IJPES
www.ijpes.com
International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies
ISSN: 2148-9378

Investigation of the Relationship between Reading Habits and Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Prospective Teachers

Hanife ESEN-AYGÜN[1], Berfu KIZILASLAN TUNÇER[2]

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Educational Sciences, Çanakkle, Turkey *0000-0001-9363-7083*

Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Primary Education, Çanakkale, Turkey, *0000-0001-5184-4869*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 09.12.2020
Received in revised form 31.05.2021
Accepted 22.06.2021
Article type: Research Article

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between prospective teachers' metacognitive reading strategies and their reading habits. The study was designed in correlation model. The sample of the study was determined by simple random sampling. The sample of the study consists of 506 prospective teachers out of which 255 are on Primary Education and 249 are on Preschool Education. In the research, Book Reading Habit Attitude Scale and Metacognitive Reading Strategies Scale were used as data collection tools. While there is no significant difference in the reading habits of the prospective teachers, there is a significant difference in the use of metacognitive strategies in favor of the female prospective teachers. The reading habits of prospective teachers and the extent to which they use metacognitive reading strategies do not differ by department and grade level. In addition, it was found that there was a moderately significant relationship between prospective teachers' use of metacognitive reading strategies and the level of reading habits.

Keywords:
Reading habits, metacognitive reading strategies, prospective teacher.

1. Introduction

The primary purpose of schools is to prepare children successfully for life and a higher education institution. Given this goal, it is thought that being successful is that students get good grades from various exams. Accordingly, students are asked to read, understand and answer exam questions carefully. In other words, it is expected to understand what you are reading. Accordingly, the concept of being able to understand what it reads comes to the fore. When the literature examines, it is understood that the capacity to understand what he read is important not only in the teaching of mother tongue, but also in other courses (Ateş, 2008; Batur, Gülveren, & Bek, 2010; Belet & Yaşar, 2007; Demirel, 1993; Göktaş & Gürbüztürk, 2014). Because reading is very important skill for child's success in school life (Leppänen, Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Based on this information, studies related to reading activities come to the fore, especially during the preschool period when students first meet with voices and the elementary school period when they combine these voices. Fluent and effective reading skills are the most important achievement children need at school (Høien & Lundberg, 1998). Research shows that gaining reading skill and reading became a habit occurred in primary school years (Güneş, 2007). Therefore, giving children reading skills and making reading a habit are among the primary objectives of primary education (Karadağ, 2014). Accordingly, it is thought that gaining a positive attitude towards reading in early ages will positively affect the reading habits (RH). The student with RH will be more successful in reading-related activities.

[1] Corresponding author's address: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Educational Sciences, Çanakkle, Turkey
e-mail: hanifeesen@comu.edu.tr

Citation: Esen-Aygün, H. & Kızılaslan-Tuncer, B. (2021). Investigation of the relationship between reading habits and metacognitive reading strategies of prospective teachers. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies, 8*(4), 153-166. https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2021.8.4.191

Reading habit is that individuals see reading as a necessity, enjoy the material they read, criticize what they read and continue it for life (Can, Türkyılmaz, & Karadeniz, 2010; Clark & Foster, 2005; Hopper, 2005; Hughes - Hassell and Rodge, 2007 ; Nathanson, Pruslow & Levitt, 2008; Odabaş, Odabaş, & Polat, 2008; Yılmaz, 1998). Lifelong reading habit is gained in schools (Sanacore, 1992). It can be said that having a positive attitude towards reading during school years turned into a habit of reading in the future. For this reason, it is thought that teachers are an important model for giving children the habit of reading books at an early age. The teacher is an individual with a strong influence on students (Aslantürk, 2008). In particular, when studies related to reading are examined, it is known that teacher is a model and encouraging students to read in gaining reading habit (Çakmak & Yılmaz, 2009; Odabaş, Odabaş & Polat, 2008; Özbay, 2006; Yılmaz, 2006). In addition, research reveals that giving time and opportunity for individuals to read what they love has a role in developing reading skills (Hiebert, 2009; Gambrell, 2015). Teachers can guide, motivate, and support students and be exemplary with their attitudes and behaviors towards reading, encouraging students to read and directing them to books that are appropriate to their level and following publications (Baccus, 2004; Bozpolat, 2010; Myette, 2006).

Reading is a cognitive activity (Karadağ, 2014). A successful reading process occurs when the reader uses metacognitive reading strategies (MRS) before, during and after reading the text (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). Accordingly, it is thought that one of the factors playing a role in the quality of reading action is the ability to use MRS. Examination of the literature reveals that MRS include actions such as highlighting, underlining, circling, writing key words, sentences, or paragraphs, determining the outline and creating a diagram, associating with prior information, imagining, visualizing, questioning and self-examining, reviewing, slow reading, and rereading selected texts (Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Taraban, Rynearson, & Kerr, 2000; Wade, Trathen, & Schraw, 1990; Presley et al, 1992; Paris, Cross, & Lipson, 1984; Simpson, Stahl, & Francis, 2004; Simpson, & Nist, 2000; Yıldız, 2013; Yılmaz, 2012). The use of reading strategies has a positive role in academic success (Baydık, 2011; Çöğmen, 2008). When reading action is evaluated from this point of view, it is understood that the teacher responsible for teaching reading skills is also responsible for teaching appropriate reading strategies to the student (Baydık, 2011). In teaching MRS, the teacher is expected to be a model, practice, give feedback, and reinforce correct responses (Antoniou and Souvignier, 2007). Accordingly, it is thought that the teacher should actively use metacognitive reading strategies.

