

Evaluation of Students Approach towards Reading Skills by Assessing the Quality of their Learning Outcomes

Neelala Harish¹, Karuna Sree Kedala²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Sciences, S R Engineering College, Warangal,
Telangana, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Sciences, S R Engineering College, Warangal,
Telangana, India

ABSTRACT

In the previous decades scientists found a shared connection between an understudy's academic reading skills and academic success. Understudies and also instructors, be that as it may, underestimate the learning of this aptitude. Subsequently, most understudies utilize a surface approach to reading in reading academic reading materials. This paper will talk about the need of educators to instruct the correct reading methodologies to enable understudies to utilize a deep approach in reading academic writings. Members of this exploration consider were taken from first-year college course. The target of the examination is to assess understudies approach to reading by surveying the quality of their learning outcomes.

Keywords : Deep Approach, Reading Skills, Surface Approach

I. INTRODUCTION

Success at the college level for the most part relies upon existing pre-passage school traits, including the authority of some principal academic skills (Tinto, 1993). These incorporate – reading, composing, basic reasoning, oral introduction, and media proficiency. Regardless of the significance of these skills for academic success, educators rarely show them (Bean, 1996). They for the most part take them for granted, as they have a tendency to surmise that all understudies effectively obtained these skills either as a component of their auxiliary instruction or somewhere else in school (Erickson, Peters, and Strommer, 2006). Actually most first-year understudies need academic reading skills, particularly on the grounds that University-level reading extraordinarily contrasts from

High School reading. In this way, most understudies utilize non-college systems to peruse academic writings, which brings about understudies adopting a surface strategy to reading.

The target of this paper is to examine a few procedures, illustrations, and assets went for elevating understudies to adopt a deep strategy to reading. The significant precept of this article is that if instructors expressly show understudies how to peruse academic messages in adjusted courses where understudies have adequate chances to take part in reading exercises all through the term, understudies will probably embrace a deep approach to reading.

This paper starts with a discourse of the contrast between a surface and a deep

approach to reading. At that point relate an activity inquire about examination that I led to break down whether expressly showing academic reading skills, combined with the presentation of instructing and learning exercises intended to urge understudies to effectively participate in deep reading in adjusted courses, has any kind of effect in the approach understudies take to reading. At that point, I investigate the classifications of examination expected to peruse academic writings and the significance of adjusting courses. At long last, I share a portion of the educating and learning exercises went for encouraging understudies' selection of a deep approach to reading.

II. SURFACE AND DEEP APPROACHES TO READING

Learning a discipline includes creating familiarity with the ways of being, considering, composing, and seeing the universe of those specialists in the discipline. Reading academic writings distributed by those disciplinary specialists licenses understudies to inundate in the way of life of the discipline and facilitates learning its traditions, talk, skills, and information (Erickson, Peters, and Strommer, 2006, p.122). Be that as it may, this is just conceivable if understudies take a deep approach to reading.

A surface approach to reading is the tacit acceptance of information contained in the content. Understudies taking a surface approach to reading usually think about this information as isolated and unlinked facts. This leads to superficial maintenance of material for examinations and does not advance understanding or long haul maintenance of learning and information. In

contrast, a deep approach to reading is an approach where the reader utilizes higher-order subjective skills, for example, the ability to analyze, integrate, tackle issues, and thinks meta-intellectually keeping in mind the end goal to negotiate meanings with the author and to develop new meaning from the content. The deep reader centers around the author's message, on the ideas she is endeavoring to pass on, the line of argument, and the structure of the argument. The reader makes associations with already known ideas and standards and utilizes this understanding for critical thinking in new settings. Basically, surface readers center around the sign, i.e., the content itself, while deep readers center around what is implied, i.e., the meaning of the content (Bowden and Marton, 2000, p. 49).

