

Seeking a Solution for Summer Reading Loss¹

Hakan DEDEOĞLU²

Hacettepe University

Ömer ERBASAN³

Trakya University

Abstract

The study was carried out to determine whether Turkish primary school 1st graders experienced reading loss during the summer holidays and whether giving book support to disadvantaged students during the summer holidays was effective in preventing this loss. The research was conducted with 26 students at a rural primary school. The pretest-posttest quasi-experimental design was used, and while the experimental group including 12 students carried out reading activities during the summer holiday as part of the ‘Telafide Ben De Varım’ (I Am in for the Remedial) program, the control group consisting of 14 students did not participate in any summer reading. In the study, the “Error Analysis Inventory” prepared by Akyol (2020) based on Harris and Sipay (1990), Ekwall and Shanker (1988) and May (1986) was used as the data collection tool. With the Error Analysis Inventory consisting of Comprehension Scale, Setting Scale, and Articulation Scale, three types of reading levels are measured: anxiety level, instructional level and independent level. The results of the pre-test administered before the start of the summer vacation using this inventory revealed that the students in both groups generally showed poor reading performance and their average reading level was at the “anxiety” level. The post-test administered after the opening of the schools showed that the level of the control group did not change, while the experimental group increased to the “instructional” level. As a result of book reading activities, the reading level scores of the experimental group increased significantly compared to before the intervention, while there was a significant decrease in the control group. Based on these findings, the importance of providing book support to students living in disadvantaged areas to prevent summer reading loss and increasing book reading during the summer is strongly recommended.

Keywords: Reading, Summer Reading Loss, Reading Retardation, Primary School

DOI: 10.29329/epasr.2023.548.4

Submitted: 17 February 2023

Accepted: 12 May 2023

Published: 01 June 2023

¹This study was presented as an oral presentation at the IPTES congress (Antalya-Turkey) in 2022.

²Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey, 0000-0003-2436-7010

Correspondence: dede@hacettepe.edu.tr

³ Asst. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Trakya University, Edirne, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0001-7852-2747, Email: omererbasan@trakya.edu.tr

Introduction

Reading and writing are among the most important learning experiences for any individual. In addition, reading and writing form the foundation of other types of learning. Therefore, failure in reading and writing may lead to failure at school, and ultimately result in ending up with an unsatisfactory profession. Therefore, it is extremely important to acquire reading and writing skills properly and in a timely manner.

The reading and writing skills are first acquired in the first grade of primary school. In the first grade, children first learn about the sound groups and then how to read them. Gaining fluency in reading and understanding what one reads requires a long time and much effort. By the end of the first grade of primary school, students usually have learned to read and write. However, when the education period is completed, not every student is literate at the same level. Some students read very fluently, while others read slowly and without comprehension. This gap between them is particularly evident in the learners who reside in rural or low-income areas.

For learners who cannot fully acquire reading and writing skills, how to spend the summer vacation is extremely important.

For learners, the summer vacation in Türkiye lasts three months. This long period may lead to reading loss, especially for students who have just started reading and have not yet achieved fluency in reading. Especially for children from low-income families, summer reading loss poses a greater risk.

Summer Reading Loss

Summer reading loss is a common problem particularly among children living in rural areas who are not exposed to books during summer vacation. This problem is more common among children from low-income or immigrant families. Significant differences have been found between the literacy skills of children from low-income families and their middle- and high-income peers (Chatterji, 2006). In low-income families, children are exposed to almost no books during the long summer vacation, which increases the gap between children who have adequate books and resources at home. Indeed, this is an important reason for the low graduation rate and the decrease in future human potential (McGill-Franzen, Ward, & Cahill, 2016). According to Dickinson and Tabors (2001), the retardation in literacy skills in early childhood is significantly related to low academic and reading success in older ages.

