e-Kafkas Journal of Educational Research e-KJER Research Article

The Effect Of The 6+1 AWE Model With Intertextual Reading On The Reading Comprehension Skills Of Specially Talented People

Abdulkadir Sağlam[1] **Bilge Gök**[2]

To cite this article:
Sağlam & Gök (2024). The effect of the 6+1 AWE model with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension skills of specially talented people. *e-Kafkas Journal of Educational Research*, *11*, 311-333. doi: 10.30900/kafkasegt. 1344086

Research article **Received: 15.08.2023** **Accepted: 04.07.2024**

Abstract

Enhancing reading comprehension skills among gifted students necessitates research emphasis and innovative strategies beyond a simple examination of reading habits and attitudes. The purpose of this research is to uncover the impact of the 6+1 Analytical Writing and Evaluation Model (AWEM), when combined with intertextual reading, on the reading comprehension abilities of gifted students. The study employed a four-group semi-experimental design within the framework of quantitative research methodologies. The participant cohort comprised 28 gifted fourth-grade students. Over a span of 7 weeks, the experimental phase of the study aligned with the sub-dimensions of the 6+1 AWEM. Data were collected using the Intertextuality Reading Comprehension Test (IRCT) and subsequently analyzed utilizing the paired samples t-test. The findings revealed a positive correlation between the integration of intertextual reading and the 6+1 AWEM and the enhancement of reading comprehension skills among gifted students. Furthermore, the experimental activities centered around intertextuality and the 6+1 AWEM Model were found to have a positive impact on the sustained levels of reading comprehension proficiency among the gifted students. Another notable outcome of the study was the affirmative influence of the experimental activities involving the 6+1 AWEM, combined with intertextual reading, on the enduring improvement of reading comprehension levels in fourth-grade gifted students.

Keywords: Gifted students, intertextuality reading, 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model, reading comprehension.

[1] Corresponding Author, abdulkadirsaglam@hakkari.edu.tr, Hakkari University Faculty of Education

[2] Author, Hacettepe University Faculty of Education

Introduction

In the 21st century, the diversity of knowledge has increased rapidly, leading to the emergence of new knowledge. This has caused existing knowledge to change or become obsolete. In parallel, the needs of society have also changed, leading societies to seek new approaches to educate their individuals in line with new requirements.

According to Akyol (2019), who shows reading as the backbone of school programs, reading skills have an important place in the basis of almost every discipline or every lesson. Reading skill and the process of making sense of what is read are the two factors that make the biggest contribution to educational programs and teaching processes that try to make a person's life meaningful, starting from primary school (Akyol, 2019). In order for a text to be considered to have been read completely, it is necessary to understand the messages intended to be given in the text. Otherwise, the text will not go beyond voicing. Understanding a text is one of the biggest goals of reading the text. In this regard, Brassell and Rasinski (2008) also state that many reading experts consider reading comprehension as a very important element in reading. They even define reading as extracting meaning from written text.

Stating that the main purpose of the act of reading is to comprehend what is read and to develop the ability to comprehend in the reading process, Güneş (2004) says that understanding what you read includes finding out what the text means, thinking about it, coming to conclusions and evaluating it. In addition, reading comprehension also includes cognitive processes such as examining, interpreting, deciding, analyzing-synthesizing, translating, choosing and evaluating. Caldwell (2008) says that some experts state that it is impossible to describe understanding and that it is indeed difficult to define understanding. According to Caldwell (2008), understanding is a highly complex and multifaceted cognitive process, and despite years of research, it is still not and will not be fully understood. Brassell and Rasinski (2008) define reading comprehension; “A process in which the reader points to the written information in the text, responds to it in a way that proves that he understands it, and transforms the information”. The reader's ability to associate the events in the text with real events and the ability to apply the information in the text to a new situation shows that a text is fully understood (Bilge, 2019). According to Akyol et al. (2014), reading comprehension is one of the most important indicators of reading success. Without writing skills, the effectiveness and permanence of listening, speaking, and reading skills will be limited.

According to Karatay (2011), reading is effective in obtaining information and ideas, and writing is effective in sharing feelings and thoughts with other people. Reading is undoubtedly one of the most essential parts of human life for all contemporary societies. In today's world, which is called the age of information and communication, reading maintains its importance as the most reliable and fundamental way of accessing accurate information (Cemiloğlu, 2001). Grabe and Stoller (2001) see reading as the most basic way of accessing information sources and state that the reading process significantly contributes to the ability to synthesize and critically evaluate. Akyol (2019), in support of synthesizing the reading process, stated that reading changes the individual's perspective on life by enabling the individual to connect past and future experiences. Erbasan and Erbasan (2020) also noted that an individual could be influential in developing himself, his family, society, and even the world through his reading activity.

According to Akyol (2019), who points to reading as the backbone of school programs, reading skill is essential in almost every discipline or every course. Reading skills and making sense of what a person reads are the two factors that contribute most to educational programs and teaching processes that try to make a person's life meaningful, starting from primary school (Akyol, 2019). For a text to be considered fully read, the messages intended to be given in the text must be understood. Otherwise, the text is no more than a vocalization. Understanding a text is one of the biggest goals of reading a text. In this regard, Brassell and Rasinski (2008) state that many experts in reading see reading comprehension as an essential element in reading. They even define reading as extracting meaning from the written text.

Creating beautiful and understandable texts also facilitates comprehension. To understand what is read, students should know the title of the text; they should have encountered the concepts, events, characters, and problem situations they meet in the text while reading, and they should be accustomed

to the writing style at least as much as these affect students' reading comprehension processes and help to structure the reading comprehension process (Özdemir & Baş, 2019). Regardless of the purpose of reading, comprehension is a fundamental skill. A better understanding of texts depends on the reader's motivation, strategies, efforts, and richness of the social environment (Akyol, 2019), the student's prior knowledge, past experiences, and ability to relate to other events in their lives. Intertextuality is one of the best elements through which students can establish these relationships.

