,750	,910		,866	
w24	,873	,714	,928		,886	
w25	,735	,559	,852		,747	
w2	,419			,622	,470	
w16	,482	,553		,613	,541	
w17	,618	,578		,708	,629	.795
w18	,710	,609		,815	,688	
w19	,669	,542		,795	,572	
w1	,488	,533			,502	
w3	,727			,603	,679	
w5	,732			,838	,693	.801
w14	,607			,837	,600	
				,764		

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the entire scale was found to be .838.

As a result of the factor analysis performed on the reading attitude scale, a total of eleven items, which did not belong to any factor or whose factor loadings are below .40, were removed from the scale and, as a result, three factors were obtained. The first factor explains 25,79 % of the total variance related to the scale, the second factor explains 20,18 % and the third one explains 16,17 %. Thus, 62,14 % of the scale is explained.

As a result of the factor analysis performed on the writing attitude scale, a total of eleven items, which did not belong to any factor or whose factor loadings are below .40, were removed from the scale and, as a result, three factors were obtained. The first factor explains 27,59 % of the total variance related to the scale, the second factor explains 20,21 % and the third one explains 19,08 %. Thus, 66,88 % of the scale is explained.

For the findings related to the reliabilities of the scales, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated, and the coefficients of .816 was found for the entire reading attitude scale, .886 for its first sub-dimension, .776 for its second sub-dimension, and .725 for its third sub-dimension. On the other hand, the coefficients of .838 was found for the entire reading attitude scale, .923 for its first sub-dimension, .795 for its second sub-dimension, and .801 for its third sub-dimension. Tezbaşaran (1997) suggests that a correlation coefficient in a Likert-type scale should be as close as possible to 1 to be considered adequate. Therefore, it can be inferred from the above results that the reliability of the scale is high. When considered the explanatory factor analyses and the internal consistency coefficients of the reading and writing attitude scales, whose explanatory factor analyses were performed and factor structures were revealed through the SPSS 15.0 software, it was concluded that each scale is valid and reliable with the obtained items.

Findings Related to the Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Reliability Level of Reading and Writing Attitude Scales

The secondary confirmatory factor analysis of Reading and Writing Attitude Scales was performed through the AMOS 6.0 software and the maximum likelihood model was used in the analyses. When the importance of the theory is taken into consideration, the secondary model becomes more significant in structural equation studies (Şimşek, 2007). Therefore, the scales were subjected to the secondary confirmatory factor analysis.

As a result of the secondary confirmatory factor analysis performed on the reading attitude scale after the modifications that were predicted by the Amos 6.0 software and theoretically-acceptable among error terms, the Chi-Square was found to be (χ^2) 125,480; degrees of freedom (df) was found to be 56 and -thus- the model is statistically significant ($P < 0.01$). When considered the minimum modifications between the error terms predicted by the software, the results of the secondary confirmatory factor analysis of the reading attitude scale are presented in Table 3.

As a result of the secondary confirmatory factor analysis performed on the reading attitude scale after the modifications that were predicted by the Amos 6.0 software and theoretically-acceptable among error terms, the Chi-Square was found to be (χ^2) 94,426; degrees of freedom (df) was found