This difference in reading skills between the children of low-income families and those of high-income families during the summer vacation is explained by the faucet theory in the literature. Alexander, Entwisle and Olson are the researchers who introduced the faucet theory, which states that

books and similar resources can be used by all children when schools are open. During this period, the faucets are on and the resources flow for the children. However, this is not the case during the summer holidays. Schools remain closed during the summer and access to books is limited. In this period when schools are closed, children from low-income families who do not usually have books and similar resources at home experience losses for three months, while children from high-income families continue to learn because they have access to books and similar resources. In other words, when the summer vacation ends, the gap between them becomes wider. This may actually grow up to a few years of achievement gap by the time they graduate from the secondary school (Alexander, Entwisle, & Olson, 2007). According to Borman and Dowling (2006), if economically disadvantaged students cannot catch up with their peers in early grades, a two-year reading achievement gap can be expected in secondary school. According to another study, students from middle-income families tend to increase their reading skills slightly during the summer holidays, while students from low-income families show a significant loss in reading skills, leading to a three-month gap between the two groups when schools open (Cooper et al., 1996). According to Alexander, Entwisle, and Olson (2007), 80% of the difference in achievement between children from low and high socioeconomic status communities is due to summer reading loss.

Very few studies in Türkiye have focused on summer reading loss, and therefore, no measures have been undertaken to prevent summer reading setback. However, in some studies, teachers cautioned that the long summer vacation causes reading loss in students (Arı, 2004; Babayiğit & Erkuş, 2017). Summer reading setback has been on the agenda for many years, especially in the USA and some European countries, and there has been a lot of research on it. For example, students in New York City were found to have summer reading loss in 1983 (Hayes & Grether, 1983). Many subsequent studies have confirmed that students experience summer reading setback (Borman & D'Agostino, 1996; Cooper, Nye, Charlton, Lindsay, & Greathouse, 1996; Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 1997; Pedersen, 2012).

Summer Reading Programs

In the USA, summer reading programs have long been implemented to prevent the reading loss in children from low-income families during the summer vacation and to close the gap between them and their peers. So much so that more than 14 million children benefited from the summer program in the USA in 2010 (America After 3 PM, 2010). These programs can be implemented through libraries as well as through schools.

Researchers state that children who read during the summer are less likely to experience reading loss (Heyns, 1987). A study conducted by comparing international test scores in 27 countries determined that a home library is as important as parent education (Evans, Kelley, Sikora, & Treiman,

2010). In addition, the effect of summer school is greater for children who have fewer books at home because each book counts for low-income families where books are rare (Evans, Kelley, Sikora, & Treiman, 2010).

Summer reading programs are designed in various ways. Most of these programs are not teacher-guided but rather encourage voluntary and independent reading, where children are given books to take home (Allington et al., 2010; Kim & Guryan, 2010; White, Kim, Kingston, & Foster, 2014; Wilkins et al., 2012). This type of program is often preferred because of its low cost. In some other programs, some teachers are assigned to work in groups to help children achieve fluent reading, in which students are given books to read, come to school once a week and do reading activities with the guidance of their teacher. According to Kim and Quinn (2013), teacher-oriented reading programs support student development better than those in which students take books home independently.

Whichever type of program is preferred, providing books to low-income families during the summer holidays, especially in rural areas, helps prevent children's reading loss. According to Lindsay (2013), such programs not only prevent retardation in reading, but also contribute to developing a positive attitude towards reading, fluency in reading, more and longer reading, and better reading comprehension (McGill-Franzen & Ward, 2015). Researchers make the following suggestions to increase the effectiveness of summer reading programs:

- Owning a book is more effective than borrowing it. Therefore, if possible, books should be given to children permanently, not on loan.
- Informing and guiding parents about the program increases the effectiveness of the program.
- Guiding teachers in associating books with other literacy activities increases the effectiveness of the program.
- Choosing the books that students will read increases the effect.
- If the program is to be carried out under the guidance of a teacher, the number of student groups should be kept low and each group should not exceed 12 students.

Considering these suggestions will increase the success of a summer reading program to be implemented. Furthermore, the due adaptations should be made by considering the specific conditions and needs in the Turkish context.