Intertextual meaning-making skill, which is more complex than other meaning-making skills, has been included among the achievements of the Turkish lesson as of the 4th grade in primary education (MoNE, 2021). In-text meaning-making skills are among the successes in the second grade of primary school. Learning in-text and extra-textual meaning skills is among the third-grade outcomes. Teaching in-text meaning-making, extra-textual meaning-making, and intertextual meaning-making skills should be done with questions covering all three types of meaning without focusing on a single kind of meaning. Only in-text questions raise individuals who are rote memorizers, and only out-of-text questions raise individuals who make interpretations devoid of content. Questions covering all three meaning-making skills should be prepared and directed to students. However, to develop the mental skills of future generations, attention should be paid to emphasize questions on intertextual meaning-making skills as the age level increases (Ertem & Özen, 2014). The curriculum should be designed in line with the objectives listed. Curriculum plays an active role in acquiring reading and writing skills and communication, language, and cognitive skills required for a lifetime. Individuals who learn their mother tongue well can realize themselves emotionally and cognitively. This is possible with curriculum programs that are renewed and developed according to the needs of the age (Türkben, 2019). While planning this curriculum, appropriate methods, techniques, and strategies should be used to develop gifted students' high-level skills further.

It is seen that studies on intertextuality are concentrated in two areas in the literature: literature and improving reading comprehension and writing skills. In the mainstream literature, studies such as examining the works of various writers in terms of intertextuality, examining Turkish teaching programs in terms of intertextuality, and the presence of intertextuality elements in various works are frequently encountered. Regarding intertextuality, this study includes studies aimed at improving reading comprehension and writing skills.

The first example of a study in this sense in the country is found in Akyol's (2019) study, which aims to provide information about intertextuality. Various later studies investigated the effect of intertextuality on reading comprehension (Ünal, 2007; Ünal and Köksal, 2008; Ateş, 2013; Akdal, 2019; Demirci, 2019; Kitiş 2019), as well as the effect of intertextuality on improving students' writing and creative writing skills. It is possible to come across studies (Akdal, 2011; Akdal and Şahin, 2014; Güler, 2018; Kozak-Şamcı, 2019). Baş, Avşar-Tuncay and Şahin (2015) conducted a study in which they revealed how tales of Asian-European origin can be used with a structural intertextuality in primary education.

When the studies carried out abroad are examined, we can see that researching the effect of intertextuality on reading comprehension (Bloom and Egan-Robertson, 1993; Harris and Trezise, 1997; Meehan; 2000; Johnson, 2011; Hagen, Braasch and Braten, 2014), researching the effect of writing and creative writing (Manak , 2009; Fair, 2010), studies examining the student's ability to establish intertextual connections (Hartman, 1995), examining adults' use of intertextuality in the process of establishing meaning (MacMonagle, 2012), and providing information about intertextual content analysis (Hallesson and Visen, 2018).

New strategies should be implemented to improve gifted students' comprehension and writing skills. For this purpose, activities such as publishing magazines or yearbooks, reading and writing poems, and intertextual reading can be organized at school (Orhan-Karsak, 2014). A study conducted by Albertson and Billingsley (2001) shows that using different planning and strategies contributes to students' writing more fluent and comprehensive stories and to the originality and quality of the stories. Therefore, strategies such as the 6+1 Analytical Writing and Assessment Model (AWEM) can be used.

The 6+1 AWEM is a process-oriented model of writing skills developed in the 1980s. American

educators and researchers developed this model at the Northwest Research Laboratory for Education (NWREL), which believed that existing standardized instruments were insufficient to measure students' writing skills. The model evaluates the writing process in seven stages (Özkara, 2007).

The ideas stage is one of the students' most difficult steps in the writing process. At this stage, it is necessary to decide which ideas will be addressed in writing (Steineger, 1996). The organization is a stage related to the internal structure of the writing and provides a connection between the ideas and the intended meaning. Editing can be considered as a road map of the writing (Paquette, 2002). Style is the author's way of expressing himself and adds a unique personality to the writing. The method of expression creates a difference that distinguishes the text from other works and reflects the author's style (Paquette, 2002). A rich vocabulary for correct and impressive expression is essential, constituting the vocabulary selection stage of the 6+1 AWEM. According to Güleryüz (2000), word memory plays a vital role in understanding what is being expressed and conveying feelings, experiences, and thoughts. Sentence fluency is the ability of writing to be pleasing to the ear and the eye; for this, the word patterns used and the flow and rhythm of language are essential (Kaldırım, 2014). The sixth stage, spelling and punctuation, is crucial in writing regarding content and form. In addition to spelling, the correct and appropriate use of punctuation marks is also evaluated. (+1) Presentation refers to the appearance of the writing on the page. Care should be taken to ensure that the page layout, bottom, top, and margins are equal. According to Culham (2003), the appearance of work affects the reader, and students should be aware of this.

When studies on the 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model in Turkey are examined, Yazar (2004) study reveals the relationship between the academic achievements of secondary school students and 6+1 AWEM, and aims to improve students' writing skills with AWEM (Özkara, 2007; Kaldırım, 2014; Özdemir, 2014; Özdemir and Özbay, 2016), examining the effect of 6+1 AWEM on students' writing attitude, writing motivation and writing anxiety (Görgüç, 2016; Altuner, 2017); Examining the effects of process-based writing approaches on students' writing skills (Sever, 2013; Sever and Memiş, 2013), examining the effects of feedback and correction types on students' writing skills and aiming to evaluate according to 6+1 AWEM (Yıldız, 2016), peer-supported It is seen that there are studies examining the effect of writing on students' writing skills (Sarikaya and Yılar, 2019) and conducting the validity and reliability study of the 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation scale (Sarikaya and Yılar, 2018).

On the subject of 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation, there are studies that compare the texts written by students by hand with those written on computers (Mcguire, 1995; Traughber, 1998), and examine the effect of the 6+1 AWE Model on students' writing skills (Kozlow and Bellamy, 2004; Olson, 2004; Harmon, 2005; Jordan, 2005; Paquette, 2009; Coe et al., 2011), aiming to reveal the differences in teachers' teaching styles with the 6+1 AYD model (Blasingame, 2000), aiming to examine students' written expression skills (Dettra, 2010) studies are available.

Whether or not a specially talented individual acquires reading prematurely is explained entirely as a result of the child's interest in reading and written materials, verbal ability area, family support, an environment rich in written resources, and presenting this environment to them in an entertaining way (Süel, 2020).

Gifted students learn to read, pronounce words and make meaningful sentences earlier than their peers. Since they can memorize more easily, they can memorize more words and as a result, their thoughts are more fluent (Çağlar, 2004; Sak, 2011). They read with more pleasure and like literary texts more than their peers (Akarsu, 2001; Davaslıgil and Leana, 2004). In the research conducted by Bond and Bond (1983; cited in Moore, 2005), it was determined that the reading level of half of the gifted students who started primary school was one to three grades ahead of their peers. Similar results were encountered in the study of Van Tassel-Baska, Johnson, Hughes, and Boyce (1996). In the research conducted by Reis et al. (2004) on specially talented students in the city center and rural areas, it was determined that these students had comprehension and language skills at least two years ahead of their peers, in parallel with the findings above.

