21st-century readers: Developing literacy skills in a digital world

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a triennial survey of 15-year-old students around the world that assesses the extent to which they have acquired the key knowledge and skills essential for full participation in societies. The assessment in 2018 focuses on reading, mathematics, science and the innovative domain of global competence. Reading was the main subject assessed in PISA 2018, and the reading framework was devised to include essential reading skills in a digital world.

The thematic report 21st-century readers: Developing literacy skills in a digital world provides important insights into how 15-year-old students are developing reading skills that help them navigate through information in a technology-rich 21st century. This report focuses on policies and practices that can harness digitalisation to create better learning opportunities. It also looks at ways to counter digitalisation’s disruptive effects in and for education.

**Turkey**

**Summary of key findings**

- In PISA 2018, having a strictly focused navigation and actively explore single- and multiple-source items were strongly correlated with knowledge of effective reading strategies and reading performance. In Turkey, about three in ten students showed these navigation behaviours.

- Students in Turkey scored well below the OECD average in the index of reading strategies for assessing the credibility of sources (-0.23 points, OECD average: -0.1), similar to students in Iceland, Israel, Jordan and Slovak Republic, and disadvantaged students scored significantly lower than advantaged students (0.37 points of difference).

- In Turkey, about three quarters of the gender differences in reading performance can be accounted for by the difference between boys’ and girls’ knowledge of effective reading strategies - understanding and memorising a text; summarising information; and assessing the credibility of sources.

- Turkey is one of the countries where the index of enjoyment of reading is the highest. This has remained relatively unchanged between 2009 and 2018, (above 0.60). However, while the gender gap in this index is one of the largest among all participating countries and economies in PISA 2018 (Turkey: 0.76, OECD average: 0.60), the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students is one of the lowest, even if it still shows inequity (Turkey: 0.11, OECD average: 0.45).

- Compared to students who rarely or never read books, print-book readers in Turkey scored 31 points more in reading after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile and
students’ gender. No differences were observed in Turkey between digital-book readers and those who rarely or never read books.

- In PISA 2018, the relationship between reading performance and time spent using digital devices for schoolwork was negative in 35 countries and economies, after accounting for students and schools’ socio-economic status. In Turkey, this negative association was of 5 points in reading performance, similar to that in Belgium, Poland, Russia and Spain.

Digital divide

- In Turkey, 61% of students (OECD average-31: 89%) had both a connection to the Internet at home and a computer they could use for schoolwork in PISA 2018. This was 47 percentage points more than in PISA 2003 and significantly above the OECD average (OECD average-31: 28 percentage points more).
- In Turkey, some 31% (OECD average: 79%) of students attending disadvantaged schools\(^1\) compared to 83% (OECD average: 94%) of students attending advantaged schools reported having access to the Internet and a computer they can use for schoolwork at home. In Denmark, Iceland and Poland, over 95% of students attending disadvantaged schools report that they had a computer linked to the Internet for doing schoolwork at home. In contrast, this percentage is lower than 20% in Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, and Viet Nam.

Opportunity to learn

- In Turkey, 49% of students reported being trained at school on how to recognise whether information is biased (OECD average: 54%). More than 75% of students had access to this school training in Albania, Singapore and the United States. However, less than 40% of students did so in Argentina, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica, Latvia, Morocco and Viet Nam.
- The percentage difference between students from advantaged\(^2\) and disadvantaged backgrounds who were taught how to detect biased information on the Internet across OECD countries was 8 percentage points in favour of advantaged students. In Turkey, there is no difference between both groups of students.
- Education systems with a higher proportion of students who were taught digital skills in school and who have digital access at home were more likely to correctly distinguish fact from opinion in the PISA reading assessment even after accounting for country per capita GDP. In Turkey, the PISA reading released item of distinguishing fact from opinion was estimated to be 63% correct\(^3\), one of the highest together with Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States (OECD average: 47%).

Navigating digital environments

- Almost one in five students on average across OECD countries reported feeling lost in the PISA test when navigating through different pages. In Turkey, as well as in Australia, Canada, Croatia, the United Kingdom and the United States, about 16% of students reported these difficulties while approximately one out of two students did so in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand.
- In Turkey, approximately 29% of students followed item instructions in the PISA reading assessment by carefully selecting pages relevant to the tasks and limiting visits to irrelevant pages (strictly focused navigation) and actively navigating both single- and multiple-source items (actively explorative navigation). These navigation behaviours were strongly correlated with knowledge of effective reading strategies and reading performance. In comparison, more than half of the students showed those
navigation behaviours in Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China) (hereafter “B-S-J-Z [China]”), Hong Kong (China), Korea, Singapore and Chinese Taipei, and at least 40% in Canada, Japan, Macao (China), New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

- Students in Turkey scored significantly below the OECD average in the index of knowledge of reading strategies for assessing the credibility of sources, similar to students in Iceland, Israel, Jordan and Slovak Republic (between -0.20 and -0.25 points, OECD average: -0.01). Students in Turkey reported a large socio-economic gap (0.37 points) in this index, comparable with the gaps in B-S-J-Z (China), Colombia and Saudi Arabia.