Purpose of the Study

No study has been found in Türkiye focusing on summer reading loss and aiming to produce a solution for it. However, primary school teachers in Türkiye, especially in rural areas, frequently observe summer reading loss in their students. So much so that the first few months of the 2nd grade are usually spent with the repetition of reading activities or the efforts to bring the students who regressed in reading to the level at the end of the 1st grade. Therefore, that no scientific studies have

been conducted yet on this problem is a major shortcoming, which teachers often experience. Summer reading loss is not only a problem of Türkiye. Summer reading loss is a common problem in many developed countries such as the USA. Although the international studies on this problem began in the 1960s, the lack of research on it in Türkiye is particularly noteworthy. On the other hand, schools were frequently closed during the Covid-19 pandemic, and students has to attend distance education, which restricted students' access to education, especially in rural areas with limited internet access. In other words, while reading loss was previously limited only to the summer holiday, it went on almost the whole year during the pandemic.

Based on these facts, it is important to conduct a study to determine the current status of summer reading loss in Türkiye, along with a need for research probing for potential solutions for it. As such, the current study aimed to determine whether primary school first grade students experience reading loss during the summer vacation and to find out whether providing book support to disadvantaged students during the summer vacation (book reading activities) is effective in preventing summer reading loss.

Method

Research Design

Conducted to determine whether primary school first grade students experience reading loss during the summer vacation and whether providing book support (book reading activities) during the summer vacation is effective in preventing summer reading loss, this study has a quasi-experimental design with a pre-test post-test control group. While this design provides the researcher with a high statistical power, it allows the findings to be interpreted in a cause-effect relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2019).

Sample

The research was carried out with 26 primary school first grade students in a village primary school in İscehisar district of Afyonkarahisar province of Türkiye. The experimental group consists of 12 students and the control group consists of 14 students. The experimental group voluntarily participated in the program named 'I'm In for Recovery', which started during the summer vacation.

Data Collection Tools

To reveal the reading levels of the students in the study, the Error Analysis Inventory adapted by Akyol (2020) from Haris and Sipay (1990), Ekwall and Shanker (1988) and May (1986) was used. With the inventory, students' reading and reading comprehension levels can be determined. During the implementation of the inventory, the comprehension levels of the readers are determined by the

answers from the questions asked about the text and the word recognition and phonetic mistakes made by the students in the reading aloud part.

Three types of reading levels are determined through the Error Analysis Inventory (Akyol, 2020):

1. Anxiety Level: It shows that the reader makes too many reading errors and understands very little of what s/he reads.
2. Instructional Level: It shows that the student needs the support of a teacher or an adult in reading and comprehension.
3. Independent (Free) Level: It means that the student reads at her/his level and understands what s/he reads without the need for the support of any other person.

The Error Analysis Inventory consists of comprehension scale, articulation scale and setting scale. If the sum of the scores obtained by the student from these scales is below 180, the level of anxiety is in the range of 180-240 points, the education level is at the independent level if it is higher than 240 points.

The text titled “Sunday” in the book “Informal Reading Inventory” written by Karasu, Girgin and Uzuner (2013) was used as the reading text in the Error Analysis Inventory, with the permission of the authors. This text represents the story genre, and consists of 122 words. For the comprehension scale of the inventory, a total of eight questions were prepared, four of which were simple comprehension and four were in-depth comprehension. While most of the questions were taken directly from the questions prepared for the text from the relevant book, a small number of questions were revised and updated.

Data Collection

At the end of the spring semester before the summer vacation began, the reading skills of the 1st grade students were measured using the Error Analysis Inventory. While the experimental group consisting of 12 students was reading books during the summer vacation as part of the ‘I’m In for Recovery’ program, the control group of 14 students did not participate in the summer reading activities. While the students were reading under the supervision of the teacher during the course, book support was also provided for them to read at home and the books they read were followed up. In the first week when schools opened, students’ reading skills were re-measured using the same text and inventory.