Reading skills of specially talented students; They are listed as intuition based on visual clues about meaning, benefiting from and personalizing old knowledge and experiences, following cognitive

processes in the text to obtain information, development and organization of thought as a result of intertextual connections between old and new reads (Catron and Wingebach, 1986 as cited in İlter, 2020). Robinson, Shore, and Enersen (2007) stated that gifted students should be given the opportunity to choose what to study so that their reading habits can continue after studying in the field they love. Reading material can sometimes be a magazine, sometimes a story, autobiography or any other text.

Implementing new strategies is essential to improve the reading comprehension skills of gifted students, who are expected to be the country's top individuals in the future. Therefore, it is thought that 6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading can effectively develop these skills of gifted students. Since gifted students have higher-order thinking skills and can synthesize prior knowledge with new learning, it is essential to expand their existing skills further.

Integration of Intertextual Reading and 6+1 AWEM

Intertextual reading is included in the Turkish Language Teaching program achievements starting from the fourth grade of primary school (MEB, 2018). Akyol (2019) states that intertextual reading involves metacognitive processes. Considering that gifted students also have high-level thinking skills, it can be said that intertextual reading is an effective method in improving the reading comprehension skills of gifted students. 6+1 AWEM is one of the methods that supports the development of students' writing skills (Özkara, 2007; Kaldırım, 2014). This model enables students to follow an analytical method on their writing skills by ensuring that they progress gradually throughout the writing process and are evaluated gradually. 6+1 AWEM is a useful model that can be used while developing the writing skills of specially talented students who have characteristics such as higher order thinking skills, superior imagination, and rich vocabulary. Considering that gifted people generally have a complex mental structure, it is envisaged that the systematic thinking exercises that will be taught to them about writing will also contribute to the elimination of general mental confusion. The implementation of new strategies is necessary to improve the comprehension and writing skills of specially talented students who are thought to be the highest-ranking people of the country in the future. In this sense, it is thought that 6+1 AWEM, integrated with intertextual reading, can improve these skills of specially talented students. Considering the characteristics of gifted students such as having high-level thinking skills and being able to synthesize new knowledge with previous knowledge, it will be important to carry out studies to further develop these existing characteristics of these students.

Importance and Purpose of the Study

Research on improving the reading comprehension and writing skills of gifted students is limited (Akça-Üşenti, 2013; Bi, 2020; Kitano & Lewis, 2007; Orhan-Karsak, 2014; Ökcü, 2019; Süel, 2011; Sağlam et al., 2020; Tetik, 2020;). The number of studies examining these skills together is relatively small (Akça-Üşenti, 2013; Ginn et al., 2002). Furthermore, there is a lack of research regarding the advancement of reading comprehension abilities among gifted students through the utilization of the 6+1 AWEM in conjunction with intertextual reading. Existing literature predominantly concentrates on enhancing the writing skills of typically progressing students. It is seen that research on gifted students primarily focuses on areas such as reading habits, attitudes toward reading, motivation toward writing, and writing concerns.

However, considering the results of the studies showing that intertextual reading is effective in improving reading comprehension skills and 6+1 AWEM is effective in improving writing skills, it is predicted that 6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading can be an effective implementation model to improve reading comprehension and writing skills in gifted students. However, more research is needed on this subject. It is essential to examine and implement more strategies and models to improve these skills of gifted students.

When the relevant studies are examined in general; There are a limited number of studies aimed at improving the reading comprehension skills of gifted students, there are almost no studies that deal with both skills together, there is no study aimed at improving the reading comprehension skills of gifted students through intertextuality, and again, studies conducted using 6+1 AWEM mostly show that students at normal level It is possible to say that it focuses on improving writing skills. It is seen

that research on gifted students mostly focuses on areas such as reading habits, reading attitudes, writing motivations, and situations of experiencing writing anxiety. In the literature, no research has been found that uses intertextuality and the 6+1 AWE Model to improve the reading comprehension and writing skills of gifted students. Considering the positive results of previous studies showing that intertextuality is effective in the development of reading comprehension skills and the 6+1 AWE model is effective in the development of writing skills, it can be said that intertextuality and 6+1 AWE model will be an effective application model in the development of reading comprehension and writing skills of gifted students.

With this perspective in mind, the primary objective of this study is to uncover the impact of integrating the 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension skills of fourth-grade gifted students. Since the acquisition of intertextual meaning was first included in the 4th grade level in the Turkish Curriculum (2018), this grade level was chosen for the application.

Problem Statement

In the study, answers to the problem sentence "What is the effect of 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension skills of fourth-grade gifted students?" and the following sub-problems were sought.

Sub Problems

1. How does 6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading in the experimental and control groups affect the reading comprehension skills of gifted fourth-grade students?

2. How does 6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading in the experimental and control groups affect the reading comprehension retention of gifted fourth-grade students?

Method

Research Design

To begin with, this study employed a quasi-experimental research approach, opting for a four-group experimental research design. The choice of a four-group experimental design is regarded as a robust methodology for assessing the impact of experimental interventions when compared to control groups. It also facilitates the examination of variations in the presence or absence of a pre-test (Cohen et al., 2007 as cited in Köksal, 2013), as well as the evaluation of pre-test and experimental interactions (Balcı, 2013).

When it is not possible to control all variables, quasi-experimental design is most preferred in educational research. The environments where most educational-themed experimental studies take place are environments where researchers cannot intervene much. Experimental designs are the studies with the highest internal validity in studies related to education (McMillian and Schumaer, 2014; cited in Koçak and Göktaş, 2020). Problems related to the suitability of the participants for the research and the environments in which the research will be conducted may not allow the creation of artificial groups. Random assignment provides advantages over external validity in an experimental study and avoiding problems with non-equivalent groups (Currie, 2001). The four-group experimental design involves the impartial selection of groups but does not involve the impartial assignment of participants to groups because the researcher cannot artificially create the groups. Because impartial assignment of selected students to groups may cause disruption of the current education process (Creswell, 2003; Clark and Creswell, 2007). For this reason, the sample in the study was not randomly assigned; However, the four groups examined were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. The experimental design, which is frequently used in behavioral sciences, provides the researcher with a high level of statistical power in testing the effect on the dependent variable and allows the findings to be evaluated from a cause-effect perspective (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016; Braver and Braver, 1988; Doğan, 2017). Fraenkell, Wallen, and Hyun (2011) stated that experimental research is one of the most powerful research models that researchers can benefit from and that experimental research is the best way to establish causality between variables.