In line with the information obtained from the literature on RH and MRS, it is understood that individuals with developed RH are successful readers and successful readers use various strategies to increase the quality of reading action. As stated above, it is seen that early childhood periods are critical in terms of gaining RH and skills. In the light of this information, it is considered that the quality of reading activities of prospective teachers who will train the next generations is important. This is because people with RH contribute not only to their own personal development but also to social development (Philip, 2005). Accordingly, it is believed that obtaining information about prospective teachers' RH and their use of MRS will provide important information about the social sustainability of reading. When analyzing the literature, it is found that there are many studies about prospective teachers' RH in our country (Batur, Guelveren, & Bek, 2010; Bozpolat, 2010; Guer, 2014; Kuş and Türkyılmaz, 2010; Özbay, Bağcı, & Uyar, 2008; Saracaloğlu, Karasakaloğlu, & Aslantuerk, 2010; Yalman, Ozkan, & Kutluca, 2013; Yılmaz, 2006; Yılmaz & Benli, 2010). In addition, there are some studies about prospective teachers' use of reading strategies (Çeçen, 2011; Dilci & Babacan, 2011; Edizer, 2015; Karasakaloğlu, 2012; Karasakaloğlu, Saracaloğlu, & Özelçi, 2012; Topuzkanamış, 2010). However, it is understood that a few studies focusing on the relationship between prospective teachers' MRS and RH (Çetinkaya-Edizer, 2015; Kuş & Türkyılmaz, 2010). This limited number of studies provides important information about the relationship between prospective teachers' RH and MHR. When the studies are examined closely, it is seen that Çetinkaya-Edizer (2015) is working with Turkish prospective teachers and Kuş and Türkyılmaz (2010) are working with Social Science and Turkish prospective teachers. When the Turkish Teacher Special Field Competencies (2017) is examined, it is understood that Turkish teachers have important duties in developing their comprehension and expression skills and using the language correctly and effectively. However, it is the Preschool teacher's responsibility (Pre-School Education Program, 2013) to provide students with phonetic awareness, reading awareness, and writing awareness in early childhood. It is the responsibility of the Primary teacher to gain the ability to first read and write (Turkish Lesson Teaching Program, 2018). In this regard, it is understood that there are important duties for teachers working at the Basic Education level and prospective teachers studying at the Department of Basic Education. As stated

above, teachers have an important role on reading skills. Therefore, it is important for prospective teachers responsible for raising future generations to learn about their RH and their use of MRS. In this regard, this study aimed to investigate the relationship between the pre-school teachers' levels of using MRS and their RH. Accordingly, the sub-problems of the research as follows:

- What is the level of prospective teachers' attitudes towards reading habit?
- What is the level of prospective teachers' metacognitive reading strategies?
- Do the attitudes of prospective teachers towards reading books change according to their gender, their department, grade, parental education status?
- Do the prospective teachers' metacognitive reading strategies change according to their gender, department, grade, parental education status?
- Is there a significant relationship between prospective teachers' reading habit attitude scores and metacognitive reading strategies scores?

2. Method

In this chapter, information on the research model, sampling, data collection tools, and data analysis and interpretation are presented.

2.1. Research Model

In this study it is focused on investigate relationship between the prospective teachers' RH and MRS. Due to this the study is designed in correlation model.

2.2. Sampling

It is used a simple random sampling method. Demographic information about prospective teachers is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Demographic Information*

		Frequency	Percentage
Department	Primary Education	255	50.8
	Pre-school Education	249	49.2
	Missing Value	2	0.4
	Total	506	100.00
Gender	Female	402	50.4
	Male	102	49.2
	Missing Value	2	0.4
	Total	506	100.00
Grade	1	35	6.3
	2	163	32.3
	3	177	35.00
	4	129	26.5
	Missing Value	2	0.4
	Total	506	100.00
Education Level of Mother	Primary School	267	54.00
	Secondary School	94	19.00
	High School	101	20.4
	College	32	6.3
	Missing Value	12	2.4
	Total	506	100
Education Level of Father	Primary School	186	36.8
	Secondary School	97	19.2
	High School	142	28.1
	College	74	14.6
	Missing Value	7	1.4
	Total	506	100.00

As seen in Table 1, 506 prospective teachers, 402 women and 102 men, participated in the research. 255 prospective teachers study in Primary Education and 249 in Preschool Education. 35 first grade, 163 second grade, 177 third grade and 129 fourth grade prospective teachers were taken place in the sampling.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Book reading habit attitude scale. The Book Reading Habit Attitude Scale, developed by Gömleksiz (2004), is a single factor five-point Likert scale with 30 items. Factor analysis was performed to determine the validity of the scale containing 22 positive and 9 negative items. KMO value was calculated as 0.83, and Barlett test was calculated as 2202.20. As a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was determined as 0.88.

Metacognitive reading strategies scale. The scale developed by Taraban, Kerr and Rynearson (2004) was adapted to Turkish by the Çöğmen (2008). It measures the metacognitive strategies used by university students at reading texts concerning their lessons and studying lessons. The two-dimensional scale consists of 22 items. As a result of the construct validity study of the scale translated into Turkish by two experts, the KMO value was significant with the result of the 0.80 Barlett test. According to the reliability analysis results; The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the analytical strategies sub-dimension, the first factor of the scale, was 0.78, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the second factor of the scale, and the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the second factor of the scale Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.81.

3. Results

According to first research problem, Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of prospective teachers' attitudes toward RH.