Data Analysis

The Error Analysis Inventory was used to measure students’ reading skills. To determine the comprehension level the student, simple comprehension questions and deep comprehension questions

about the text were prepared. The total score the student gets is divided by the total score he/she should get, and thus the percentage score is calculated. Scoring is calculated as follows (Akyol, 2020):

For simple comprehension questions:

- “2” for fully answered questions,
- “1” for partly-answered questions, and
- “0” for questions that are not answered.

For in-depth questions:

- “3” for questions answered fully and thoroughly,
- “2” for those which have some shortcomings but give more than half of the expected answer,
- “1” for half of the expected answer,
- “0” point for those that are not answered at all.

In the articulation and setting scale, the words that the student reads incorrectly are recorded, and then the percentile score is calculated by dividing the total score the student gets by the total score he/she should get. The scoring is calculated as follows (Akyol, 2020):

Setting scale scores:

- “0” for Never read
- “1” for The Word Given by The Teacher
- “2” for Not Containing the Same Words/Structures
- “3” for Containing the Same Words/Structures
- “4” for Using the Same Words as the Author.
- “5” for Self correction.”

To increase the reliability, the data collected from the students were scored by an expert in this field together with the researchers. The scoring showed that the reading levels of the students determined both by the researchers and the expert were the same.

To determine whether the data collected in the study showed a normal distribution, a normality test was performed with the SPSS program. Since the number of data was less than 30, the Shapiro-Wilk test was performed, and the data were found to be normally distributed before and after the intervention ($p \geq 0.05$). Since the distribution of the data was normal, the difference between the groups was analyzed with the independent-samples t-test. Since the normality result of the posttest-pretest difference within the groups did not show normal distribution, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was performed.

Results

Pre-Intervention Results

The Error Analysis Inventory was used to determine the reading skills of the students at the end of the 1st grade. Accordingly, the inventory scores of the students in the experimental and control groups before the intervention are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Scores of the Groups before the Intervention

Grup	No.	Name of Student	Pre-Intervention				Total
			No. of Word per Minute	Comprehension Scale	Setting Scale	Articulation Scale	
Experiment	1	Hatice	23	65	38	78	181
	2	Ayşe	50	40	40	48	128
	3	Fadime	17	55	33	57	145
	4	Emir	16	25	36	56	117
	5	Mert	27	70	52	77	199
	6	Gizem	20	20	44	74	138
	7	Nimet	44	80	50	73	203
	8	İbrahim	55	85	88	77	250
	9	Buse	21	35	45	57	137
	10	Derya	20	40	38	63	141
	11	Hakan	31	40	61	73	174
	12	Tolga	36	55	58	71	184
	-	Mean	30	50,8	48,5	67	166,4
Control	1	Sefa	31	70	42	73	185
	2	Ali	10	20	48	42	110
	3	Seda	44	70	92	80	242
	4	Elif	13	90	40	63	193
	5	Erdem	25	30	55	77	162
	6	Merve	43	50	44	68	162
	7	Volkan	52	75	69	63	207
	8	Arda	26	50	70	54	174
	9	Burcu	33	55	46	68	169
	10	Hilal	18	40	38	57	135
	11	Filiz	43	60	52	74	186
	12	Ahmet	27	40	50	78	168
	13	Kadir	20	35	42	70	147
	14	Mehmet	19	25	33	69	127
-	Mean	28,8	50,71	51,5	66,8	169	

As seen in Table 1, according to the results of the pretest before the summer vacation, the students in the experimental and control groups generally showed poor reading performance and their average reading level was at the “anxiety” level (<180). Before the intervention, the average of the number of words read by the students in both groups per minute and the average of the scores they got from the comprehension, setting and articulation scales were also very close to each other. The independent t-test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference

between the reading skills of the students in the experimental and control groups before the intervention, is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of the Groups before the Intervention

	Group	N	Mean	S	sd	t	p
Pretest	Exp.	12	166,41	38,91	24	-,186	,854
	Control	14	169,0714	33,85			

The t-test analysis showed no significant difference between the reading level scores of the groups before the intervention. Therefore, the groups can be said to be equivalent to each other before the intervention ($p>0.05$).