The four-group experimental design used in the study provides the opportunity to evaluate the effect of the experimental study compared to the control group, to examine the change in whether or not

there is a pretest in the experimental study (Cohen, Manion, & Marrison, 2007 as cited in Köksal, 2013), and to evaluate the pretest and experimental interactions (Balcı, 2013) is considered one of the strongest designs among experimental designs. McMillian and Schumaer (2014) also stated that in studies designed with a four-group experimental design, while a pre-test was applied to two groups, internal and external validity was higher than quasi-experimental designs, since a pre-test was not applied to two groups, and that the researcher largely controlled threats to internal validity with this design.

Within the study, two distinct groups were established: an experimental group and a control group, both consisting of 28 students each, with 14 students per group. The integration of the 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading was implemented exclusively in the experimental group across a total of 7 sessions and 28 lesson hours, allotting 4 hours per session.

In the selection process of the study group, the aim was to identify specially talented students, taking into account the determined criteria. For this purpose, in the first stage, specially talented fourth grade students attending BİLSEM in the province where the study will be conducted were determined. According to the information received from the institution's administration, it was determined that this number is 68. These students continue their activities at the science and art center in 10 groups consisting of 5 and 7 students each. 9 of these groups consist of 7 students each. Three of the groups consisting of 7 students each consist of private school students who are in a better socio-economic situation. The institution administration informed the researcher that groups were formed, taking into account the fact that students continue their activities in science and art centers outside formal education hours and that the working hours of private schools differ from public schools. In line with the sample selection criteria of the study, it was decided not to include these three groups in the study. Among the remaining 6 groups consisting of 7 people, there were 2 students in one group who stated that they did not want to participate in the study voluntarily. In the evaluations made for the remaining 5 groups, the teachers who carried out the activities of those groups were interviewed and it was decided to include 4 groups in the study, in which there were more students who were thought to be behind in reading comprehension and writing compared to other specially talented students. Since the group numbers were considered to consist of equal numbers of students, a group of 5 students was not included in the study. The 4 groups that were decided to take part in the study were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups.

The symbolic representation of the four groups of experimental designs is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Symbolic Representation of Four Groups of Experimental Designs

Group	Pre test	Experimental application	Post test	Persistence Test
E1	0_1	X	0_3	0_7
C1	0_2		0_4	
E2		X	0_5	0_8
C2			0_6	

E1: Experimental Group

C1: Control group

E2: Experimental Group

C2: Control group

X: Experimental application

01, 02: Pre-test application of Experimental and Control groups

03, 04, 05, 06: Post-test application of Experimental and Control groups

07, 08: Permanence test application of the Experimental and Control groups

Looking at Table 1, it can be seen that two of the four groups determined in the study constitute the experimental group and two constitute the control group. In the study groups formed according to the four-group quasi-experimental design, pre-test was applied to groups E1 and C1, but pre-test was not applied to groups E2 and C2. At the end of the study, a posttest was administered to all groups. While intertextual reading was carried out through illustrated children's books with the experimental groups and narrative text writing practices were carried out within the scope of the features based on 6+1 AWEM (ideas, organization, style, word choice, sentence fluency, spelling, presentation), students in the control groups were subjected to the normal teaching process. continued.

Study Group

The study group was constituted using the criterion sampling technique, a purposeful sampling method. Selection criteria included fourth-grade students attending the Science and Art Center, with socio-economic disadvantages and no mental or physical impairments that could influence their reading, writing, and reading comprehension skills. The chosen students were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control groups. Fox and Guyer (2014) stated that random assignment can be made in four-group experimental designs. In this context, the groups in the study were assigned randomly.

The study employed t-test analysis to ascertain whether a significant distinction existed between the pre-test scores of the Intertextual Reading Comprehension Test (IRCT), utilized to gauge the reading comprehension levels of Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1. The findings of this analysis are depicted in Table 2.

Table 2.
t-Test Results of IRCT Pre-Test Scores of Experimental 1 and Control 1 Group

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Sd	t	p
Experimental 1	7	24.28	8.23	26	2.44	.823
Control 1	7	23.57	7.96			

Upon reviewing Table 2, one can observe the average pre-test scores of the gifted fourth-grade students who participated in the study prior to the 7-week research period. The table illustrates that the mean pre-test score for Experimental Group 1, where the experimental intervention was conducted, stood at 24.28, while the mean pre-test score for Control Group 1 reached 23.57. Notably, given that the scores derived from the Intertextual Reading Comprehension Test (IRCT) fall within the range of 0 to 36 points, it can be inferred that the scores are above average due to the study's focus on gifted fourth-grade students. The average scores of both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 groups display elevated levels.

Upon examining Table 2, it becomes apparent that there exists no significant distinction between the pre-test outcomes of the IRCT administered to Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1 ($t(26)=2.44$, $p>0.01$). It was ascertained that the mean pre-test score for Experimental Group 1 was $\bar{X}=24.28$ points, while the mean pre-test score for Control Group 1 was $\bar{X}=23.57$ points. These findings indicate that, before the implementation of the intervention, the scores of Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1 were in close proximity. This suggests a similarity in reading comprehension skills between the two groups prior to the intervention.

Data Collection Tool

This study used IRCT to determine students' reading comprehension levels. This test was applied to reveal the current reading comprehension status of gifted 4th-grade students before the experimental application process and the change in reading comprehension status after the experimental application.

Intertextual Reading Comprehension Test (IRCT)

This test was applied to reveal the current reading comprehension status of gifted 4th grade students before the experiment application process and the change in their reading comprehension status after the experiment application. It consists of questions at the level of simple in-text comprehension, extra-text comprehension and intertextual comprehension regarding texts determined by the researcher and

experts in the field in accordance with the level of the students. The test developed by the researcher was examined by 13 field experts, piloted and the test was given its final form. Again, during the evaluation phase, it was coded and analyzed by 3 experts. Akyol (2019) stated that in tests to be developed to measure the student's understanding level; "When evaluating the answers given in the test, it is suggested that "2" points should be given for questions that are fully answered at the in-text comprehension level, "1" point should be given for half-answered questions, and "0" points should be given for questions that are not answered at all. For the extra-textual and intertextual in-depth comprehension level questions: "3" points for questions answered completely and effectively, "2" points for those who give more than half of the expected answer, even though they are slightly lacking, "1" point for half-answered questions, "no answer." He stated that calculations can be made by giving "0" points for questions that are not given. In IRCT, scores are calculated in line with these criteria.