Table 2. *Prospective Teachers' Attitudes Toward Reading Habits*

	N	Min	Max	X	Ss
Book Reading Habit Attitude	506	1.17	4.83	3.16	0.29

It is seen that in Table 2, the prospective teachers' attitudes towards the RH are at a medium level (X = 3.16; ss = 0.29). Considering that the highest score that can be obtained from the scale is 5, it is seen that this value is moderate.

Table 3. *Prospective Teachers' Metacognitive Reading Strategies*

	N	Min	Max	X	Ss
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	506	1.27	5.00	3.82	0.53

The analysis of Table 3 shows that the prospective teachers' MRS are at an intermediate level (X = 3.82; ss = 0.53). Since the highest value that can be obtained on the scale is 5, this value shows that the prospective teachers have an intermediate cognitive reading strategy.

The third sub-problem of the study is: "Do prospective teachers' attitudes toward reading books change according to gender, subject area, grade level, mother's educational level, and father's educational level?" It was formulated as follows (Table 4).

Table 4. *Kolmogorov Smirnov Test Value for Prospective Teachers' Scores From Attitude Scale Regarding Reading Books*

Scale	N	Stat	Sig
Book Reading Habit Attitude Scale	506	0,108	0,000

When Table 4 is analyzed, it is seen that the prospective teachers' RH attitude scale does not fit the normality distribution. Therefore, the use of non-parametric tests, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests, was considered appropriate for the solution of the third sub-problem of the research.

a. Do the attitudes of prospective teachers towards reading habit differ according to their gender?

Table 5. *Prospective Teachers' Attitudes to Reading Books by Gender*

	Gender	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Book Reading Habit Attitude	Female	401	250.96	100634.00	20033.00	0.75
	Male	102	256.10	26122.00		

As seen in Table 5 that prospective teachers' RH attitudes (U = 20033.00, p <0.05) did not differ in terms of their gender.

b. Do the attitudes of preservice teachers towards RH differ according to the department they are studying?

Table 6. *Prospective Teachers' Attitudes to Reading Books According to Department*

	Department	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Book Reading Habit Attitude	Primary Education	254	251.80	63957.50	31572.50	0.97
	Preschool Education	242	252.20	62798.50		

As seen in Table 6, it was seen that prospective teachers' RH attitudes (U = 31572.50, p <0.05) did not differ in terms of the department.

c. Do the attitudes of prospective teachers towards reading habit differ according to their grade?

Table 7. *Prospective Teachers' Habits of Reading Books by Grade Level*

	Grade	N	Sum of Rank	sd	x^2	p
Book Reading Habit Attitude	1	35	269.34	3	2.05	0.56
	2	163	256.51			
	3	177	240.14			
	4	128	257.92			

When Table 7 is analyzed, it was seen that prospective teachers' RH attitudes do not differ in terms of grade levels [x^2 (3) = 0.56, p <0.05].

d. Do the attitudes of preservice teachers towards RH differ according to the level of mother education?

Table 8. *Prospective Teachers' Attitudes to Reading Books by Mother's Education Level*

	MEL	N	Sum of Rank	sd	x^2	p
Book Reading Habit Attitude	Primary School	267	263.47	3	15.19	0.02
	Secondary School	94	257.96			
	High School	101	207.32			
	College	31	201.19			

It was determined that prospective teachers' RH attitudes differ in terms of mother's education level [x^2 (3) = 0.02, p <0.05]. To determine the significant difference observed between the groups depending on the significant differences between the groups, Mann Whitney U test was applied over the binary combinations of the groups. Table 9 shows the Mann Whitney U test results done over the binary combinations of the groups.

Table 9 shows that there is a significant difference between prospective teachers whose mother attended primary school and prospective teachers whose mother attended secondary school or university. There is also a significant difference between prospective teachers whose mother attended secondary school and prospective teachers whose mother attended grammar school in favour of those whose mother attended secondary school.

Table 9. *Prospective Teachers' Habits of Reading Books by Mother's Education Level*

Mother Education Level	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p	Mother Education Level	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Primary School	267	181.88	48561.00	12315.00	0.78	Secondary School	94	108.06	10158.00	3801.00	0.16*
Secondary School	94	178.51	16.78			High School	101	88.63	8952.00		
Primary School	267	196.00	52331.50	10413.50	0.00*	Secondary School	94	66.38	6240.00	1139.000	0.69
High School	101	154.10	15564.50			College	31	52.74	1635.00		
Primary School	267	153.60	41010.00	3045.00	0.16*	High School	101	66.58	6725.00	1557.00	0.96
College	31	114.23	3541.00			College	31	66.23	2053.00		

e. Do the attitudes of prospective teachers towards RH differ according to the level of father education?

Table 10. *Prospective Teachers' Attitudes to Reading Books by Father's Education Level*

	FEL	N	Sıra Ortalaması	sd	x^2	p
Book Reading Habit Attitude	Primary School	186	275.22	3	10.38	0.01
	Secondary School	97	237.95			
	High School	142	235.10			
	College	72	223.56			

It was seen that prospective teachers' RH attitudes [X2 (3) = 0.01, p <0.05] differ in terms of mother's education level. Mann Whitney U test was applied over the binary combinations of the groups to determine the significant difference observed between the groups. Table 11 shows results done over the binary combinations of the groups.