Research ponders demonstrate that most college understudies today take a surface approach to reading and learning (Biggs, 1998, p. 58). This marvel happens because teachers usually address the writings and evaluates understudies on their maintenance of facts and standards passed on in the addresses (Wendling, 2008; Hobson, 2004, p.1)

III. READING ACADEMIC TEXTS

Reading is a procedure shaped partly by the content, partly by the reader's background, and partly by the situation the reading happens in (Hunt, 2004, p. 137). Reading an academic content does not just include discovering information on the content itself. Rather, it is a procedure of working with the content. When reading an academic content, the reader recreates the meaning of the content, together with the author. At the end of the day, readers negotiate the meaning with the author by

applying their earlier learning to it (Maleki and Heerman, 1992). Be that as it may, this procedure is just conceivable if the reader utilizes a progression of categories of analysis, some of which are particular to each academic discipline. Hence, working with a content and recreating its meaning entail both non discipline-particular and particular strategies. The master reader has incorporated these categories and applies them almost instinctively. Yet, first-year understudies overlook these categories of analysis. Thus, educators in each discipline need to teach both the general analytical instruments and the discipline-particular values and strategies that facilitate disciplinary reading and learning (Bean, 1996, p. 133).

Categories of Analysis

General categories of analysis to interact with academic writings incorporate the accompanying: (I) reading reason; (ii) setting; (iii) author's theory; (iv) deconstruction of assumptions; (v) evaluation of author's arguments; and (vi) outcomes of author's arguments. The master reader approaches an academic content with a particular reason, e.g., to get ideas about activities that advance deep learning, to compare Kelsen's and Austin's thought of law, to analyze the utilization of swimming pool images in Lucrecia Martel's movies, or to examine the characteristics of dysfunctional families in Alejandro Casavalle's dramaturgy. As amateur readers in academic disciplines, first-year understudies do not know why they have to read the assigned writings. The reading guides enable understudies to navigate through the writings and to enable them to center around the fundamental issues of each content. Since

a few teachers don't clearly explain the motivation behind each reading assignment to understudies.

When reading the author's publications, which are more sophisticated, this familiarity with the author's ideas turns out to be exceptionally useful in understanding the author's Space Law writings.

Understudies also should be taught how to recognize the author's proposition, main claims, and arguments dealing with the issues they are occupied with. For this reason, I encourage my understudies to attempt to understand what the author plans to do. They have to consider whether, for example, the author plans to challenge a current position, regardless of whether she wants to examine a variable that past researchers have missed, or to apply a hypothesis or an idea recently. Understudies should be taught to recognize the diverse positions utilized by the author, the arguments used to hold these situations as well as the counter-arguments. Bean prescribes an activity where understudies are asked to compose what a paragraph says and what it does. This activity encourages understudies to distinguish the reason and capacity of academic writings (Bean, 1996).

Not at all like authors of course readings specifically intended for the school classroom, authors of academic books and articles take for granted many ideas, standards, and debates of the discipline as they assume that their audience is familiar with them. In this way, it is important to enable understudies to end up aware of these assumptions and to learn to deconstruct them. In this way, understudies need to examine the ideas not analyzed in the content. Understudies need to look into these

ideas in school reading material, encyclopedias, or other reference books. Similarly, if the author alludes to a debate in the discipline or is reacting to another article or book, they have to quickly read about these debates or articles in different publications.

Perhaps the absolute most important advance of reading academic writings is for understudies to judge the quality or validity of the author's arguments. I constantly stretch the importance of not taking the author's argument at face value. Teachers need to demonstrate our understudies the importance of evaluating the argument's adequacy in making its claims, and considering the confirmation the author offers in help of her claim. Understudies also need to contemplate counter-arguments utilized, and the logical reasoning utilized by the author. Besides, they have to evaluate any irregularities of thought, and the relevance of examples and proof. For this reason, I always give my understudies an article where the authors endeavor to persuade the readers of the logical rationality of legal arguments (Aldisert et. al., 2007). While written in extremely persuasive language, the article demonstrates a few contradictions as the authors themselves wind up perceiving that legal arguments don't always take after rationales. Furthermore, more genuine works in Philosophy of Law demonstrate the contrary point (Murphy, 1967). I ask my understudies to distinguish the main claims of the content and to judge the validity of these arguments.

Finally, it is important to enable understudies to consider the non immediate outcomes of the arguments utilized by the author. I enable them to reflect about the implications and applications of the author's proposal. I ask my

understudies to make associations with different writings, to relate the arguments to different points learned in class, and to relate the author's arguments to their own involvement. For example, we read an article on fear based oppression in the aviation business where the author proposes a progression of measures to forestall psychological oppressor acts. While these measures may without a doubt hinder new fear based oppressor attacks, a careful take a gander at the author's proposal leads to the conclusion that not very many individuals will qualify to fly. In this way, my understudies usually argue that measures that will bar the majority of passengers from flying are not an extremely sensible way of controlling fear based oppression.