Post-Intervention Results

The number of books read by the experimental group and the control group during the intervention process is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Number of Books that Students Own and Read in the Process

Group	No.	Name of Student	No. of books at home	No. of Books read during the Intervention
Experiment	1	Hatice	3	9
	2	Ayşe	2	15
	3	Fadime	4	6
	4	Emir	2	8
	5	Mert	3	10
	6	Gizem	5	9
	7	Nimet	9	14
	8	İbrahim	11	8
	9	Buse	1	11
	10	Derya	2	6
	11	Hakan	3	9
	12	Tolga	4	7
-	Mean		4,08	9,3
Control	1	Sefa	2	2
	2	Ali	0	1
	3	Seda	7	2
	4	Elif	5	2
	5	Erdem	1	5
	6	Merve	2	3
	7	Volkan	8	2
	8	Arda	5	2
	9	Burcu	6	3
	10	Hilal	4	1
	11	Filiz	3	1
	12	Ahmet	6	2
	13	Kadir	3	4
	14	Mehmet	1	2
-	Mean		3,92	2,2

As can be seen in Table 3, the number of books in the homes of the students is quite low (four books on average). This average was determined based on the statements of the students. The number of books read by the students in the experimental group during the intervention was monitored and the students were observed to read an average of 9.3 books in this process. On the other hand, the number of books read by the control group could not be monitored, and student statements were taken as the basis.

The measurement was repeated at the end of the summer holiday, when the schools opened, and the scores of the experimental and control groups are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Scores of the groups after the intervention

Group	No.	Name of Student	Post-Intervention				Total
			Words Read per Minute	Comprehension Scale	Setting Scale	Articulation Scale	
Experimental	1	Hatice	30	90	54	80	224
	2	Ayşe	56	85	63	80	228
	3	Fadime	17	65	48	65	178
	4	Emir	18	40	44	68	152
	5	Mert	29	90	57	74	221
	6	Gizem	32	60	38	70	168
	7	Nimet	54	70	60	86	216
	8	İbrahim	61	85	87	74	246
	9	Buse	29	50	50	63	163
	10	Derya	23	45	43	61	149
	11	Hakan	34	45	66	78	189
	12	Tolga	39	65	60	71	196
		Mean		35,1	65,8	55,8	72,5
Control	1	Sefa	23	55	41	68	164
	2	Ali	8	20	38	41	99
	3	Seda	51	75	81	76	232
	4	Elif	11	80	44	54	178
	5	Erdem	20	25	60	78	163
	6	Merve	46	45	48	74	167
	7	Volkan	49	65	72	61	198
	8	Arda	28	50	57	72	179
	9	Burcu	30	50	50	66	166
	10	Hilal	18	30	33	60	123
	11	Filiz	47	55	52	75	182
	12	Ahmet	25	35	48	73	156
	13	Kadir	18	35	45	70	150
	14	Mehmet	20	30	34	61	125
	Mean		28,1	46,4	50,2	66,3	163

As can be seen in Table 4, the results of the second measurement performed after the opening of schools show that the control group's level (Anxiety) did not change, while the level of the

experimental group increased to the Instruction level. Another remarkable finding is that while the average score of the control group from the inventory was 169 before the summer holiday, the score decreased to 163 afterwards. The mean score of the experimental group, which was 166.4 before the intervention, increased to 194.1 afterwards. Another finding is the increase in the mean score of the experimental group on the comprehension scale after the intervention. During this period, the mean score of the control group decreased. Again, when the average number of words read per minute was examined, an increase was observed in the experimental group, while the average of the control group did not change compared to before the intervention. The result of the independent t-test, which was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the reading skills of the students in the experimental and control groups after the intervention, is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of the groups after the intervention

	Group	N	Mean	S	sd	t	p
Post-test	Exp.	12	194,17	32,59	24	2,412	,024
	Control	14	163	33,06			