Table 11. *Prospective Teachers' Habits of Reading Books by Father's Education Level*

Father Education Level	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p	Father Education Level	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Primary School	186	148.85	27686.50	7746.50	0.51	Secondary School	97	120.30	11669.50	6857.00	0.95
Secondary School	97	128.86	12499.50			High School	142	119.79	17010.50		
Primary School	186	176.19	32771.00	11032.00	0.01*	Secondary School	97	86.78	8418.00	3319.00	0.58
High School	142	149.19	21185.00			College	72	82.60	5947.00		
Primary School	186	137.18	25516.00	5267.00	0.00*	High School	142	109.12	15495.00	4882.00	0.59
College	72	109.65	7895.00			College	72	104.31	7510.00		

The fourth sub-problem of the study is, "Does the MRS of prospective teachers change according to their gender, the department they are studying, their grade, the education level of their mothers and the education level of their fathers?" It was expressed as. The results of the Kolmogorov Smirnov test are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. *Kolmogorov Smirnov Test Value for Primary School Teachers' Scores from the Scale of Metacognitive Reading Strategies*

Scale	N	Stat	Sig
Scale of Metacognitive Reading Strategies	506	0.44	0.019

It is seen that the prospective teachers' scores of the MRS scale is not normal. Therefore, non-parametric tests, Mann Whitney-U test and Kruskal Wallis tests were found suitable for solving the third sub-problem of the research.

f. Do prospective teachers' metacognitive reading strategies differ according to their gender?

Table 13. *Mann Whitney U Test Results Regarding the Gender of Prospective Teachers' Cognitive Reading Strategies Scale*

	Gender	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	Female	254	251.80	63957.50	31572.50	0.97
	Male	242	252.20	62798.50		

Examination of Table 13 shows that prospective teachers' MRS differed significantly by gender (U = 17875.50, p 0.05). When the mean rank scores were examined, it was found that this difference was in favor of female prospective teachers.

g. Do prospective teachers' MRS differ according to the department they are studying?

Table 14. *Prospective Teachers' Cognitive Reading Strategies Scale Mann Whitney U Test Results*

	Department	N	Mean of Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	Primary Education	255	255.33	65109.50	31025.50	0.65
	Preschool Education	249	249.60	62150.50		

The analysis of Table 14 shows that prospective teachers' MRS do not differ significantly according to the subjects studied (U = 31025.50, p 0.05).

h. Do prospective teachers' metacognitive reading strategies differ according to the grade level they are studying?

Table 15. *Kruskal Wallis Results Related to Grade Level of Prospective Teachers' Metacognitive Reading Strategies Scale*

	Grade	N	Sum of Ranks	sd	x^2	p
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	1	35	247.40	3	0.67	0.87
	2	163	256.59			
	3	177	255.77			
	4	129	244.42			

It is seen that prospective teachers' MRS do not differ significantly from grade levels [x^2 (3) = 0.87, p <0.05]. In other words, the MRS of prospective teachers do not change significantly depending on their grade levels.

i. Do prospective teachers' metacognitive reading strategies differ according to their mother's education levels?

Table 16. *Kruskal Wallis Results Regarding Mother Education Level of Prospective Teachers' Metacognitive Reading Strategies Scale*

	MEL	N	Sum of Ranks	sd	x^2	p
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	Primary School	267	256.16	3	2.74	0.43
	Secondary School	94	228.76			
	High School	101	242.13			
	College	32	247.28			

It is seen that prospective teachers' MRS do not differ significantly according to their mother's education levels [x^2 (3) = 0.43, p <0.05]. In other words, the MRS of prospective teachers do not change significantly depending on the level of maternal education.

j. Do prospective teachers' MRS differ according to their father's education levels?

Table 17. *Prospective Teachers' Metacognitive Reading Strategies Scale Related to Father's Education Level Kruskal Wallis Results*

	FEL	N	Sum of Ranks	sd	x^2	p
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	Primary School	186	266.97	3	6.24	0.10
	Secondary School	97	231.16			
	High School	142	234.84			
	College	74	261.12			

It is seen that prospective teachers' use of MRS do not differ significantly from their father's education levels [x^2 (3) = 0.10, p <0.05]. In other words, the level of prospective teachers' use of MRS does not change significantly depending on their level of father education.

Table 18. *The Relationship Between Prospective Teachers' Habits of Reading and Metacognitive Reading Strategies*

	X	ss	r	p
Book Reading Habit Attitude	3.16	0.53	0.31*	0.00
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	3.82	0.29		

It is seen that there is a moderately positive significant relationship between prospective teachers' RH attitudes and their use of MRS (r = 0.31; p = 0.00).

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

This study investigated the relationship between pre-school and primary school prospective teachers' level of MRS and RH. The RH of the prospective teachers and the use of MRS were moderate. The RH of prospective teachers (Kurgan ve Çekerol, 2008; Kuş & Türkyılmaz, 2010; Yılmaz, Köse & Korkut, 2009) and their use of MRS (Ateş, 2003; Çeçen & Alver, 2011; Dilci & Babacan, 2011; Kuş and Turkyilmaz, 2010; Topuzkanamış, 2009) are examined, it becomes clear that there are studies that both support the findings of this research and reveal findings to the contrary. For example; in the study of Yılmaz, Köse and Korkut (2009), which examines the RH of university students, it is seen that students have poor RH. Similarly, in a study that examined the RH of Turkish and Social Studies prospective teachers, the study frequency of Turkish prospective teachers reading books was higher than that of Social Studies teachers. Still, the study showed that the prevalence of prospective teachers was low (Kuş & Türkyılmaz, 2010). In another study conducted with prospective primary teachers, reading interests seem to be moderate (Saracaloğlu, Yenice, & Karasakaloğlu, 2009). Unlike these studies, Kurgan and Çekerol (2008) concluded that the students of the child development department have a high RH. It is seen from the above findings that the attitudes of prospective teachers towards RH are moderately and weakly concentrated. This situation can be interpreted as prospective teachers do not make reading a habit. In addition, when examining studies on metacognitive strategy, different results are seen, as in RH. For example, in the study by Kuş and Türkyılmaz (2010), it is found that prospective teachers use MRS only to a small

