

AN ANALYSIS OF THE THEORETICAL RESTRUCTURE OF LITERACY IN SINDH FROM CUSTOM TO CONTEMPORARY TECHNOLOGY

Jan e Alam Solangi *

Yusra Shahani **

Dr Ghulam Ali Buriro ***

Abstract

The word "Literacy" has stayed alive for decades with an unchanged meaning, connotation, use, orientation and objectives. Its definition largely rests upon the teaching and learning of two basic skills: reading and writing and a brief knowledge of arithmetic. The awe-inspiring emergence and rife existence of digital tools, screen literature and digital media has significantly reshaped the concept of learning and the definition of literacy, the academicians all over the world are attempting to examine and if need be, redefine the term literacy in view of digital technology. This study was undertaken to evaluate the scope, role and influence of technology in the context of Sindh. The data was collected from the students of Mass Communication studying at four universities of the province including University of Sindh Jamshoro, University of Karachi, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Nawabshah and Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur by applying random sampling technique. The data was processed through descriptive and inferential statistics, and the results were drawn on the basis of achieved statistics. The results reveal that students of mass communication in all four varsities on in all are fast adopting digital technology mode/form of literacy. The findings show that more than 90% students use digital media. 80% students use digital tools for research and information. Only 10% students use technology for editing and proofreading. It was also learnt from the findings that despite overwhelming use of digital form of literacy by the individual youth population in Sindh, there is however; a significant need for the academic and other professional institutions also to adopt this innovative, current and popularly proliferating form of literacy.

Key words: *Literacy, Academicians, Digital Technology, Inferential Statistics & Screen Literature.*

1. Introduction

The term literacy is usually identified as an ability to read, write and use the basic applications of arithmetic (Merriam-Webster). Literacy is a systematic way of decoding sounds, symbols of a discourse in a meaningful content (Lankshear and Knobel 2006a: 64). This definition has governed our educational systems as the preamble of literacy for many years. In view of this orientation, students have all along been exposed to the learning of reading and writing as the core skills of literacy.

In recent times, the term literacy has expanded its role and scope to the use of numbers, symbols, graphs and other common means of communication to understand the message and convey a piece of information as per the existing culture of symbols (UNESCO). Under this doctrine, the existing schooling system begins with teaching pupil how to read and write. The teaching learning goals of early education are set accordingly; but in the world where keyboard is replacing the pen and voice recognizing programs are replacing the keyboard, the digital writing reading interface tools dwarf the significance of the skills like reading and writing (Andrews and Smith 2011). The ever-changing scenario dominated by the technology calls for revisiting the definition of literacy. The domain of education is going through a dramatic phase of revolution (Kellner 2002). It offers and unruly excess on literature to the readers. Today it is impossible to treat education in an utter isolation from the technology (Zhu and Goldberg 2009). The screen literature offered in cinemas and theaters, by remaining the social media rife through smart phones and media literature and by prevailing on television channels is far more powerful means of literacy. The inevitable role of technology has enormously encroached our academic life.

In this study, the main focus lies on evaluating the concept of pressing demand of changing our orientation towards the ways of teaching/learning and the literacy through the skills of reading and writing. There is significant possibility to see a world where we no longer need to write for writing and read for reading (Charan, Buriro et al. 2017). The study attempts to explore the possible paradigm shift of literacy skills from a manual way of reading and writing to a digital mode of reading and writing.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1 New Literacies and Multimodal Literacies

It is important to evaluate our literacy goals as whether or not they would be helping our students to meet the challenges of future workplace life and its demands. The unlimited scope of digital technology demands the educationists to

redefine the term "Literacy". The digital technology revolution rife urges drastic conceptual reconstruction of literacy with new pedagogy, curriculum, and goals (Marshall McLuhan 1961 and 1964), (Walter Ong 1988). Hence, the terms like New Literacies (Lankshear and Knobel 2003), Multiliteracies (Cope and Kalantzis 2000) have been coined to identify the role technology in education and its applications on the existing definition of the term literacy. The terms like "new" and "multi" indicate the digital technology when associated with the term literacy (Rowse and Walsh 2011). The screen journalism with its vast capacities, has transformed the idea of teaching/learning. The digital literacy helps to express the ideas in a way deemed for the particular topic and theme (Lanham 2010). Moreover the term Multimodal Literacies emphasize on adoption of a multiple and plural forms of literacies (Kress, 2014). In other words, a unified definition of literacy for all fields and literacy objectives may not find acceptance in the future. It has empowered the text to be more meaningful and colossal, thus urging the educationists to renegotiate the preset definition, role, and objectives of literacy (Group 1996).