The t-test revealed a significant difference in favor of the experimental group between the reading level scores of the groups after the intervention ($p < 0.05$). Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test results for within-group differentiation are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Within-group differentiation

	Post test – Pre test	N	Rank Mean	Rank Total	z	p
Exp.	Negative Ranks	1	1	1	-2,981	,003
	Positive Ranks	11	7	77		
	No Diff.	0				
Control	Negative Ranks	10	8,75	87,50	-2,199	,028
	Positive Ranks	4	4,38	17,50		
	No Diff.	0				

Considering the differentiation within the group, since the p value ($p < .003$ and $.028$) is less than 0.05, there is a significant difference between the scores before and after the intervention for both groups. Thus, while the reading level increased significantly in the experimental group after the intervention, the reading level fell significantly in the control group.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Although summer reading loss or retardation continues to be a serious problem frequently encountered by teachers working in disadvantaged areas, the scarcity of studies on summer reading loss in Türkiye, and the lack of any preventive measures are a definite cause for concern. As such, the current study aimed to determine whether first-year students experienced reading loss during the summer holiday and to determine whether providing book support (book reading activities) during this holiday was effective in preventing summer reading loss.

Our results clearly show that first grade students living in a disadvantaged region and who did not participate in reading activities during the summer vacation experienced reading loss. Our literature review revealed that the studies to determine the summer reading loss in Türkiye are quite inadequate Yıldız (2014) found that reading speed of the 4th grade students decreased significantly after the summer holiday compared to the pre-holiday. Comparing public and private school students, Yıldız et al. (2021) examined how the fluent reading skills of students who were in the first grade at outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic developed during the second grade and whether they had any learning losses. They found that the public school students could reach the reading speed that the private school students had at the beginning of the year only at the end of the year, and there was a one-year difference in reading speed between the two groups. They also determined that public school students' reading errors increased twice as much compared to the pre-pandemic period. These results are also important because they show that socioeconomic level is a determinant variable on reading loss, In some other studies, teachers mentioned that the long summer vacation causes reading loss. Focusing on the concepts of learning, memory and forgetting, Arı (2004) found that the long summer vacation causes learning loss and recommended offering support activities during this period. In their study titled "Problems and solution proposals in the process of primary literacy teaching," Babayiğit and Erkuş (2007) report teachers' observation that their students had forgotten some reading and writing elements during the transition from first grade to second grade, after vacation. International studies also confirm that students experience reading loss during the long summer vacation (Borman & D'Agostino, 1996; Cooper, Nye, Charlton, Lindsay, & Greathouse, 1996; Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 1997; Pedersen, 2012).

We found that doing reading activities and providing book support to students during the summer vacation prevented summer reading loss and improved reading skills. That providing book support to disadvantaged students during the summer vacation or summer reading programs prevents reading loss has been demonstrated by many studies (Allington et al., 2010; Borman & Dowling, 2006; Kim & Guryan, 2010; Lindsay, 2013; McDaniel et al., 2017; White, Kim, Kingston, & Foster, 2014; Wilkins et al., 2012). According to Lindsay (2013), summer reading programs are effective in preventing reading loss, in developing a positive attitude towards reading and ensuring fluency in reading. However, such a program is not implemented during the summer vacation in Türkiye. Unfortunately, whether children read or have access to books during their summer vacation is not known. No efforts are made to keep track of students' reading status, and monitoring their progress depends entirely on the individual efforts of the teachers. As such, the program, 'Telafide Ben De Varım - I Am in for the Remedial', which was put into practice during the summer vacation at the end of the 2020-2021 academic year, provided an opportunity for summer reading activities and book reading follow-up. Whereas the reading skills of the students who participated in the program improved, and the students who did not participate in the program experienced reading loss.