extent. Moreover, Ateş (2013), who investigates university students' awareness of MRS, shows that awareness of MRS is at an intermediate level. Topuzkanamış (2009), focusing on the use of metacognitive strategies by prospective teachers, also shows that the use of the strategy is moderate. According to Topuzkanamış (2009), prospective Turkish teachers use the most strategies while prospective elementary teachers use the strategy below the mean. In contrast to these results, Dilci and Babacan (2011) who work with prospective elementary teachers and Çeçen and Alver (2011) who work with prospective Turkish teachers are believed to use MRS frequently. It can be said that this is due to the different characteristics of the working groups. Moreover, it is known that children frequently use reading strategies (Kuruyer & Özsoy, 2016) that adults use less (Wood, Motz, & Willoughby, 1998). Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that prospective teachers use age-related metacognitive strategies less. When the information from the literature is reviewed along with the findings obtained in this study, it becomes clear that there are many factors that influence the use of RH and metacognitive strategies. According to Guer (2014), who works with prospective teachers from different teacher education programs, prospective teachers are among the less likely to read. Preservice teachers explain this situation for reasons such as housework, intensity of work, exams, book prices, computer use and watching television, the effect of friendship environment and tablet / phone / television use (Kuş & Türkyılmaz, 2010; Saracaloğlu, Yenice, & Karasakaloğlu, 2009; Yalman, Özkan & Kutluca, 2013). Therefore, it is understandable that the results of these studies with different sample groups cannot be matched. However, it is recommended that this situation be taken into account in order to increase the qualification of teachers. It is believed that prospective teachers who will be the teachers of the future should be role models with their RH for the role they will play in shaping the society. Therefore, it is recommended that provisions be made to eliminate the situations that prevent the prospective teachers from becoming better readers. One of the variables examined within the scope of the study is gender. In particular, it is thought that the gender variable comes to the fore in studies related to reading. In this study, it is understood that there is no significant difference in the RH of prospective teachers in terms of gender. At the same time, there is a significant difference in favor of prospective female teachers in the levels of prospective teachers' use of metacognitive strategy. In other words, although the RH of female and male prospective teachers are similar, prospective female teachers use metacognitive strategies more than prospective male teachers. It is seen that the findings regarding both the RH and the use of metacognitive strategy are compatible with the literature. For example, in Bozpolat's (2010) study, there is a significant difference in favor of female teachers in the opinions of prospective teachers about on reading books. Similarly, in the study of Aydın-Yılmaz (2006), which examines the RH of prospective primary teachers, it is understood that RH does not change according to gender. In addition, Odabaş, Odabaş and Polat (2008), who examined the RH of university students, revealed that women read more books. Still, there is no difference between men and women at the habit level. In addition, in studies on the use of MRS, it is seen that the findings of this study are supported by some studies but not supported by others. For example, Erdem (2012), who examined the MRS of Turkish Language and Literature prospective teachers, revealed no difference between the female and male prospective teachers. Similarly, in Çeçen and Alver (2011), who work with prospective Turkish teachers, it states that gender does not differ in the use of metacognitive strategies of prospective teachers. The findings of the studies described above contradict this study. On the other hand, it is clear that there is a significant difference in gender in the studies of Ateş (2013), which investigates the MRS of university students, and Topuzkanamış (2009) and Kuş and Türkyılmaz (2010), which investigate the MRS of prospective teachers. These findings support the results of this study. Although there is no significant difference between genders in terms of RH, it is believed that the RH of prospective female teachers are more positive than those of males. However, it is found that females use more strategies than males in applying MRS. Arslan (2013), who studied the gender variable in adult reading studies, found that this situation is related to the fact that women spend more time reading books because they spend more time at home than men. Accordingly, this study assumes that female teachers' attitudes towards RH and MRS are more positive than male teachers' attitudes, which is related to gender roles. Teachers' RH and their level of use of MRS do not differ significantly by subject area. In other words, the RH and use of MRS of prospective preschool teachers and elementary school teachers are similar. Although the structure of the Preschool Education and Primary Education courses differ from each other, it is believed that the RH and MRS of the two groups are similar to the profile of students who prefer education faculty. Examination of the literature reveals that the thinking styles of prospective preschool and elementary teachers are similar in studies examining the profiles of prospective teachers. The style of thinking provides important information about