Content Validity Studies of IRCT

Lawshe technique was used in the content validity calculations of IRCT. In the first step of the content validity calculation, a 14-item test was created for the IRCT, which included Feridun Oral's books titled "Red Apple" and " This Winter No One Will Be Cold," consisting of 6 questions for in-text comprehension level, three questions for each text, four questions for out-of-text comprehension level, two questions for each text, and finally four questions for intertextual reading comprehension to be answered by thinking both texts together. The test was presented to a total of 13 experts, including one professor, five associate professors, four doctoral faculty members, one research assistant, and two teachers who have postgraduate education and are in the process of completing their doctoral education by conducting many academic studies in the field of classroom teaching.

In order to test the statistical significance of the obtained CVRs, while the cumulative normal distribution was used for content validity criteria in the relevant literature, the minimum values for CVRs (content validity criteria) were determined and tabulated by Veneziano and Hooper (1997) at α = 0.05 significance level for ease of calculation. Accordingly, the statistical significance of the item is given by the minimum values for the number of experts (Yurdugül, 2005), and the minimum values for the CSRs at α=0.05 significance level are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.
Minimum Values for CVRs at α=0.05 Significance Level

Number of Experts	Minimum Value	Number of Experts	Minimum Value
5	0.99	13	**0.54***
6	0.99	14	0.51
7	0.99	15	0.49
8	0.78	20	0.42
9	0.75	25	0.37
10	0.62	30	0.33
11	0.59	35	0.31
12	0.56	40	0.29”

Table 3 shows the number of experts who will participate in the test development phase and the minimum values of the CVRs corresponding to this number of experts. Since 13 experts were reached in IRCT, at α=0.05 significance level, CVR>0.54 was taken as the content validity criterion.

The data obtained from the expert opinions in IRCT were calculated using the CVR formula and given in Table 4.

Table 4.
Content Validity Ratios and Index for the Sample Scale Based on Expert Opinions

Item	Valid	Should be corrected	Should be removed	CVR	CVI	Item	Valid	Should be corrected	Should be removed	CVR	CVI
1	13	0	0	1.000	0.948	**7**	11	2	0	0.692	0.769
2	12	1	0	0.846		**8**	12	1	0	0.846	
3	12	1	0	0.846		**9**	11	2	0	0.692	
4	13	0	0	1.000		**10**	12	1	0	0.846	
5	13	0	0	1.000		**11**	11	2	0	0.692	0.769
6	13	0	0	1.000		**12**	12	1	0	0.846	
						13	11	2	0	0.692	
						14	12	1	0	0.846	
Total Number of Experts: 13											
Content Validity Criteria: 0.540											
Total-Content Validity Index (CVI):0.846											

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that each of the items in the test has a CVR value between 0.692 and 1.000. Considering that the CVR criterion is 0.540, since the CVR values of the test items in IRCT are above this criterion, it was decided to include them in the developed test.

Conversely, CVI expresses the total validity of the test items whose CVRs are calculated. In such a case, CVI is calculated by taking the average of the CVR values of the items decided to be included in the test. Yurdugül (2005) states that the CVI should be calculated separately for each sub-dimension if the test has sub-dimensions. In this context, it is seen in Table 10 that the CVI value of the in-text comprehension level questions dimension of the IRCT is 0.948; the CVI value of the out-of-text comprehension level questions dimension is 0.769, and the CVI value of the intertextual comprehension level questions dimension of the IRCT is also 0.769. The total CVI value of the IRCT is 0.846.

As a result, the content validity analyses conducted in the IRCT, in line with the expert opinions, concluded that the CVR values of all 14 test items and the test's CVI value were found to be statistically significant.

Data Collection Process

In this study, the experimental group underwent an intervention aimed at teaching intertextual reading. The individual responsible for conducting the intervention was the researcher. Data collection took place during the spring semester of the 2020-2021 academic year. Prior to the intervention, clear communication was established with parents, teachers, and students regarding the implementation process. They were requested to complete the "Parent Voluntary Participation Form" and "Parent Permission Form," while students were requested to complete the "Child Voluntary Participation Form" and "Permission Form," all of which were provided by the school administration. This ensured the completion of necessary consent procedures. Owing to the Covid-19 coronavirus pandemic, data collection was conducted remotely through online platforms, adhering to pandemic-related guidelines. For the implementation of the study, the necessary ethics committee permissions were obtained from Hacettepe University Ethics Committee Commission with a letter dated 27/04/2021 and numbered 1552524.

Application Process

During the research, no study was conducted for the control groups. The application process of the study was carried out in a total of 10 sessions (40 lesson hours) in 4 stages. Information about the application process is given in Table 5.

Table 5.
Application Process of the Study

Stage	Application	Duration	Applied Group
1st Stage	Pre-test application	1 session (4 class hours)	Experimental Group 1
			Control Group 1
2nd Stage	Experimental application	7 sessions (28 class hours)	Experimental Group 1
			Experimental Group 2
3rd Stage	Post-test application	1 session (4 class hours)	Experimental Group 1, 2
			Control Group 1, 2
4th Stage	Retention test application	1 session (4 class hours)	Experimental Group 1
			Experimental Group 2
TOTAL		10 Sessions - 40 class hours	

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that in the 1st stage of the application, the pre-test application was applied to the experimental 1 and control 1 group in the form of 1 session (4 lesson hours). In the 2nd stage, the experimental applications were carried out in 7 sessions (28 lesson hours) to the experimental 1 and 2 groups. In the 3rd stage, the post-test application was applied to all study groups in 1 session (4 lesson hours). In the 4th stage, the retention test application was carried out 5 weeks after the application to the groups in which the experimental applications were carried out to the Experimental 1 and 2 groups. The research lasted a total of 40 lesson hours in 10 sessions.

Internal and External Validity of the Study

Obtaining accurate results in experimental research is essential for the validity, reliability, and credibility of the research (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016; Karasar, 2016). Internal and external validity are two important types of validity that should be considered in such studies. Internal validity pertains to the potential influence of the independent variable on alterations in the dependent variable, whereas external validity pertains to the extent to which the outcomes can be applied to broader contexts (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016; Karasar, 2016). The study implemented the subsequent precautions to mitigate factors that could compromise both internal and external validity.