to be 55 and -thus- the model is statistically significant ($P < 0.01$). When considered the minimum modifications between the error terms predicted by the software, the results of the secondary confirmatory factor analysis of the writing attitude scale are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Reading and Writing Attitude Scales Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Scale	Dimensions	Items	Standardize		
			Reg. Weights	t	p
Reading Attitude Scale	R1 ($\sum\eta = 0,91^*$, $\sum v_{C(n)} = 0,69^{**}$)	r21	0,636	---	---
		r22	0,846	11,820	.000
		r23	0,942	12,296	.000
		r24	0,898	11,863	.000
		r25	0,817	10,775	.000
	R2 ($\sum\eta = 0,83^*$, $\sum v_{C(n)} = 0,51^{**}$)	r1	0,728	---	---
		r2	0,652	4,394	.000
		r15	0,722	6,785	.000
		r17	0,773	7,182	.000
		r18	0,692	6,625	.000
	R3 ($\sum\eta = 0,81^*$, $\sum v_{C(n)} = 0,53^{**}$)	r3	0,852	---	---
		r5	0,781	4,550	.000
		r14	0,478	4,542	.000
		r16	0,768	5,188	.000
		w21	0,693	---	---
		w22	0,874	14,427	.000
Writing Attitude Scale	W1 ($\sum\eta = 0,92^*$, $\sum v_{C(n)} = 0,72^{**}$)	w23	0,941	14,101	.000
		w24	0,928	14,073	.000
		w25	0,783	12,690	.000
		w2	0,673	---	---
		w16	0,678	5,891	.000
	W2 ($\sum\eta = 0,83^*$, $\sum v_{C(n)} = 0,50^{**}$)	w17	0,71	6,144	.000
		w18	0,865	6,353	.000
		w19	0,62	6,083	.000
		w1	0,593	---	---
		w3	0,771	3,649	.000
W3 ($\sum\eta = 0,81^*$, $\sum v_{C(n)} = 0,52^{**}$)	w5	0,856	3,694	.000	
	w14	0,652	3,553	.000	

* $\sum\eta$: Construct Reliability = $(\sum \text{standardized loadings})^2 / (\sum \text{standardized loadings})^2 + \sum \text{error}$

** $\sum v_{C(n)}$: Variance Extracted = $\sum (\text{standardized loadings})^2 / \sum (\text{standardized loadings})^2 + \sum \text{error}$

(Hair et al., 1998, p. 612)

Table 3 demonstrates that the dimensions obtained through the explanatory factor analysis were confirmed in both scales. The standardized regression weights of the items in the factors were found to be very high and the items were found to be statistically significant. Of the reading attitude scale, as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, the construct reliability for the first factor was found to be .91, variance extracted was found to be .69; construct reliability for the second factor was found to be .83, variance extracted was found to be .51; construct reliability for the third factor was found to be .81, variance extracted was found to be .53. Of the writing attitude scale, the construct reliability for the first factor was found to be .92, variance extracted was found to be .72; construct reliability for the second factor was found to be .83, variance extracted was found to be .50; construct reliability for the third factor was found to be .81, variance extracted was found to be .52. According to Hair et al. (1998) and Şimşek (2007), construct reliability and variance extracted should be .50 and above. Thus, it was concluded that the determined dimensions are valid, reliable

and they belong to the relevant factor. The goodness of fit indexes concerning the secondary confirmatory factor analysis of the scales are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Goodness of Fit Indexes Related to the Model formed in the Reading and Writing Attitude Scales**

Measures of Fit	Good Fit	Acceptable Fit	Reading Attitude	Writing Attitude
RMSEA	$0 < \text{RMSEA} < 0,05$	$0,05 \leq \text{RMSEA} \leq 0,10$	0,070	0,053
NFI	$0,95 \leq \text{NFI} \leq 1$	$0,90 \leq \text{NFI} \leq 0,95$	0,925	0,953
CFI	$0,97 \leq \text{CFI} \leq 1$	$0,95 \leq \text{CFI} \leq 0,97$	0,956	0,980
GFI	$0,95 \leq \text{GFI} \leq 1$	$0,90 \leq \text{GFI} \leq 0,95$	0,939	0,950
AGFI	$0,90 \leq \text{AGFI} \leq 1$	$0,85 \leq \text{AGFI} \leq 0,9$	0,886	0,904
χ^2/df	$0 < \chi^2/\text{df} < 3$		$125,480 / 56 = 2,241$	$94,426 / 55 = 1,717$