the individual's perspective. For example, there are many studies that show that there is a relationship between prospective teachers' thinking styles and academic achievement (Akbıyık & Seferoğlu, 2002; Çubukçu, 2004; Koray, Koeksal, Oezdemir, & Presley, 2007; Oezerbaş, 2011). Thinking is the process of creating symbols and meanings in the brain to define the external world (Çubukçu, 2004). Reading is also a cognitive activity that is performed to make sense of various symbols. Therefore, this finding can be interpreted as suggesting that prospective teachers are similar in their use of RH and MRS as well as thinking styles. In addition, studies conducted with prospective teachers found that the reading profiles of preschool and elementary school teachers were similar in terms of reading behaviors (Bozpolat, 2010). Based on this information, it is predicted that the reading profiles of preschool teachers and elementary teachers correspond to the similarities in their thinking styles. The level of RH and the use of MRS do not change according to the department in which the prospective teachers study, nor do they change according to the grade level of the prospective teachers in this study. In other words, the RH and MRS of the prospective teachers do not differ significantly by grade level. This finding shows a result that is contrary to the studies in the literature. For example, Odabaş, Odabaş, and Polat (2008) found significant differences in prospective teachers' RH in favor of first-grade prospective teachers. Çeçen and Alver (2011) found significant differences in studies on the use of metacognitive strategies in favor of prospective teachers studying in the first grade. Erdem (2012) concluded that there was a significant difference in the use of metacognitive strategies in favor of second and third year students. However, it should be taken into consideration that these studies were conducted with college students from faculties such as Art and Science, Turkish Education and Turkish Language and Literature Education students from the Faculty of Education. The fact that the results of the studies described above do not support this study is probably due to different characteristics of the sample groups. Although there is no significant difference in terms of grade level in this study, it can be observed that the average of RH and MRS decreases as the grade level increases. There may be many reasons for this. For example, it is known that RH decreases with age and that simpler than metacognitive strategies are preferred at older ages (Kuruyer & Oezsoy, 2016; Wood, Motz, & Willoughby, 1998). Although this study did not measure the age variable, it is hypothesized that the RH weakens and the use of metacognitive strategies decreases with age as grade level progresses in general. Moreover, in the study of literature, the pressure created by the exam (KPSS) is also one of the reasons why prospective teachers do not read (Kuş & Türkyılmaz, 2010; Saracaloğlu, Yenice, & Karasakaloğlu, 2009; Yalman, Oezkan & Kutluca, 2013). It can be inferred that prospective teachers spend less time on activities related to reading and make reading a priority when the anxiety of being employed in upper grades increases. Another variable examined in the research is the educational level of the parents. The results show that the educational level of parents causes a significant difference in RH. In addition to school activities, reading activities also play an important role in reading achievement (Leppaenen, Aunola, & Nurmi, 2005). For this reason, it is considered important to be a role model for children in terms of reading books outside of school. Research indicates that families play an important role in being a role model in RH (Yavuzer, 2003; Yılmaz, 2011; Yılmaz, Koese & Korkut, 2009). In this study, it is assumed that parents' educational level plays an important role in prospective teachers' RH. However, the study results in the literature do not support the findings obtained in this study. For example, Kurulgan and Çekerol (2008), in their study of college students' RH, found that there was no significant difference in RH depending on parents' educational level. Similarly, in the study of Batur, Gülveren and Bek (2010), which investigates the RH of prospective teachers, there is no significant difference according to the educational level of parents. Similarly, Bozpolat (2008) who investigated the RH of primary school teachers and prospective Turkish teachers concluded that there was no significant difference between RH and parents' educational level. Although the findings on parents' educational level are not confirmed in the literature, researchers in this study point out the role of parents' RH (Aslanturk, 2008; Aydın-Yılmaz, 2006). In particular, it is observed that children from families with RH have high levels of RH (Aydın-Yılmaz, 2006). Therefore, in order to obtain more accurate information about prospective teachers' RH and the role of families, it is proposed to consider prospective teachers' RH, family RH, and parents' educational status together. The results show that the use of metacognitive strategies by prospective teachers does not significantly depend on the educational status of parents. Considering the literature, it is understandable that the use of metacognitive strategies as a function of parental education level was not investigated. However, considering the impact of parents on children, it is assumed that parents play a role in the use of metacognitive reading strategies. Accordingly, it is recommended that parents' educational level in using metacognitive strategies be investigated, as well as their use of metacognitive strategies and whether

this situation is a role model for their children. In this way, comprehensive information on the role of the family in the use of metacognitive strategies will be obtained. Finally, the relationship between the degree of use of MRS of prospective teachers studying in the department Basic Education and the degree of RH was investigated. The results show that there is a moderately significant relationship between prospective teachers' use of MRS and the level of RH. Since the relationship between MRS and RH was investigated for the first time in this study, it is assumed that previous studies on reading are not based on this issue. However, in Kuş and Turkyilmaz's (2010) study, it is found that there is a moderate relationship between Turkish language and social studies prospective teachers' reading frequency and their use of metacognitive strategies. Similarly, in the study of Karasakaloğlu, Saracaloğlu, and Yılmaz-Özelçi (2012), who investigated the reading strategies, critical thinking attitudes, and metacognitive skills of prospective Turkish teachers, it is found that prospective teachers who use MRS also read books frequently. In contrast to these studies, Susar-Kırmızı (2011) found that there was a weak relationship between the amount of time spent reading daily, the use of strategies, the number of books read, and the use of strategies. Although the frequency of reading, time spent on reading and number of books read, and RH are different situations, the findings obtained should support this study. In conclusion, as the RH increases, the prospective teachers use more metacognitive strategies or the prospective teachers use more metacognitive reading strategies. However, the most striking point in all these studies is the level of using reading strategies. According to Erdem (2012), prospective teachers do not support the use of pedagogical reading strategies in a qualified manner. Considering the fact that reading strategies are related to metacognitive skills, it is recommended that prospective preschool and elementary teachers who realize the beginning of reading activities should support the use of metacognitive reading strategies. In this way, it is believed that distant goals in the learning-teaching process can be better achieved. In addition, it is assumed that reading is an important factor for academic success as it precedes all academic studies. Accordingly, it is proposed that the effectiveness of programs that support the use of MRS be examined in future studies of reading. In this way, it is predicted that the elements that enhance the quality of reading instruction will be more comprehensively determined.

5. References

Akbıyık, C., & Seferoğlu, S. S. (2002). *Eleştirel düşünme eğilimleri ve akademik başarı.* https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/2387867/Akbiyik-Seferoglu_CUEF-2006_Elestirel-Dusun.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1550138542&Signature=l9I0yDSQBQgkB%2BvkpprwMnKGwJ4%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DElestirel_dusunme_egilimleri_ve_akademik.pdf

Antoniou, F., & Souvignier, E. (2007). Strategy instruction in reading comprehension: An intervention study for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 5(1), 41–57.