**Strategies to tackle inequality and gender gaps**

- In Turkey, students scored below the OECD average in reading (466, OECD average: 487) and reported a higher than average perception of difficulty of the PISA reading assessment, comparable to that in Moldova (0.21). As in 69 other countries/economies, disadvantaged students in Turkey perceived the PISA reading assessment as more difficult than advantaged students, even after accounting for students’ reading scores. This perception-of-difficulty gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students was the largest in B-S-J-Z (China), Luxembourg, and Singapore – close to a half standard deviation after accounting for reading performance (approximately -0.50). This gap was -0.09 in Turkey, lower than on average across OECD countries (OECD average: -0.22).

- On average across OECD countries, more boys reported that they felt the PISA reading test was easier than girls did even though boys scored 25 points lower than girls did in reading after accounting for students’ socio-economic backgrounds. In Turkey, boys scored 24 points lower than girls did in reading after accounting for students’ socio-economic backgrounds but they actually reported they felt the PISA reading test was more difficult than girls did.

- About 15% (OECD average: 29%) of the association between socio-economic background and reading performance can be accounted for by the difference between socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged students’ reported self-perception of reading competence in Turkey.

- Compared to almost two-thirds on average across OECD countries, about three quarters of gender differences in reading performance in Turkey can be accounted for by the difference between boys’ and girls’ knowledge of effective reading strategies - understanding and memorising a text; summarising information; and assessing the credibility of sources.

**Print reading in a digital world**

- Compared to students who rarely or never read books, print-book readers in Turkey scored 31 points more in reading, and those who balance print and digital reading scored 25 points more after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile and students’ gender. Unlike the OECD average where digital-book readers scored 15 points more than those who rarely or never read books, no differences were observed in Turkey between these two groups of students.

- Compared to students who rarely or never read books, digital-book readers in Turkey read about 3 hours more a week (OECD average: 3 hours); print-book readers about 4 hours more a week (OECD average: 4 hours); and those who balance both formats about 5 hours or more a week after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile and students’ gender (OECD average: 5 hours).

- The index of enjoyment of reading decreased between 2009 and 2018 on average across OECD countries, and in one-third of countries and economies with available data on this index.
In Turkey, not only the index remained the same between the two years, but students kept one of the highest levels of enjoyment of reading across countries and economies – 0.68 points.

- In Turkey, more than half of students report reading books in paper format more often than in any other format (55%). This is the largest percentage of readers in paper format across all participating countries and economies, followed by Japan, Korea and Slovenia (OECD average: 36%).

- Students in Turkey report spending 5.5 hours per week reading for enjoyment, one of the highest across OECD countries (OECD average: 3.6). This is similar to students in Poland and only below students in Greece. The amount of time students in Turkey spend reading for enjoyment per week has remained without changes since PISA 2009.

- Girls and students from a higher socio-economic background typically report higher levels of enjoyment of reading. The gap between boys and girls was among the largest in Turkey (0.76 points), and similar to that in Portugal, Austria, Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic. Differences in the index of enjoyment of reading between disadvantaged and advantaged students is of 0.11 points in Turkey, this gap is significantly lower than on the average of OECD countries (OECD average: 0.45 points).

Figure 1. Average time of reading for enjoyment by the format of reading

Difference between students who read books in the following way and those who "rarely or never read books", after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile, and students’ gender

Teachers’ practices

- Disadvantaged students and boys – who typically have a lower reading performance - perceived less stimulation from their teachers in reading activities in 49 countries/economies participating in PISA 2018. In Turkey, while no differences were observed between disadvantaged and advantaged students, boys had a lower perception of teachers’ stimulation of reading engagement than girls by 0.20 points. In Turkey, girls scored 25 points more than boys in reading performance (OECD average: 30 points), and advantaged students 76 points more than disadvantaged (OECD average: 89).

- The association between teachers’ stimulation of reading engagement and students’ enjoyment of reading is positive in all participating countries and economies in PISA 2018. It is positive, as well, with reading performance in 61 countries and economies after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile. In Turkey, the association with reading performance is positive as there is a
A five point change in performance associated with a one-unit increase in the index of teacher’s stimulation of reading engagement (OECD average: 7 points).

- Reading fiction texts and reading long texts for school more frequently was positively associated with reading performance in most countries/economies, after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile. In Turkey, students who reported reading fiction books two or more times during the last month scored 11 points more in reading than students who did not, after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profile (OECD average: 9 points). Students who had to read longer pieces of texts for school (101 pages or more) achieved 20 points more in reading than those who reported reading smaller pieces of text (10 pages or less) after accounting for students’ and schools’ socio-economic profiles and students’ gender (OECD average: 31).

- The average duration of time per week students spent using digital devices during classroom lessons and outside of classroom lessons for language lessons across OECD countries was 41 minutes. Students in Australia, New Zealand, Sweden and the United States reported spending more than 1 hour a week, and students in Denmark reported about 2 hours a week. In Turkey, students reported spending 39 minutes a week. Like Turkey, Israel, Italy and Thailand, had shares of students reporting that during the last month both the teacher and students used a digital device for learning and teaching during test language lessons, that virtually matched the OECD average: 37 to 38%.