*Schermelleh-Engel and Moosbrugger, 2003, p. 23-74

The value that tests the statistical suitability of the model proposed in the confirmatory factor analysis and of the analyzed sample is the value of χ^2 (Schumacker, 2004). The value χ^2 tests whether the covariance matrix that belongs to the population is equal to the covariance matrix applied in the model. However, since this value is sensitive to the sample size and since high χ^2 values are obtained in multi-element samples, it is considered to be more appropriate to use the χ^2/df value corrected with the degree of freedom (df) (Bagozzi, 1981). In this study, the χ^2/df value obtained for the reading attitude scale was found to be 2,241; and the χ^2/df value obtained for the writing attitude scale was found to be 1,717. This finding implies that the model is statistically significant. Besides, it is suggested that an IFI value -which is not included in the table but considers both the sample size and the complexity in the model- of .95 and above exhibits a good fit (Şimşek, 2007). In this study, the IFI value obtained for the reading attitude scale was found to be .957; and the IFI value obtained for the writing attitude scale was found to be .980; and this points to a good fit.

According to the goodness of fit index in the model presented in Table 4, the values in the reading attitude scale are at the acceptable level of fit, and the values in the writing attitude scale are at the good level of fit. This finding implies that the dimensions obtained as a result of the explanatory factor analysis are confirmed by the confirmatory factor analysis for both scales.

Data analysis

Since this study was aimed at determining the impact of attitudes towards reading and writing on academic achievement, the data were analyzed based on the model development strategy, with the maximum likelihood model and through the Amos 6.0 software.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

In the model created for the Hypothesis 1, after the modifications that were predicted by the Amos 6.0 software and were theoretically-acceptable among error terms, the Chi-Square (χ^2) was found to be 638,043, degrees of freedom (df) was found to be 298 and -thus- the model is statistically significant ($P < 0.01$). The χ^2/df value of the model was found to be 2,141; RMSEA value 0,067; NFI value 0,963; CFI value 0,956; GFI value 0,952; AGFI 0,922; and the IFI value was found to be 0,952. According to the goodness of fit results presented in Table 4, RMSEA and CFI values are within the limits of acceptable fit, and the other values are within the limits of good fit. This implies that the model created for the Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

In the model created for the Hypothesis 2, after the modifications that were predicted by the Amos 6.0 software and were theoretically-acceptable among error terms, the Chi-Square (χ^2) was found to be 126,174, degrees of freedom (df) was found to be 70 and -thus- the model is statistically significant ($P < 0.01$). The χ^2/df value of the model was found to be 1,802; RMSEA value 0,056; NFI value 0,925; CFI value 0,964; GFI value 0,943; AGFI 0,902; and the IFI value was found to be 0,965. According to the goodness of fit results presented in Table 4, NFI, CFI and GFI values are

within the limits of acceptable fit, and RMSEA and AGFI values are within the limits of good fit. This implies that the model created for the Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

In the model created for the Hypothesis 3, after the modifications that were predicted by the Amos 6.0 software and were theoretically-acceptable among error terms, the Chi-Square (χ^2) was found to be 121,155, degrees of freedom (df) was found to be 68 and -thus- the model is statistically significant ($P < 0.01$). The χ^2/df value of the model was found to be 1,782; RMSEA value 0,055; NFI value 0,941; CFI value 0,973; GFI value 0,941; AGFI 0,896; and the IFI value was found to be 0,973. According to the goodness of fit results presented in Table 4, RMSEA, NFI and GFI values are within the limits of acceptable fit, and CFI and AGFI values are within the limits of good fit. This implies that the model created for the Hypothesis 3 was accepted. Information regarding the created models are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Data Regarding the Hypotheses.

Hypotheses	Path	Path coefficient	t- value	Results
H1	READ → WRT	.475	4,192*	Supported
H2	READ → ACH	.070	,870	Rejected
H3	WRT → ACH	.075	,911	Rejected

* $p < 0,05$

Table 5 indicates that the hypothesis that the reading attitude is a significant predictor of the writing attitude is supported; and the reading and writing attitudes do not significantly predict academic achievement and, thus, these hypotheses are rejected.