2.2 Media Literacy

The immensely powerful offspring of digital technology, inarguably, is the Media Literacy. Media has come up as more powerful means of entertainment and information and largely acquired the role of constructing the images of concepts in the society. Hence, the question is not whether or not media is good but how to utilize it for a better purpose (Kellner 2002). It offers a more powerful schooling for learning science, ethics, culture politics and much more. Media Literacy is flexible and convenient for learning languages (Lou, Wu et al. 2010). It emancipates learning from a traditional classroom setting and makes it more functional and relevant (Liu, Ho et al. 2011). Media Literacy is essential for students to acquire 21st century literacy skills to have global learning of literacy, communication and research (Rahamat, Shah et al. 2017). Although the Media Literacy has often been criticized for developing a less critical attitude in the students as it does not possess the authenticity and validity of traditional text literacy (Coiro 2003).

2.3 Rationale

The paper highlights the possible shift in the literacy paradigm. The concept of literacy is expanding beyond reading and writing to achieving the ability of interacting through technology (Pianfetti 2001). The educationists need to gauge the potential indicators of such a change and steer the literacy objectives accordingly. The media literacy is going through a phase of development hence, it is essential for the educators to watch its role in the literacy (Coiro 2003). In

countries like Pakistan, it is essential to foresee such changes and prepare accordingly. Kellner (2002) believes that without adequate knowledge and training of technology, the institutions will fall victim to ambiguity and chaos. The powerful domain of media literacy is yet out of our curriculum focus. Hence, the study is carried out to evaluate the role of modern technology in the context of curriculum and literacy goals. The area under this study has rarely been exposed to any research in such topics. Consequently, it will further lead to other potential research areas in the same and more related perspectives.

3. Research Methodology

The study is a part of a research project in which the participants were invited to contribute in evaluating the problems they faced in academic writing skills. During the study, the participants studying BS Mass Communication (4-Year Program) and MA Mass Communication (2-Year Program) were given a comprehensive profile form to obtain from them the correlated data. The participants' profiles were cross-tabulated with their responses through *mM* SPSS statistics software. In the analysis, the study revealed certain invaluable facts which are presented in this paper.

3.1. The Participant Profiles

The profiles were developed with the help of a comprehensive profile preform as which asked the participants if they used computer for study purpose. If yes, how and why they found it useful in their studies. Similarly, they were also asked if they used social media tools like Face book, Twitter, Unkedln, We Chat, etcetera, and how much time they devoted for it. The profiles were further transferred to the *mM* SPSS software for cross tabulation.

3.2 The questionnaire

A comprehensive questionnaire was developed after a rigorous procedure of pilot testing. The questionnaire was validated through face-validity; whereas, the reliability was established through test re-test reliability tool.

3.3 Population

The research population scope was delimited to 210 male and female students of four Universities of Sindh-Pakistan, offering admissions to the programs of four years BS Mass Communication or two years MA Mass Communication. The research population was drawn from following universities: University of Sindh Jamshoro, University of Karachi, Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur and Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Nawabshah.

3.4 Sample

Simple random sampling method was applied to select the participants for the study. As the enrollment strength varied from university to university; hence a minor variation in the sample size was inevitable. The table given bellow highlights the statistics of research sample.

Table No.01: *Participants Sample details.*

University	SBBU	UoS	SALU	KU	Total
Boys	25	30	30	20	105
Girls	25	25	30	25	105
Total	50	55	60	45	210

SBBU: Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad.

UoS: University of Sindh, Jamshoro.

SALU: Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur.

KU: Karachi University, Karachi.



Graph No.01 *Sample details by gender, age and university*

Most of the students had face book accounts and frequently remained in touch with friends through face book/twitter!Instagram or other social websites. Following figures were discovered about the sample.

Table No.02: *Social Media Cross tabulation*

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Face book	Yes	98	84	182
	No	7	21	28
Total		105	105	210

The above table shows that 86.66% students are using Facebookt among the non-users is the majority of females 20% who do not use it usually due to the lack of access to the devices or cultural barriers.