Arslan, A. (2013). Okuma becerisi ile ilgili makalelerde cinsiyet değişkeni. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, *2*(2), 251–265.

Aslantürk, E. (2008). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin ve sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuma ilgi ve alışkanlıklarının karşılaştırılması* [Master's thesis]. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi.

Ateş, M. (2008). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin okuduğunu anlama düzeyleri ile Türkçe dersine karşı tutumları ve akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki* [Doctoral dissertation]. Selçuk Üniversitesi.

Ateş, A. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin okuma stratejileri üstbilişsel farkındalık düzeyleri (İnönü Üniversitesi Örneği). *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi, 2(4)*, 258–273.

Baccus, A. A. (2004). *Urban fourth and fifth grade teachers' readıng attitudes and efficacy beliefs: Relationships to reading instruction and to students' reading attitudes and efficacy beliefs.* Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Batur, Z., Gülveren, H., & Bek, H. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının okuma alışkanlıkları üzerine bir araştırma: Uşak Eğitim Fakültesi örneği. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *2010*(5), 32–49.

Baydık, B. (2011). Okuma güçlüğü olan öğrencilerin üstbilişsel okuma stratejilerini kullanımı ve öğretmenlerinin okuduğunu anlama öğretim uygulamalarının incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *36*(162), 301–319.

Belet, Ş., & Yaşar, Ş. (2007). Öğrenme stratejilerinin okuduğunu anlama ve yazma becerileri ile Türkçe dersine ilişkin tutumlara etkisi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, *3*(1), 69–86.

Bozpolat, E. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının okuma alışkanlığına ilişkin tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi (Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi örneği). *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken/Journal of World of Turks*, *2*(1), 411–428.

Can, R., Türkyilmaz, M., & Karadeniz, A. (2010). Ergenlik dönemi öğrencilerinin okuma alışkanlıkları. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *11*(3), 1-21.

Clark, C., & Foster, A. (2005). Children's and young people's reading habits and preferences: The who, what, why, where and when. *National Literacy Trust*.

Çakmak, T., & Yılmaz, B. (2009). Okul öncesi dönem çocuklarının okuma alışkanlığına hazırlık durumları üzerine bir araştırma: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Beytepe Anaokulu örneği. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, *23*(3), 489–509.

Çeçen, M. A., & Alver, M. (2011). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının üstbilişsel okuma stratejilerini kullanma düzeyleri (Giresun Üniversitesi örneği). *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *3*(5), 39–56.

Çetinkaya-Edizer, Z. (2015). Relationship between the attitudes of turkish prospective teachers on reading habits and their perceptions of the uses of metacognitive reading strategies. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, *23*(2), 645–658.

Çöğmen, S. (2008). *Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin kullandıkları okuduğunu anlama stratejileri* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi.

Çubukçu, Z. (2004). Öğretmen adaylarının düşünme stillerinin öğrenme biçimlerini tercih etmelerindeki etkisi. *XIII.Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı*, 6-9 Temmuz 2004 İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Malatya.

Demirel, M. (1993). Öğrenme stratejilerinin öğretilmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 17 (83): 52–59.

Dilci, T., & Babacan, T. (2011). Sınıf öğretmen adaylarının üstbilişsel okuma stratejileri ile çoklu zeka alanları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *12*(3), 47–64.

Erdem, C. (2012). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretmen adaylarının okuma stratejilerini kullanma düzeyleri. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, *1*(4), 162–186.

Gambrell, L. B. (2015). Getting students hooked on the reading habit. *The Reading Teacher*, *69*(3), 259–263.

Göktaş, Ö., & Gürbüztürk, O. (2014). Okuduğunu anlama becerisinin ilköğretim ikinci kademe matematik dersindeki akademik başarıya etkisi. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, *2*(4).

Güneş, F. (2007) Türkçe öğretimi - yaklaşımlar ve modeller. Pegem.

Gür, T. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının okuma ve boş zaman değerlendirme alışkanlıkları. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken/Journal of World of Turks*, *6*(1), 161–180.

Hiebert, .H. (2009). *Reading more, reading better*. Guilford.

Høien, T. & Lundberg, I. (1988). Stages of word recognition in early reading development. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 32, 163 – 182.

Hopper, R. (2005). What are teenagers reading? Adolescent fiction reading habits and reading choices. *Literacy*, *39*(3), 113–120.

Hughes-Hassell, S., & Rodge, P. (2007). The leisure reading habits of urban adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *51*(1), 22–33.

Karadağ, R. (2014). Okuma ilgisi, tutumları ve alışkanlığı konusunda yapılmış çalışmaların lisansüstü tezlere dayalı analizi: yök ve proquest veri tabanları örneklemi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *35*(1), 1–17.

Karasakaloğlu, N. (2012). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuduğunu anlama stratejileri ile öğrenme ve ders çalışma stratejileri arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, *12*(3), 1921–1950.

Karasakaloğlu, N., Saracaloğlu, A. S., & Özelçi, S. Y. (2012). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının okuma stratejileri, eleştirel düşünme tutumları ve üst bilişsel yeterlilikleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *13*(1).

Koray, Ö., Köksal, M. S., Özdemir, M., & Presley, A. İ. (2007). Yaratıcı ve eleştirel düşünme temelli fen laboratuarı uygulamalarının akademik başarı ve bilimsel süreç becerileri üzerine etkisi. *İlköğretim Online*, *6*(3), 377–389.