Factors Threatening Internal Validity

In this study, measures were taken to control the threats to internal and external validity. Factors that threaten internal validity include time effect, pre-test effect, data collection tools effect, subject selection effect, subject loss effect, maturation effect, statistical regression effect, implementation/practitioner effect, participants' effect, and expectations effect (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016; Karasar, 2016). This study considered pre-test, time, data collection tools, maturation, selection of subjects, and attrition effect.

Factors Threatening External Validity

External validity is stated as the generalizability of the findings obtained as a result of the application to the universe and effects the credibility of the application (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016; Karasar, 2016). Among the factors that threaten external validity are the sampling effect, the pre-test/experimental interaction effect, and the effect of independent variables. This study considered these factors in the context of external validity.

Data Analysis

Statistical package programs were used for data analysis. Confidence intervals were used to determine the reliability of the results. While a 95% confidence interval is calculated in a hypothesis test where the Type I error is held at 5%, a 99% confidence interval is calculated when the Type I error is held at

1% (Büyüköztürk, 2016; Kul, 2013). Hence, the significance level was accepted as 0.01 in the study.

According to Büyüköztürk (2016), for normality of data distribution, Shapiro-Wilk tests are used in groups smaller than 50 and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests are used in large groups. Again, Ak (2008: 10) and Can (2020: 91) also state that Shapiro-Wilk analysis should be used to determine normality in cases where the number of observations is below 30. Since the study consisted of a total of 28 students in 4 groups, Shapiro-Wilk analysis and MOAT normality tests were performed. Since Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) suggested that graphical methods are more useful for large samples, this assumption was tested using descriptive statistics and hypothesis tests, taking into account the number of samples.

The normality tests of the data in the study sample were performed, and it was seen that IRCT showed a normal distribution. The conformity of the data to the normal distribution can also be tested with descriptive statistics, hypothesis tests, and graphical methods. In this study, values between -1.5 and +1.5 were accepted as "normal" by considering Field's (2013) recommendations. The kurtosis and skewness values of the IRCT test data for the pre-test, post-test, and retention tests are presented in Table 6.

Table 6.
Kurtosis and Skewness Values of IRCT Data for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test

Test	Group Name	Kurtosis	Kurtosis Std. Error	Skewness	Skewness Std. Error
Pre-test	Experimental 1	0.04	1.03	0.02	0.57
	Control 1	-0.25	0.88	-0.90	0.61
Post-test	Experimental 1	0.13	1.03	0.35	0.57
	Control 1	0.32	0.88	0.72	0.61
	Experimental 2	0.65	0.99	-0.14	0.63
	Control 2	-0.32	0.77	0.72	0.74
Retention test	Experimental 1	0.11	0.89	-0.71	0.57
	Experimental 2	0.78	0.99	0.44	0.63

Upon examining Table 6, it becomes evident that the kurtosis and skewness values for the IRCT lie within the range of -1.5 to +1.5 for both the pre-test, post-test, and retention test. Furthermore, the quotient of the kurtosis and skewness values divided by their standard errors falls between -2 and +2. Consequently, it can be deduced that the IRCT data exhibit a normal distribution.

Altman (1980) stated that if a study is conducted on a group that covers a special group and cannot reach a large number of people, parametric tests can be used for small samples. Myers et al. (2013), Kalaycı (2018) and Eltaş (2021) also emphasized in their studies that the use of parametric tests is safer when working with small group samples if the necessary conditions are met (kurtosis-skewness, normality, graphical methods). Based on this, parametric tests were used in the study.

To ascertain whether a significant disparity existed between the IRCT pre-test and post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1 students, an independent samples t-test was conducted.

Within the study conducted according to the four-group experimental design, an independent samples t-test analysis was carried out to discern if a significant distinction was present between the IRCT pre-test and post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2. These groups constituted those where the experimental intervention was implemented. The primary objective of this test was to separately compare the averages of pre-test and post-test scores for each group.

A dependent groups t-test analysis was employed to ascertain whether a noteworthy difference existed between the IRCT pre-test and post-test scores among students within Experimental Group 1. The dependent groups t-test aims to reveal the significance of the difference between the arithmetic means of related groups. Furthermore, Eta-square ($\eta 2$) values, indicative of effect size, were also computed to assess the impact of the independent variable (6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading) on the dependent variable (reading comprehension skill).

When the effect size values of the study were examined, it was seen that the effect size of the significant difference between the groups was 0.22. Effect size values have a value between 0.00 and

1.00. 0.01; 0.06; Eta-squared value at 0.14 levels is small; middle; It is defined as a large effect size (Büyüköztürk, 2016). The collected data were analyzed within the framework of the problem and sub-problems using appropriate analysis techniques.

Findings

This section of the study encompasses the findings garnered from the analysis of data collected throughout the research process. The outcomes pertaining to the two subsidiary inquiries derived from the primary inquiry of the study, namely, 'What is the impact of integrating 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension aptitude of gifted fourth-grade students?' are elucidated and interpreted within this segment.

Findings Related to the First Sub-Problem

The initial sub-inquiry of the study addresses the query, 'What is the influence of 6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension abilities of gifted fourth-grade students in the experimental and control groups?'

In the study, t-test analysis was conducted to reveal whether there was a significant difference between the pretest scores of the Experiment 1 and Control 1 groups from IRCT and the analysis results are presented in Table 7.

Tablo 7.
T-Test Results for IRCT Pre-Test Scores of Experimental 1 and Control 1 Groups

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Sd	t	p
Experimental 1	7	*24.28*	8.23	26	2.44	.823
Control 1	7	*23.57*	7.96			

*p<0.01

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the MOAT pretest results applied to the Experiment 1 and Control 1 groups (t (26)=2.44, p>0.01). It was determined that the average of the pretest scores of the Experiment 1 group was $\bar{X}$=24.28 points, and the average of the pretest scores of the Control 1 group was $\bar{X}$=23.57 points. These data show that the scores of Experiment 1 and Control 1 groups were close to each other before the application, indicating that the groups were close to each other in terms of reading comprehension skills before the application.

To address this sub-inquiry, an independent samples t-test analysis was conducted to ascertain if a significant disparity existed between the post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1 in the Intertextual Reading Comprehension Test (IRCT). The results of this analysis are succinctly outlined in Table 8.