Most of the students used face book less than one hour a day. 64 students use it for one to two hours a day as mentioned in the table given below:

Table No.03: *Facebook user time and gender cross tabulation*

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
FB_Time	less than 1hour	67	53	120
	1-2hour	29	35	64
	2-4hour	4	0	4
	5.00	1	0	1
	N.using	4	22	26
Total		105	105	210

Table No 04: Frequency Tabulation

Face book

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Always	109	51.9	51.9	51.9
Sometimes	53	25.2	25.2	77.1
Hardly	10	4.8	4.8	81.9
Rarely	8	3.8	3.8	85.7
Never	30	14.3	14.3	100.0
Total	210	100.0	100.0	

4. Data Analysis

The data was collected in person by the coauthor from the sample. Later the data was transferred to the mM SPSS program and following results were drawn after applying descriptive statistics and t-test.

Table No. 05: Response Report on Digital tools will change the literacy definition.

Digital tools on literacy definition	Mean	% of Total N	N	% of Total Sum
S. Agree	1.4737	18.6%	38	18.3%
Agree	1.5053	46.6%	95	46.7%
UnD	1.5769	12.7%	26	13.4%
Disagree	1.4783	11.3%	23	11.1%
S. Disagree	1.4211	9.3%	19	8.8%
22.00	1.6667	1.5%	3	1.6%
Total	1.5000	100.0%	204	100.0%

Table No. 06: *Group Statistics Digital tools will change the literacy definition.*

	Gender	N	Mean	Response Percentage	Std. Error Mean	t
Digital tools on Male literacy definition	Male	102	2.6667	97.14%	.22739	0.397
	Female	102	2.8137	97.14%	.29251	

Table value at 0.05 = 1.97166
at > 0.05

df= 206

Significant

Table shows that at 0.05 levels the statistical calculations reveal the t-value stands as 0.397 which is less than the table value = 1.97166. Hence, the statement, "Modem writing soft ware will change the writing at all" is accepted.

Table No. 07: *Response Report on You use modem assessment an editing tools.*

You use modem assessment and editing tools.	Mean	% of Total N	N	% of Total Sum
S. Agree	1.1304	11.7%	23	8.7%
Agree	1.5735	34.5%	68	35.9%
UnD	1.6190	10.7%	21	11.4%
Disagree	1.6102	29.9%	59	31.9%
S. Disagree	1.3846	13.2%	26	12.1%
Total	1.5127	100.0%	197	100.0%

Table No.08: *Group Statistics on You use modem assessment an editing tools.*

	Gender	N	Mean	Response Percentage	Std. Error Mean	t
You use modem assessment and editing tools.	Male	96	2.8542	91.42%	.14583	1.396
	Female	101	3.1089	96.19%	.11160	

Table value at 0.05 = 1.97166
at > 0.05

df= 195

Significant

Table displays that at 0.05 levels the statistical calculations reveal the t-value stands as 1.396 which is less than the table value = 1.97166. Hence, the statement, "You use modem assessment and editing tools" is accepted.

Table No. 09: *Response Report on You uses computerized software to edit your work.*

You use computerized software to edit your work.	Mean	% of Total N	N	% of Total Sum
Always	1.5455	5.4%	11	5.6%
Sometimes	1.4894	23.3%	47	23.0%
Hardly	1.4444	13.4%	27	12.8%
Rarely	1.5410	30.2%	61	30.9%
Never	1.5000	27.7%	56	27.6%
Total	1.5050	100.0%	202	100.0%

Table No.10: *You use computerized software to edit your work.*

	Gender	N	Mean	Response Percentage	Std. Error Mean	t
You use computerized software to edit your work.	Male	100	3.5000	95.25%	.12673	0.165
	Female	102	3.5294	97.14%	.12594	

Table value at 0.05 = 1.97166
at > 0.05

df= 200

Significant

Table presents that at 0.05 levels the statistical calculations reveal the t-value stands as 0.165 which is less than the table value = 1.97166.

Hence, the statement, "You use computerized software to edit your work" is accepted.

Table No. 11: Response Report on You use speech recognizing soft wares for writing.

You use speech recognizing softwares for writing.	Mean	% of Total N	N	% of Total Sum
Always	1.2143	6.8%	14	5.5%
Sometimes	1.3556	21.8%	45	19.7%
Hardly	1.4286	10.2%	21	9.7%
Rarely	1.6667	30.6%	63	34.0%
Never	1.5238	30.6%	63	31.1%
Total	1.5000	100.0%	206	100.0%

Table No.12: Group Statistics on You use speech recognizing softwares for writing.

	Gender	N	Mean	Response Percentage	Std. Error Mean	t
You use speech recognizing soft ware for writing.	Male	103	3.2913	98.05%	.13978	3.063
	Female	103	3.8350	98.05%	.11132	

Table value at 0.05 = 1.97166
<0.05

df= 203

Significant at

Table depicts that at 0.05 levels the statistical calculations reveal the t-value is 3.063 which is greater than the table value= 1.97166. Hence, the statement, "you use speech recognizing software for writing" is rejected.