Researchers think that summer reading loss may be caused by various factors such as the lack of opportunities like insufficient reading materials at home, absence of literacy-rich activities like using libraries, and being unable to interact with interesting texts (Alexander, Entwisle, & Olson, 2007; Buckingham, Beaman, & Wheldall, 2014; Von Hippel, Workman, & Downey, 2018). For this reason, libraries in developed countries organize summer reading programs and encourage student participation in these programs. Schools can easily assume this role in Türkiye. Especially in disadvantaged areas and rural schools, organizing summer reading programs at a very low cost can be effective in reducing the losses of children with limited access to books. For this, it is necessary to have a library or classroom bookcases, especially in schools in rural areas. However, studies (Dilekçi, 2022) show that one third of the schools in our country do not have a library and that the ones that do are insufficient.

Recommendations

Listed below are some recommendations based on the findings and aimed at increasing the potential benefits of summer reading activities:

- Children's access to books should be increased in disadvantaged regions.
- Summer reading programs should be implemented especially in disadvantaged regions.
- It would be helpful to include different types of books (informative, poetry) along with stories in summer reading activities.
- If students are allowed to select the books they will read they will be more interested in reading.
- If the program is to be implemented under the guidance of a teacher, it will help to keep the number of students in the groups low.
- Different reading techniques (repeated reading, paired reading, choral reading, etc.) can be included in summer reading activities.

Policy Implications

Summer reading loss is a common and serious problem experienced by children who do not read enough books during their summer holiday when schools are closed. This problem is common especially among students who live in disadvantaged areas and are just learning to read. This loss of reading skills in the early years tends to continue and becomes increasingly difficult to compensate for in later years. Therefore, efforts to prevent reading loss are crucial. This research has determined that implementing summer reading programs and providing book support to students in rural areas are effective in reducing reading losses. This study is significant in providing policymakers with an effective and cost-efficient solution to address summer reading loss. In recent years, in an attempt to compensate for the losses during the Covid-19 pandemic, various courses have been offered during the summer vacation for certain grade levels in our country. However, upon examining these courses,

no program specifically aimed at preventing reading loss was found. This research has shown that implementing book reading programs during the summer vacation for primary school students and providing book support to students in rural areas can be beneficial in reducing reading losses. Therefore, this study can contribute to policymakers in preventing potential learning losses in later years by addressing reading losses in the early years.

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflict of interest was declared by the author.

Funding Details

No funding or grant was received from any institution or organization for this research.

Credit Author Statement

Author 1: Conceptualization and methodology, visualization, formal analysis, writing-review & editing, supervision.

Author 2: Conceptualization and methodology, writing-original draft preparation, visualization, investigation, formal analysis, writing-review & editing.

Ethical Statement

Ethics committee approval within the scope of the research has been obtained from the Afyon Kocatepe University ethics committee of scientific research with the decision numbered 2021/293 on 25.06.2021.

References

- Akyol, H. (2020). *Türkçe öğretim yöntemi* (10th ed.). Pegem Akademi.
- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2007). Lasting consequences of the summer learning gap. *American Sociological Review*, 72(2), 167-180.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240707200202>
- Allington, R. L., McGill-Franzen, A., Camilli, G., Williams, L., Graff, J., Zeig, J., Zmach, C., & Nowak, R. (2010). Addressing summer reading setback among disadvantaged elementary students. *Reading Psychology*, 31(5), 411-427.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2010.505165>
- America After 3 PM. (2010). *Special report on summer: Missed opportunities, unmet demand*. Wallace Foundation.
- Arı, A. (2004). Summer holiday learning loss. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(2), 243-258.
- Babayiğit, Ö., & Erkuş, B. (2017). Problems and solutions in literacy training process. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(2), 271-284.
<https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.334982>