Kurgan, M., & Çekerol, G. S. (2008). Öğrencilerin okuma ve kütüphane kullanma alışkanlıkları üzerine bir araştırma. *Anadolu Unıversıty Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 237–258.

Kuş, Z., & Türkyılmaz, M. (2010). Sosyal Bilgiler ve Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının okuma durumları:(İlgi, alışkanlık ve okuma stratejilerini kullanım düzeyleri). *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, *24*(1), 11–32.

Leppänen, U., Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). Beginning readers' reading performance and reading habits. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *28*(4), 383–399.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(2), 249.

Myette, S. (2006). *Finding a great read: Book selection strategies for sixth grade silent reading an abstract* [Master of arts in education]. Pacific Lutheran University.

Nathanson, S., Pruslow, J., & Levitt, R. (2008). The reading habits and literacy attitudes of inservice and prospective teachers: Results of a questionnaire survey. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *59*(4), 313–321.

Nist, S. L., & Holschuh, J. L. (2000). Comprehension strategies at the college level. In R. Flippo & D. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 75–104). Erlbaum.

Odabaş, H., Odabaş, Y., & Polat, C. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin okuma alışkanlığı: Ankara Üniversitesi örneği. *Bilgi Dünyası*, *9*(2), 431–465.

Okul Öncesi Eğitim Programı (2013). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Temel Eğitim Genel Müdürlüğü http://tegm.meb.gov.tr/dosya/okuloncesi/ooproram.pdf

Özbay, M. (2006). Okuma eğitiminde çevre faktörü. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, (24).

Özbay, M., Bağcı, H., & Uyar, Y. (2008). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının okuma alışkanlığına yönelik tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenlere göre değerlendirilmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *9*(15), 117–136.

Özerbaş, M. A. (2011). Yaratıcı düşünme öğrenme ortamının akademik başarı ve bilgilerin kalıcılığa etkisi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *31*(3), 675–705.

Paris, S. G., Cross, D. R, & Lipson, M. Y.(1984). Informed strategies for learning: A program to improve children's reading awareness and comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 1239–1252.

Sanacore, J. (1992). Encouraging the lifetime reading habit. *Journal of reading*, *35*(6), 474–477.

Saracaloğlu, A. S., Karasakaloğlu, N., & Yenice, N. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının problem çözme becerileri ile okuma ilgi ve alışkanlıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, VI*(II), 187-206.

Saracaloğlu, A. S., Karasakaloğlu, N., & Aslantürk, U. E. (2010). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuma ilgi ve alışkanlıklarının karşılaştırılması Adnan Menderes ve Uludağ Üniversiteleri Örneği. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *19*(3).

Simpson, M. L., & Nist, S. L. (2000). An update on strategic learning: It's more than textbook reading strategies. *Journal ofAdolescent and Adult Literacy, 43*, 528-541.

Simpson, M. L., Stahl, N. A, & Francis, M. A. (2004). Reading and learning strategies: Recommendations for the 21st century. *Journal of Developmental Education, 28*(2), 2–14.

Susar-Kırmızı, F. (2011). The relationship between reading comprehension strategies and reading attitudes. *Education 3–13*, *39*(3), 289–303.

Taraban, R., Rynearson, K., & Kerr, M. (2000). College students'academıc performance and self-reports of comprehensıon strategy use. *Reading Psychology*, *21*(4), 283–308.

Topuzkanamış, A. G. E. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının okuduğunu anlama ve okuma stratejilerini kullanma düzeyleri. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları*, *27*(27), 655–677.

Türkçe Öğretmeni Özel Alan Yeterlikleri (2017). Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Geliştirme Genel Müdürlüğü http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_11/06160031_1-YYretmen_Yeterlikleri_KitabY_tYrkYe_YYretmeni_Yzel_alan_yeterlikleri_ilkYYretim_parYa_4.pdf

Wade, S. E., Trathen, W., & Schraw, G. (1990). An analysis of spontaneous study strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 25*, 147–166.

Wood, E., Motz, M., & Willoughby, T. (1998). Examining students' retrospective memories of strategy development. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90, 698– 704.

Yalman, M., Özkan, E., & Kutluca, T. (2013). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin kitap okuma alışkanlıkları üzerine betimsel bir araştırma: Dicle üniversitesi örneği. *Bilgi Dünyası*, *14*(2), 291–305.

Yıldız, M. (2013). The role of the reading motivation, reading fluency and reading comprehension on Turkish 5th graders' academic Achievement. *Turkish Studies*, *8*(4), 1461–1478.

Yılmaz, B. (1998). Okuma alışkanlığı sorunu ile bir mücadele örneği ve Türkiye için öneriler. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği, 3*(12), 251–258.

Aydın-Yılmaz, Z. (2006). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuma alışkanlığı. *İlköğretim Online*, *5*(1), 1–6.

Yılmaz, B. (2012). Okuma alışkanlığının okul başarısına etkisi: Ankara Keçiören Atapark İlköğretim Okulu öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. Külcü, Ö., Çakmak. T., Özel, N. (Editörler), *Prof. Dr. K. Gülbün Baydur'a Armağan* içinde: (209-218). Özyurt Matbaacılık.

Yılmaz, B., Köse, E., & Korkut, Ş. (2009). Hacettepe Üniversitesi ve Bilkent Üniversitesi öğrencilerinin okuma alışkanlıkları üzerine bir araştırma. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, *23*(1), 22–51.

Yılmaz, M., & Benli, N. (2010). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuma alışkanlığına yönelik tutumlarının bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *12*(1), 281–291.