Language consists of four basic integrated skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. Studies have conceptually demonstrated that there exists a direct connection between these skills. Sever (2004); Sever, Kaya and Aslan (2006); Demirel and Şahinel (2006) have theoretically demonstrated this in their studies. In this respect, one of the significant findings of this study is that the reading attitude is a significant predictor of the writing attitude. This study demonstrates the connection between two of these four basic language skills with statistical proofs.

In previous research focusing on the relationship between reading and writing and academic achievement, generally the relationships between the level of reading comprehension and writing skill and academic achievements. For example; in the research carried out by Tekin (1980), Fidan and Baykul (1994), and Bloom (1995), it has been revealed that as the level of reading comprehension goes up, students' academic achievements also increase. In this study, different from the measurement of reading comprehension and writing skills, the relationship between the reading and writing attitudes and academic achievement was investigated. Therefore, the previous findings do not match up with the findings of this research.

Numerous factors (the physical formation of the classroom, families' socioeconomic conditions, students' study habits etc.) are considered today to be influential in achievement. Çalıřkan (2000) has determined that there exists a linear relationship between the income levels of the families of elementary school fifth-grade students and their achievements in reading comprehension. Akay (2004) has demonstrated that the reading comprehension skills of second-grade elementary school students positively affect their achievements in solving maths problems. Şeflek (2006), on the other hand, concluded that parents' behaviors influence students' reading comprehension skills. Sabak (2007) has concluded that there does not exist any significant correlation between third-grade elementary school students' reading comprehension skills and the descriptive variables of gender, their parents' home-ownership statuses, the economic conditions of the environment where their houses are located and the number of siblings. In this respect, the finding that the reading and writing attitudes alone are not capable of predicting academic achievement becomes understandable.

As a result of the findings obtained in this study, it is suggested that research should be carried out in order to determine the levels of prediction between the four basic language skills, studies should be

conducted to reveal the relationships between the writing achievement and the writing attitude, and between the reading comprehension achievement and the reading attitude, and to what extent all of the integrated language skills are influential in predicting the academic achievement should be explored.