- The relationship between reading performance and time spent using digital devices for schoolwork was negative in 36 countries and economies. The change in reading performance associated with an one-hour increase in the total time a week using digital devices for school in Turkey is -5 points (OECD average: -7 points), after accounting for students and schools’ socio-economic status. This relationship is similar to that in Chile, Poland and Spain, after accounting for students and schools’ socio-economic status.

**Figure 2. Indicators of reading in a digital world**
Key features of PISA 2018

The content

- The PISA 2018 survey focused on reading, with mathematics, science and global competence as minor areas of assessment. PISA 2018 also included an assessment of young people’s financial literacy, which was optional for countries and economies.

The students

- Some 600,000 students completed the assessment in 2018, representing about 32 million 15-year-olds in the schools of the 79 participating countries and economies.

The assessment

- Computer-based tests were used in most countries with assessments lasting a total of two hours. In reading, a multi-stage adaptive approach was applied in computer-based tests whereby students were assigned a block of test items based on their performance in preceding blocks.

- Test items were a mixture of multiple-choice questions and questions requiring students to construct their own responses. The items were organised into groups based on a passage of text describing a real-life situation. About 930 minutes of test items for reading, mathematics, science and global competence were covered, with different students taking different combinations of test items.

- Students also answered a background questionnaire, which took about 35 minutes to complete. The questionnaire sought information about the students themselves, their attitudes, dispositions and beliefs, their homes, and their school and learning experiences. School principals completed a questionnaire that covered school management and organisation, and the learning environment.

- Some countries/economies also distributed additional questionnaires to elicit more information. These included: in 19 countries/economies, a questionnaire for teachers asking about themselves and their teaching practices; and in 17 countries/economies, a questionnaire for parents asking them to provide information about their perceptions of and involvement in their child’s school and learning.

- Countries/economies could also choose to distribute three other optional questionnaires for students: 52 countries/economies distributed a questionnaire about students’ familiarity with computers; 32 countries/economies distributed a questionnaire about students’ expectations for further education; and 9 countries/economies distributed a questionnaire, developed for PISA 2018, about students’ well-being.

What is unique about PISA?

PISA is unique because of its:

- policy orientation, which links data on student learning outcomes with data on students’ backgrounds and attitudes towards learning, and with key factors that shape their learning in and outside of school; by doing so, PISA can highlight differences in performance and identify the characteristics of students, schools and education systems that perform well.

- innovative concept of “literacy”, which refers to students’ capacity to apply their knowledge and skills in key areas, and to analyse, reason and communicate effectively as they identify, interpret and solve problems in a variety of situations.

- relevance to lifelong learning as PISA asks students to report on their motivation to learn, their beliefs about themselves, and their learning strategies.

- regularity, which enables countries to monitor their progress in meeting key learning objectives.

- breadth of coverage, which, in PISA 2018, encompassed all 37 OECD countries and 42 partner countries and economies.
Map of PISA countries and economies

**OECD member countries**
- Australia
- Austria
- Belgium
- Canada
- Chile
- Colombia
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Japan
- Korea
- Latvia

**Partner countries and economies in PISA 2018**
- Albania
- Argentina
- Azerbaijan
- Belarus
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Brazil
- Brunei Darussalam
- Bulgaria
- Costa Rica
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Dominican Republic
- Georgia
- Hong Kong (China)
- Indonesia
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kosovo
- Lebanon
- Macao (China)

**Partner countries and economies in previous cycles**
- Algeria
- Azerbaijan
- Guangdong (China)
- Himachal Pradesh (India)
- Kyrgyzstan
- Liechtenstein
- Mauritius
- Miranda (Venezuela)
- Tamil Nadu (India)
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia

* Puerto Rico participated in the PISA 2016 assessment (as an unincorporated territory of the United States).

** B-S-J-Z (China) refers to four PISA 2018 participating Chinese provinces: Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang. In PISA 2015, the four PISA participating Chinese provinces were Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Guangdong.

1. Note by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to “Cyprus” relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. There is no authority on “Cyprus” that reflects the views of all打动土耳其 and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the “Cyprus issue”.

Note by all European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.
This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and any map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

Note regarding data from Israel

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

Note by Turkey

The information in this document with reference to “Cyprus” relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the “Cyprus issue”.

Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union

The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.
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1 The socio-economic profile is measured by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS). A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) school is a school in the bottom (top) quarter of the ESCS in the relevant country/economy.

2 The socio-economic profile is measured by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS). A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the ESCS in the relevant country/economy.

3 Rapa Nui Question 3 is a partial credit item where non-credit is scored 0, partial credit is scored 0.5, and full credit is scored 1. Therefore, the estimated percentage correct for full credit in this item is lower than 47%, on average across OECD countries. This item was estimated to be 39% correct, on average across all PISA 2018 participating countries and economies. Rapa Nui Question 3 is a Level 5 item. This means that students need to have a proficiency level 5 to have a 62% probability of getting full credit in this item (see Figure I.2.1, (OECD, 2019(a))).