Constructive Alignment

John Biggs proposes aligned teaching to cultivate a deep approach to reading and learning. In aligned teaching, there is maximum consistency all through the framework and each part bolsters the other. John Biggs (1999) conceptualizes productive alignment as a "completely rule referenced framework, where the targets characterize what we ought to teach, how we ought to teach it; and how we could know how well understudies have learned it". There are two basic premises to useful alignment. To start with, the teacher aligns the planned learning activities with the learning outcomes and the assessment, and second, understudies build meaning from what they do to learn. Thus, keeping in mind the end goal to elevate a deep approach to reading, teachers need to outline a course whose main target and learning outcomes ought to be to encourage understudies to take a deep approach to reading and learning and to utilize higher

request psychological and metacognitive skills to understand, process academic messages, and to negotiate meanings with the author of academic writings. It is important that we as teachers make those goals and learning outcomes express to our understudies, as most understudies tend to see just facts and standards as the sole substance of courses (Herteis, 2007). Eileen Herteis explains that "when our understudies consider content, they usually think it includes just facts and standards; the rest are activities (assemble work, cases, presentations) or assessments." So, "teachers have a dual obligation: we should complete a superior employment of explaining to our understudies that these "concealed" things are actually substance, and we have to give them the chances to learn them." We have to teach reading procedures, attitudes, and skills expressly and move them to the bleeding edge of our actual curricula instead of taking them for granted (Knapper, 1995).

The teaching and learning activities have to be outlined keeping in mind the end goal to elevate a deep approach to reading and learning in consonance with the proposed targets and learning outcomes. On the off chance that, for example, the teacher addresses the course readings, understudies will probably not read the writings as they will depend entirely on teacher's oral explanations and the notes they take from these addresses.

While all three segments of the framework – destinations, teaching and learning activities, and assessment—are important, assessment is the one that plays the most influential part in understudies' choice on whether to take a

deep or surface approach to reading and learning (Gibbs, 1999 and Forsaith, 2001). Understudies are heavily impacted by the shrouded educational modules. They search for signs and utilize these to drive their examination exertion. Next to no of out-of-class understudy learning is unrelated to assessment. Along these lines, the assessment has to measure whether understudies utilize higher-arrange intellectual skills to read assigned materials, regardless of whether they can viably negotiate meanings with the author, whether they can evaluate the quality of the author's arguments, whether they can deconstruct shrouded assumptions in the writings, and whether they can see the non immediate implications and applications of the author's arguments (Carlino, 1999). Barbara Millis also proposes the utilization of classroom assessment systems (CATs) to advance deep reading and learning all through the course (Millis, 2008).

Examples of Teaching and Learning Activities that Foster a Deep Approach to Reading

Apart from expressly teaching understudies how to read academic messages in an aligned course, depended on a progression of understudy focused activities intended to encourage my understudies to actively engage in deep reading. For example, we play several games which they are familiar with. We play the Amazing Race where understudies in teams have to keep running from the classroom to the library, at that point to my office, at that point to the PC lab, and then back to the classroom. In each of these stops, they have to analyze academic messages and answer a few inquiries. For instance, a gathering has to discover the book "Taking a gander at Canada's Legal System" by Patrick Fitzgerald and Barry Wright and summarize

and explain the legal technique utilized as a part of common law as depicted in the book. Another gathering has to summarize and explain the statement from B. Nicholas found on the book *Canadian Legal System*, 5th version by Gerald Gall and they have to give examples not said in the book. In the PC lab, they have to discover a report entitled "Aboriginal Peoples and the Criminal Justice framework" prepared by the Canadian Criminal Justice Association and explain in their own particular words the contention amongst aboriginal and non-aboriginal values in a court setting. The primary team that returns to the classroom gives a total oral account of all the reading tasks while whatever remains of the teams contribute actively to the talks.