REFERENCES

- Acıyan, A. (2008), *Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Okuma Alışkanlıkları ve Akademik Başarı Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişki [The Relationship Between High School Students' Reading Habits and Academic Achievement Levels]*. Yeditepe Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Akay, A. A. (2004), *İlköğretim 2. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Okuduğunu Anlama Becerilerinin Matematik Problemlerini Çözme Başarısına Etkisi [The Impact of Second-Grade Elementary School Students' Reading Comprehension Skills on their Achievements in Solving Maths Problems]*. Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. İstanbul: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Aksan, D. (2007). *Her Yönüyle Dil: Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim (4. baskı) [Language from the ground up: Linguistics in General (4th Edition)]*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Akyol, H. (2006). *Yeni Programa Uygun Türkçe Öğretim Yöntemleri [Turkish Language Teaching Methods In Accordance With The New Program]*. Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T.-D. and Akert, R. M., (2004), *Social Psychology (Forth Edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Ateş, M. (2008), *İlköğretim İkinci Kademe Öğrencilerinin Okuduğunu Anlama Düzeyleri ile Türkçe Dersine Karşı Tutumları ve Akademik Başarıları Arasındaki İlişki [The Relationship Between Elementary Education Second-Level Students' Reading Comprehension Levels and Their Attitudes towards Turkish Language Course and Academic Achievements]*. Selçuk Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Konya: Unpublished Doctorate Thesis.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1981), "Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. A comment", *Journal of Marketing Research*. 18 (3) 375-381.
- Balcı, A. (2009). "İlköğretim 8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Okumaya Yönelik Tutumları ve Okuduğunu Anlama Düzeyleri [Elementary school eighth-grade students' attitudes towards reading and their reading comprehension levels]", *Journal of New World Sciences Academy Education Sciences*. 4 (4) 1308-1330.
- Bazerman, C. (1980), "A Relationship between Reading and Writing: The Conversational Model". *College English*. 41(6) 656-661.
- Bloom, B, S (1995), *İnsan Nitelikleri ve Okulda Öğrenme (Trans. Durmuş Ali Özçelik) [Human Characteristics and School Learning]* İstanbul: Milli eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analiz El Kitabı (11Baskı) [Data Analysis Handbook for Social Sciences]*, Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Çalışkan, M. (2000), *Ailenin Bazı Sosyo-Ekonomik Faktörlerinin Öğrencinin Okuduğunu Anlama Başarısına Etkisi [The Impact of Families' Various Socioeconomic Factors on Students' Achievements in Reading Comprehension]* Abant izzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Bolu: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Demirel, Ö. and Ün, K. (1987), *Eğitim Terimleri Sözlüğü [Education Dictionary]*. Ankara: Şafak Matbaası.
- Demirel, Ö. and Şahinel, M. (2006), *Türkçe Öğretimi [Turkish Teaching]*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Fidan, N. and Baykul, Y. (1994), İlköğretimde Temel İhtiyaçların Karşlanması. (Meeting the Basic Needs in Elementary Education), *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 10
- Fitzgerald, J. and Sahanahan, T. (2000), Reading and Writing Relations and Their Development", *Educational Development*, 35 (1), 39-50.
- Güngör, E. (2009), *İlköğretim 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Kitap Okuma Alışkanlığı ile Türkçe Dersi Akademik Başarıları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi [An Analysis of the Relationship between Elementary School Fifth-Grade Students' Book-Reading habits and their Turkish Language Course Academic Achievements]*, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Adana: Unpublished Master's Thesis..

- Hair, J.F. Jr., Andreson, R.E. Tahtam, R.L. and Black, W.C. (1998), *Multivariate data analysis* (5th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International Inc.