Table 8.
T-Test Results for IRCT Post-Test Scores of Experimental 1 and Control 1 Groups

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Sd	t	p	η^2
Experimental 1	7	33.42	6.22	29	5.80	.002*	0.22
Control 1	7	27.00	6.06				

*p<0.01

Table 8 illustrates that the average IRCT post-test score for Experimental Group 1 stood at 33.42, while the average IRCT post-test score for Control Group 1 was 27.00. A noteworthy disparity emerged between the IRCT post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1 (t(29)=5.80, p<0.01). Based on these mean scores, it was deduced that the significant difference favored Experimental Group 1, the group subjected to the experimental intervention.

Upon scrutinizing the effect size values within the study, it becomes evident that the effect size for the significant disparity between the groups measured 0.22. Effect size values typically range from 0.00 to 1.00. Eta-square values of 0.01, 0.06, and 0.14 denote small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively (Büyüköztürk, 2016). In accordance with this classification, it can be inferred that the

significant difference observed between Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1 within the study has a substantial effect. In other words, the impact of the intervention assessed in the study is notably substantial.

To ascertain the presence of a significant disparity between the IRCT post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2, an independent samples t-test analysis was conducted, and the outcomes are presented in Table 7.

Table 9.
T-Test Results for IRCT Post-Test Scores of Experimental 1 and Experimental 2 Groups

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Sd	t	p	η^2
Experimental 1	7	33.42	6.22	23	1.67	.000*	0.11
Experimental 2	7	30.84	7.13				

*p<0.01

Upon inspecting Table 9, it becomes apparent that a noteworthy disparity exists between the mean scores of Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 in the IRCT post-test ($t(23)=1.67$, $p<0.01$). This significant discrepancy favored Experimental Group 1, which underwent pre-testing before the experimental intervention, as evidenced by the average scores of the groups (Experimental Group 1: 33.42; Experimental Group 2: 30.84). These findings can be interpreted as suggesting that the group pre-tested before the experimental intervention in the study might have been cognizant of the study's objectives, potentially leading to increased awareness and consequently higher post-test scores. The effect size value, measuring 0.11, signifies a notable impact.

The determination of a significant difference between the IRCT pre-test and post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 holds crucial statistical significance concerning the efficacy, validity, and reliability of the experimental study. In this context, the outcomes of the dependent samples t-test analysis pertaining to the scores of Experimental Group 1 in the IRCT pre-test and post-test are presented in Table 10.

Table 10.
T-Test Results Regarding IRCT Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Experimental Group 1

Test	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Sd	t	p	η^2
Pre-test	7	24.28	8.23	18	1.60	.000*	0.50
Post-test	7	33.42	6.22				

*p<0.01

When examining the pre-test and post-test mean scores of students within Experimental Group 1, it is evident that the mean pre-test score was $\bar{X}$= 24.28, while the mean post-test score increased to $\bar{X}$= 33.42. Furthermore, Table 10 demonstrates that a significant difference was observed between the mean IRCT pre-test and post-test scores of students within Experimental Group 1 ($t(18)= 1.60$, $p<0.01$). In essence, this significant difference favored higher post-test scores among students in the experimental group, signifying a notable improvement in their reading comprehension. Consequently, it can be affirmed that the effect size within the noteworthy disparity observed between the IRCT pre-test and post-test holds substantial influence. In other words, the effect of the intervention assessed within the study is of significant magnitude.

The outcomes of the independent samples t-test analysis for the mean scores of Control Group 1 and Control Group 2 in the IRCT post-test are provided in Table 11.

Table 11.
T-Test Results for IRCT Post-Test Scores of Control 1 and Control 2 Groups

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Sd	t	p	η^2
Control 1	7	27.00	6.06	20	0.31	.009*	0.09
Control 2	7	25.14	5.42				

*p<0.01

Upon reviewing Table 11, it becomes evident that Control Group 1 achieved an average score of 27.00

points in the IRCT post-test, while Control Group 2 attained a score of 25.14 points. A substantial discrepancy was observed between the scores of these two groups, favoring Control Group 1 ($t(20)=0.31$, $p<0.01$). From these findings, it can be inferred that the pre-test administered to Control Group 1 might have contributed to the interpretation that the gifted students within the study potentially obtained higher post-test scores due to their advanced memory recall abilities.

The effect size value of 0.09 between Control Group 1 and Control Group 2 indicates an average impact of the intervention.

Findings Related to the Second Sub-Problem

The second sub-inquiry of the study addresses the question, "What is the impact of integrating 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading within the experimental and control groups on the retention of reading comprehension among gifted fourth-grade students?"

Data for this research concern were obtained using the IRCT. Retention test applications were administered to Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 five weeks after the conclusion of the experimental intervention, following expert recommendations. The retention tests employed the same measurement instruments as those used in the pre-test and post-test.

The outcomes associated with the data collected through the IRCT are detailed in Table 12, with the objective of offering a comprehensive understanding of the reading comprehension outcomes within the study's groups, in line with the study's overarching purpose.

Table 12.
Findings Related to the Scores Obtained by the Participating Students from the IRCT Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test

Groups	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Retention Test
Experimental 1	24.28	33.42	31.28
Experimental 2		30.84	27.14

When Table 12 is examined, it is seen that while the post-test average of the students in the Experimental 1 group, to whom the retention test was applied, was 33.42, they scored 31.28 points in the retention test; while the post-test average of the students in the Experimental 2 group was 30.84, they scored 27.14 points in the retention test. Another finding that can be deduced from the table is that the Experimental 1 group, which was pre-tested, experienced a decrease of approximately 2 points. In comparison, the Experimental 2 group, which was not pre-tested, experienced a decrease of approximately 4 points.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestions

This study was conducted with the objective of ascertaining the impact of integrating 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension capabilities of gifted fourth-grade students. The study aimed to enhance the reading comprehension skills of the participating gifted students through intertextual reading. Data was acquired through the application of the Intertextual Reading Comprehension Test (IRCT), enabling the acquisition, analysis, and subsequent conclusion-drawing from the relevant findings. The outcomes corresponding to the sub-problems are addressed individually.

Results and Discussion Pertaining to the First Sub-Problem

The study scrutinized the influence of integrating 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading on the reading comprehension skills of gifted fourth-grade students. To gain insights into this area, the IRCT was utilized as both a pre-test administered to Experimental Group 1 (E1) and Control Group 1 (C1) before the intervention, as well as a post-test administered to all groups after the intervention.