- Borman, G.D., & D'Agostino, J.V. (1996). Title I and student achievement: A meta-analysis of federal evaluation results. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(4), 309–326. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737018004309>
- Borman, G. F., & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Longitudinal achievement effects of multiyear summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 28*(1), 25-48. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737028001025>
- Buckingham, J., Beaman, R. & Wheldall, K. (2014). Why poor children are more likely to become poor readers. *The early years. Educational Review, 66*(4), 428-446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.795129>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2019). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem Akademi.
- Chatterji, M. (2006). Reading achievement gaps, correlates, and moderators of early reading achievement: Evidence from the early childhood longitudinal study (ECLS) kindergarten to first grade sample. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(3), 489-507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.3.489>
- Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A narrative and metaanalytic review. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(3), 227-268. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543066003227>
- Dickinson, D. K., & Tabors, P. O. (2001). *Beginning literacy with language: Young children learning at home and school*. Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Dilekçi, A. (2022). Evaluation of School Libraries in Terms of Quantity and Quality. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 18*(5), 248-268. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2022.467.15>
- Ekwall, E. E., & Shanker, J. L. (1988). *Diagnosis and remediation of the disabled reader* (3th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Entwisle, D.R., Alexander, K.L., & Olson, L.S. (1997). *Children, schools, and inequality*. Westview.
- Evans, M., Kelley, J., Sikora, J., & Treiman, D. (2010). Family scholarly culture and educational success: Books and schooling in 27 nations. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 28*(2), 171-197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2010.01.002>
- Harris, A. J., & Sipay, E. R. (1990). *How to increase reading ability* (9th ed.). Longman.
- Hayes, D.P., & Grether, J. (1983). The school year and vacations: When do students learn? *Cornell Journal of Social Relations, 17*(1), 56-71.
- Heyns, B. (1987). Schooling and cognitive development: Is there a season for learning? *Child Development, 58*(5), 1151-1160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130611>
- Karasu, P., Girgin, Ü., & Uzuner, Y. (2013). *Formel olmayan okuma envanteri*. Nobel Akademi.
- Kim, J. S., & Guryan, J. (2010). The efficacy of a voluntary summer book reading intervention for low-income Latino children from language minority families. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(1), 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017270>

- Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's literacy achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83, 386-431. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483906>
- Lindsay, J. (2013). Interventions that increase children's access to print material and improve their reading proficiencies. R. Allington & A. McGill-Franzen (Eds.), In *Summer reading: Closing the rich/poor reading achievement gap* (pp. 20-38). Teachers College Press.
- May, B. F. (1986). *Reading as communication: an interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Merrill Publishing Company.
- McGill-Franzen, A., & Ward, N. (2015). Series books: For seeking reading pleasure and developing reading competence. D. Wooten & B. Cullinan (Eds.), In *Children's literature in the reading program: Engaging young readers in the 21st century* (4th ed., p. 53-68). International Literacy Association.
- McDaniel, S. C., McLeod, R., Carter, C. L., & Robinson, C. (2017). Supplemental summer literacy instruction: Implications for preventing summer reading loss. *Reading Psychology*, 38(7), 673-686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2017.1333070>
- Pedersen, J. (2012). The history of school and summer vacation. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 5(1), 54-62.
- Von Hippel, P. T., Workman, J. & Downey, D. B. (2018). Inequality in reading and math skills forms mainly before kindergarten: A replication, and partial correction, of "Are schools the great equalizer?" *Sociology of Education*, 91(4), 323-357. DOI: 10.1177/0038040718801760
- White, T.G., Kim, J.S., Kingston, H.C., & Foster, L. (2014). Replicating the effects of a teacherscaffolded voluntary summer reading program: *The role of poverty*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(1), 5-30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.62>
- Wilkins, C., Gersten, R., Decker, L., Grunden, L., Brasiel, S., Brunnert, K., & Jayanthi, M. (2012). Does a summer reading program based on Lexiles affect reading comprehension? National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved October 17, 2022 from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_20124006.pdf
- Yıldız, M. (2014). *Yaz tatili akıcı okuma becerilerini nasıl etkilemektedir? İlkokulun ilk iki yılına yönelik izleme çalışması*. 13. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu Özet Kitapçığı.
- Yıldız, M., Aksoy, E., Eryılmaz, M. A., & Korkmaz, C. (2021). Reading fluency of 2nd grade students who were at 1st grade when covid-19 pandemic started: an evaluation based on learning loss. *Sınıf Öğretmenliği Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 48-64.