- Hoyle, R.H. (1995), *Structural equation modeling: concepts, issues and applications*. London: Sage Publication Inc.
- İnceoğlu, M. (2004), *Tutum, Algı, İletişim [Attitude, Perception, Communication]*. Ankara: Kesit Tanıtım Ltd. Şti.
- İskender, P. (2007), Öğretmen Adaylarının Tarih Dersine İlişkin Tutumları [Teacher Candidates' Attitudes towards the History Course], *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*. 15 (2) 631-638.
- Kaleağası, İ. (2009), *İlköğretim 4. ve 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Yazılı Anlatım Beceri Düzeyleri ile Türkçe Dersi Akademik Başarısı Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesi [Determination of the Relationship between Elementary School Fourth- and Fifth-Grade Students' Written Expression Skills and Turkish Language Course Academic Achievement Levels]*. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Adana: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Karakuş, İ. (2000), *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Öğretimi -Öğretmen El Kitabı [Teaching Turkish language and Literature- Teachers' Handbook]*. Ankara: Sistem Ofset Yayınları.
- Oral, G. (2008), *Yine Yazı Yazıyoruz [We Are Writing Again]* (3rd Edition). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Özbay, M. (2006), *Türkçe Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri [Special Teaching Methods of Turkish Language]*. Ankara: Öncü Yayıncılık.
- Özbay, M. and Uyar, Y. (2009), İlköğretim İkinci Kademe Öğrencileri için Okumaya Yönelik Tutum Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi: Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması [The Development of reading attitude scale for secondary level students: study on the validity-reliability], *Journal of New World Sciences Academy Education Sciences*. 4 (2) 632-651.
- Sabak, E. (2007), *İlköğretim 3. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Türkçe Dersinde Okuduğunu Anlama Becerilerini Etkileyen Ekonomik ve Demografik Faktörler [Economic and Demographic Factors Affecting Elementary School Third-Grade Students' Reading Comprehension Skills in Turkish Course]* Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Gaziantep: Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Salvatory, M. (1983). "Reading and Writing a Text: Correlations between Reading and Writing Patterns", *College English*. 45 (7) 657-666.
- Schumacker, R.E. 2004. *Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Sever, S. (2004), *Türkçe Öğretimi ve Tam Öğrenme [Teaching of Turkish Language and Full Learning]* (4th Edition). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Sever, S., Kaya, Z. and Aslan, C. (2006), *Etkinliklerle Türkçe Öğretimi [Teaching Turkish through Activities]*. Ankara: MORPA Yayınları.
- Şeflek Kovacioğlu, N. (2006), İlköğretim İkinci Sınıflarında Aile Çevresi ve Çocuğun Okumaya Karşı Tutumu ile Okudugunu Anlama Becerisi Arasındaki İlişkiler. (Relationships Between Elementary School Second-Grade Students' Attitudes towards Reading and Their Reading Comprehension Skills) İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Şimşek, Ö. F. (2007), *Yapısal Eşitlik Modellemesine Giriş Temel İlkeler ve LISREL Uygulamaları. [Introduction to the Structural Equation Modelling: Principles and LISREL Practices]* Ankara: Ekinoks Yayıncılık.
- Tekin, H. (1980), *Okullarımızdaki Türkçe Öğretimi [Turkish language Teaching in Our Schools]* Ankara: Mars Matbaası.
- Temizkan, M. and Sallabaş, E. (2009), Öğretmen Adaylarının Okuma ve Yazmaya Yönelik Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması [Comparison of Teacher Candidates' Attitudes towards Reading and Writing], *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Electronic Journal of Social Sciences)*. 8 (27) 155-176.
- Tezbaşaran, A. A. (1997). *Likert Tipi Ölçek Geliştirme Kılavuzu [A Guide to the Development of Likert-type Scale]* (2nd Edition). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Öğretmen Adaylarının Okuma ve Yazma Tutumları İle Akademik Başarıları Arasındaki İlişkinin Yapısal Eşitlik Modeli İle İncelenmesi