5. Discussion

5.1.1 Digital Writing

The fundamental core question receives a decisive response recorded in the table No. 11. The statistics on the table depict that 46.7% respondents have opted for the second option and agree with the statement. Only 11.1% and 8.8% have disagreed or strongly disagreed respectively. Hence it is safe to believe that majority of the students believe that modern soft wares will change the writing.

5.1.2 Technology for Assessment:

Table No.05 on using modern assessment tools shows a mixed response. It shows only 8.7% and 35.9% students strongly agree and agree with the statement. Whereas, 31.9% disagree and 12.1% strongly disagreed with the statement, hence the decision can be drawn on the basis of t test. After the application of t-test it is found that modern assessment tools are getting a positive response and the trend is likely to expand.

5.1.3 Technology for Editing

As the table No. 07 displays a negative tendency on the application of modern tools on editing, 30.9% of the students have selected the option “rarely” and 27.6% “never”. Comparatively only 5.6% and 23% students have chosen the first and second option. Hence, it is clear that most of the students do not use computer software to edit their work.

5.1.4 Speech Recognizing Tools

As the table No. 09 reveals a tilt towards the disagreement, a negative response is evident on using speech recognizing; with the statement, as 34% of the students have selected the option “rarely” and 31.1% “never”. Comparatively only 5.5% and 19.7% students have selected the first and second option i.e. “Always” and “Sometimes”. Hence, it is clear that most of the students do not use plagiarism software.

5.2 Findings and Conclusion.

The study verifies the significant role of technology in education. Majority of the sample recognizes the vast potentialities of digital tools in future literacy's.

Most of the students of mass communication rely on digital technology for reading and writing. They find digital tools more convenient and reliable than the traditional ones. The digital text is more common and acceptable.

Speech recognizing programs and digital editing has failed to attract the students. A rare number of students use them occasionally. Access and the access to the programs and tools is the common hindrance in this regard.

There are many significant evidences convincing a shift in the orientation of literacy. However, in the context where this study was conducted, the digital tools are quite unruly and need attention and further research on making it more useful and productive.

References

- Andrews, R. and A. Smith (2011). *Developing writers: Teaching and learning in the digital age*, McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Charan, A. A., G. A. Buriro, et al. (2017). "Examining the Adoptability Prospects and Implications of Digital Methods of Writing and Reading." *ARIEL, An International Journal of English Language and Literature* 28.
- Coiro, J. (2003). "Exploring literacy on the internet: Reading comprehension on the internet: Expanding our understanding of reading comprehension to encompass new literacies." *The reading teacher* 56(5): 458-464.
- Cope, B. and M. Kalantzis (2000). *Multiliteracies: Designing social futures*, London: Routledge.
- Group, T. N. L. (1996). "A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures." *Harvard educational review* 66(1): 60-93.
- Kellner, D. (2002). "New media and new literacies: Reconstructing education for the new millennium." *The handbook of new media*: 90-104.
- Kress, G. "vAn IeeuWen., t.(2001) *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*." London: Arnold.
- Lanham, R. A. (2010). *The electronic word: Democracy, technology, and the arts*, University of Chicago Press.
- Lankshear, C. and M. Knobel (2003). *New literacies: Changing knowledge and classroom learning*, Open University Press.
- Liu, E. Z.-F., H. Ho, et al. (2011). "Effects of an online rational emotive curriculum on primary school students' tendencies for online and real-world aggression." *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology* 10(3).
- Lou, S.-J., S.-C. Wu, et al. (2010). "Adoption of blogging by a Chinese language composition class in a vocational high school in Taiwan." *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 26(6).
- Pianfetti, E. S. (2001). "Focus on research: Teachers and technology: Digital literacy through professional development." *Language Arts* 78(3): 255-262.
- Rahamat, R. B., P.M. Shah, et al. (2017). "Students' readiness and Perceptions Towards using Mobile Technologies for Learning the English Language Literature Component." *The English Teacher*: 16.

- Rowsell, J. and M. Walsh (2011). "Rethinking literacy education in new times: Multimodality, multiliteracies, & new literacies." *Brock Education Journal* 21(1).
- Zhu, X. and A. B. Goldberg (2009). "Introduction to semi-supervised learning." *Synthesis lectures on artificial intelligence and machine learning* 3(1): 1-130.