Another activity used in Studies course is the Apprentice. Teams are given some reading guides which cultivate them to evaluate, judge, compare, and orchestrate information from these writings. Understudies at that point have to make a presentation to whatever remains of the class. The most noticeably bad teams are terminated and the best one is contracted.

More conventional activities incorporate the utilization of twofold passage journals, idea maps, and reading journals.

The twofold passage journal is an assignment where understudies take down notes of their readings and enter them in a segment. In a parallel segment, understudies enter their reactions to their readings. These passages may incorporate remarks, questions, associations with their personal encounters, and relations to different issues examined in class. Millis proposes utilizing twofold passage

journals to start discourse, for classroom assessment of readings, or for other classroom and gathering activities (Millis, 2008).

Idea mapping is where understudies speak to their understanding of a content by delivering graphs which display the relationships amongst ideas and ideas. Understudies utilize idea maps to interface ideas, create interrelationships, create meaning plans, associate their past encounters, and develop learning. Barbara Daley (2002) cites an understudy who utilized idea mapping and explains her involvement with this system: "[it] is a way to take the idea, apply it, and receive a deeper meaning in return at the very end. It isn't simply a question of learning an idea, learning about hypothesis, characterizing a word and spitting back a definition. It is actually applying it to what you know so it makes more sense in the actual world." For Novak (1984) idea mapping enables understudies to understand their own learning and encourage a learning-how-to-learn approach.

Reading journals are logs where understudies record their remarks on the assigned readings. They may react, question, argue, give additional examples, or expound on what the readings mean to them personally. A few teachers want to utilize more organized reading journals where they ask particular inquiries to their understudies to answer in the journals (Erickson, Peters, and Strommer, 2006, p. 125).

All these activities have in like manner the fact that they encourage understudies to utilize higher-order intellectual skills to process academic writings while at the same

time they motivate understudies to read the writings.

IV. CONCLUSION

Research thinks about on post secondary education reading and learning demonstrate that most University understudies today adopt a surface approach to reading and learning. In general, these examinations attempt to explain this marvel by concentrating on understudies' attitudes, activities, and skills. The research consider exhibited in this paper demonstrates that when teachers plan an aligned course that places academic reading at the front line of the course, where the chose class activities encourage understudies to utilize higher-arrange psychological skills to build meaning from academic writings, and teachers actualize assessment instruments aimed at evaluating whether understudies utilize such skills to read academic messages, the outcome is that understudies tend to take a deep approach to reading and learning.

V. REFERENCES

- [1]. Aldisert, R. J, Clowney, S., & Peterson, J.D. (2007). Logic for law students: How to think like a lawyer. University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 69(1), 1-22.
- [2]. Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. Higher Education Research & Development, 18(1), 57-75.
- [3]. Bowden, J., & Marton, F. (2000). The university of learning. London: Kogan Page.
- [4]. Carlino, F. (1999). Evaluación educacional: Historia, problemas. Buenos Aires: Aique.
- [5]. Erickson, B. L., Peters, C. B., & Strommer, D. W. (2006). Teaching first-year college students. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [6]. Forsaith, D. (2001). Introducing assessment-based learning to a commerce topic flinders. University, Research Papers Series. Available online at: <http://www.flinders.edu.au/socsci/index.cfm?6C53293F-CB74-C9FB-9FBE-CB0AD332A237>.
- [7]. Gibbs, G. (1999). Using assessment strategically to change the way students learn. In S. Brown, & A. Glasner (Eds.), Assessment Matters in Higher Education, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. Buckingham, UK: Herteis, E.
- [8]. Herteis, E. M. (2007). Content conundrums. PAIDEIA: Teaching and Learning at Mount Allison University, 3(1), 2-7.
- [9]. Hunt, R. A. (2004). Reading and writing for real: Why it matters for learning. Atlantic Universities' Teaching Showcase, 55, 137-146.
- [10]. Knapper, C. (1995). Understanding student learning: Implications for instructional practice. In A. Wright & Associates (Eds.), Teaching Improvement Practices. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- [11]. Marshall, P. (1974). How much, how often? College and Research Libraries, 35(6), 453-456.
- [12]. Marton, F., & Saljo, R. (1976). On Qualitative Differences in Learning I and II—Outcome and Process. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 4-11.