ÖZET

Amaç ve Önem: Bu çalışmada sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuma ve yazma tutumları ile akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki sorgulanmaktadır. Okuma ve yazma becerisi bireylerin eğitim yaşantıları ve bu yaşantılarındaki pek çok unsurun temel belirleyicisi olmuştur. Okuma ve yazma becerisine doğrudan etki eden unsurların başında bu becerilere ilişkin tutumlar gelmektedir. Tutumların davranışlar üzerindeki belirleyici etkisinin olması eğitim sürecinde tutumların değiştirilmesi için uygun eğitim ortamlarının hazırlanmasını gündeme getirmiştir. Bu değişiklik sürecinin en önemli basamaklarından biri tutumların ölçülmesidir. Bu ölçme hem sürecin başında hem de eğitim sürecinin sonunda tutumların değişim düzeyini belirlemek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır (Balcı, 2009, p. 1313). Öğretmen adaylarının okuma ve yazma tutumlarının akademik başarıları üzerindeki etkisinin ortaya konması bu araştırmanın amacını oluşturmaktadır.

Yöntem: Nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden tarama yöntemi ile tasarlanan bu çalışmada yapısal eşitlik modellemesi ile hipotezler test edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Araştırmanın hipotezleri aşağıdaki gibi belirlenmiştir: (1) Öğretmen adaylarının okuma tutumları yazma tutumlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısıdır, (2) Öğretmen adaylarının okuma tutumları onların akademik başarılarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısıdır, (3) Öğretmen adaylarının yazma tutumları onların akademik başarılarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısıdır. Araştırmada kullanılan okuma ve yazma tutum ölçeği Temizkan ve Sallabaş (2009) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Öğretmen adaylarına uygulanan “Okumaya İlişkin Tutum Ölçeği” ve “Yazmaya İlişkin Tutum Ölçeği” geliştirenlerin yazılı izni alındıktan sonra kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın katılımcılarını 2009-2010 eğitim öğretim yılında öğrenim gören Niğde Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Sınıf Öğretmenliği ana bilim dalı öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Okuma ve yazma tutum ölçeğini doldurmaya gönüllü olan kişilerden veriler toplanmış, araştırmanın çalışma grubu toplam 255 kişiden oluşmuştur. Ölçekler üzerinde açımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizleri yapılarak, yapısal eşitlik modeli kullanılarak çözümlenmeler gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Bulgular: Hipotez 1 için oluşturulan modelde uyum iyiliği sonuçlarına göre RMSEA, CFI değerleri kabul edilebilir, diğerleri ise iyi uyum sınırları içerisinde kalmıştır. Bu da hipotez 1 için oluşturulan modelin kabul edildiği anlamına gelmektedir. Hipotez 2 için oluşturulan modelde uyum iyiliği sonuçlarına göre NFI, CFI, GFI değerleri kabul edilebilir, RMSEA ve AGFI değeri ise iyi uyum sınırları içerisinde kalmıştır. Bu da modelin hipotez 2 için oluşturulan modelin kabul edildiği anlamına gelmektedir. Hipotez 3 için oluşturulan modelde uyum iyiliği sonuçlarına göre RMSEA NFI, GFI değerleri kabul edilebilir, CFI ve AGFI değeri ise iyi uyum sınırları içerisinde kalmıştır. Bu da modelin hipotez 3 için oluşturulan modelin kabul edildiği anlamına gelmektedir. Okuma tutumu yazma tutumunun anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olduğu hipotezi desteklenirken, okuma ve yazma tutumlarının akademik başarıyı anlamlı bir şekilde yordamadığı, dolayısıyla bu hipotezlerin reddedildiği görülmektedir.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler: Araştırmanın sonucunda da öğretmen adaylarının okuma tutumları yazma tutumlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olduğu sonucuna ulaşıırken, okuma ve yazma tutumlarının akademik başarılarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olmadığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Günümüzde başarıya etki eden pek çok faktörün (sınıfın fiziksel yapısı, ailenin sosyo ekonomik durumu, öğrencinin ders çalışma alışkanlıkları vb. gibi) varlığından söz edilmektedir. Çalışkan (2000), ilköğretim 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin ailelerinin gelir düzeyleri ile öğrencinin okuduğunu anlama başarısı arasında doğrusal bir ilişki olduğunu tespit etmiştir. Akay (2004), ilköğretim 2. sınıfta öğrenim gören öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama becerilerinin matematik problemlerini çözme başarısını olumlu yönde etkilediğini ortaya koymuştur. Şeflek (2006) ise araştırmasında anne ve baba davranışlarının öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama becerisini etkilediği ortaya koymuştur. Sabak (2007) yapmış olduğu çalışmada ilköğretim 3. sınıf öğrencilerinin okuduğunu anlama becerileri ile cinsiyetleri, yaşadıkları evin kendilerine ait olma durumu, evlerinin bulunduğu çevrenin ekonomik durumu, kardeş sayısı betimsel değişkenleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olmadığı sonuçlarına ulaşmıştır. Bu kapsamda değerlendirildiğinde araştırma neticesinde elde edilen sonucun okuma ve yazma tutumlarının tek başına akademik başarıyı yordayamadığı da anlaşılabilir bir durum olmaktadır. Bu çalışma sonucu elde edilen bulgular neticesinde dört temel dil becerisinin birbirlerini yordama düzeylerine ilişkin bir araştırmanın yapılması, yazma başarısı ile yazma tutumu arasındaki ve okuduğunu anlama düzeyi ile okuma tutumu arasındaki ilişkileri deşifre edebilecek çalışmaların yapılması, akademik başarıyı yordamada tümleşik dil becerilerinin tamamının ne derece etki ettiğinin ortaya konması önerilmektedir.