Based on the results derived from the IRCT post-test administered to Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1, a substantial discrepancy emerged favoring Experimental Group 1, which underwent the experimental intervention. The conclusion drawn was that the integration of 6+1 AWEM with

intertextual reading exerted a positive influence on the reading comprehension skills of gifted fourth-grade students.

One of the motives behind employing a four-group experimental design within the study was to assess the potential pre-test effect in the experimental and control groups. In line with this objective, the post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 exhibited a significant variance, favoring Experimental Group 1. In other words, the experimental group that underwent pre-testing displayed notably higher post-test scores than the experimental group that did not receive a pre-test. This analysis was similarly extended to the control groups' post-test scores, with Control Group 1 (pre-tested) displaying a significant edge. These outcomes illuminate the influence of pre-testing on the reading comprehension proficiency of gifted students within the study, facilitated by the application of intertextual reading and 6+1 AWEM. As the pre-test and post-test were identical, the gifted students leveraged their advanced memory skills (Sak, 2011; Ogurlu, 2014) to retain and replicate the applied tests' content in the post-test. In his study conducted with a similar method, Almalı (2020) concluded that, in parallel with this study, the scores of the experimental and control group, to which the pretest was applied, were higher than the scores of the experimental and control group, to which the pretest was not applied. Experimental and control groups that do not follow pretest procedures are included in the design to eliminate many of the negative effects (for example, carryover) caused by these processes. The four-group experimental design is a model that simultaneously measures the transfer effect and the experimental treatment effect (Gliner et al., 2011). In this study, it is seen that the pretest effect and the experimental application effect are clearly demonstrated.

The study underscored the significance of unveiling any significant differences between the IRCT pre-test and post-test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 1. These findings offered valuable statistical insights into the effectiveness, validity, and reliability of the experimental intervention. Accordingly, a noteworthy disparity was observed between the pre-test and post-test scores of Experimental Group 1, favoring the post-test scores.

In summation of the findings for the first sub-problem, the study demonstrated that activities conducted in harmony with intertextual reading and the integration of 6+1 AWEM favorably influenced the reading comprehension skills of gifted fourth-grade students. Furthermore, a significant difference was established, with post-test scores surpassing pre-test scores in groups that underwent pre-testing. Additionally, the study indicated that the effect of the pre-test was a contributing factor to the enhancement of reading comprehension levels among gifted students, in conjunction with the intertextual reading and activities executed with 6+1 AWEM. These results collectively underscore the positive impact of the applied strategies on reading comprehension levels.

Upon reviewing the literature, it is noteworthy that while few studies have specifically explored the effects of intertextuality on the reading comprehension of gifted students, certain investigations have examined intertextuality's influence on the reading comprehension of students with average intelligence (Ataş, 2021; Tetik, 2020; Sağlam et al.; Bi, 2020). Similarly, studies have explored the effects of 6+1 AWEM on reading comprehension (Özkara, 2007; Kaldırım, 2014; Özdemir, 2014; Sarikaya & Yılar, 2019). The study's results align with these prior findings, elucidating the positive contribution of intertextual reading to the reading comprehension skills of gifted students.

The study also established that the reading comprehension proficiency of gifted students can be enhanced. While the literature offers limited studies on this topic (Tetik, 2020; Ataş, 2021), these corroborate the findings of the present study, highlighting their positive impact on the reading comprehension levels of gifted students. The scarcity of research in this domain might be attributed to the prevailing notion that gifted students already possess adept reading comprehension skills. Nevertheless, as underscored in the study's problem statement (Kılıç, 2020; Orhan-Karsak, 2014; Albertson & Billingsley, 2001), the demand for enhancing the reading comprehension skills of gifted students remains evident. Studies such as Sağlam et al. (2020), Mısırlı Taşdemir and Özmen (2018), and Ökcü (2019) have yielded comparable results, emphasizing the potential for improving the reading comprehension levels of gifted students through diverse strategies. Similarly, studies conducted abroad (Fehrenbach, 1991; Abilock, 1999; Kitano & Lewis, 2007; Reis & Boeve, 2009; Hrina-Treham, 2011) have echoed the sentiment that reading comprehension levels among gifted students

can indeed be elevated. Consequently, the findings collectively support the notion that various strategies can be instrumental in enhancing the reading comprehension skills of gifted students.

According to the result of the study, intertextuality positively contributes to the reading comprehension skills of gifted students. In the study of Ünal (2007), which revealed the effect of intertextuality on reading comprehension, it was found that the reading comprehension level of students with normal intelligence level improved with intertextuality, which supports the findings in this study. Akdal's (2019) study also reveals that the use of infographics in intertextual reading improves the level of reading comprehension. In their studies, Ünal and Köksal (2008), Ateş (2013), Demirci (2019) and Kitiş (2019) also found that intertextuality positively affects reading comprehension. It is seen that studies conducted abroad also produce results parallel to the results obtained in this study. In one of these studies, Meehan's (2000) study found that the level of doctoral students' use of intertextuality in the discussion technique positively affected reading comprehension; Studies by Fair (2009), Johnson (2011), MacMonagle (2012) and Hagen, Braasch and Braten (2014) also revealed that intertextuality positively affects the level of reading comprehension and meaning construction. When similar studies both at home and abroad are examined, it is seen that intertextuality can be used as a strategy that improves students' reading comprehension skills.

Results and Discussion Related to the Second Sub-Problem

The study's second sub-problem sought to investigate the effect of integrating 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading on the retention of reading comprehension levels among gifted students. To this end, retention tests were administered to the experimental groups five weeks following the conclusion of the intervention. The goal was to gauge the impact of the experimental application on the retention of reading comprehension skills. The data collected and analyzed through the IRCT informed these findings.

In terms of reading comprehension, Experimental Group 1 exhibited a minor decline of approximately 2 points in the IRCT, while Experimental Group 2 experienced a decrease of nearly 4 points. This outcome may be attributed to the pre-test administered to Experimental Group 1. When assessing whether a significant difference existed between the retention test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2 in the IRCT, it was evident that the scores between these two groups did not significantly differ. This may be influenced by the fact that Experimental Group 1 encountered the same texts and questions from the IRCT on two separate occasions (pre-test, post-test, and retention test), whereas Experimental Group 2 encountered them solely in the post-test and retention test. Furthermore, the data indicated that no statistically significant distinction existed between the post-test and retention test scores of Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2. In essence, this implies that the reading comprehension scores in these two groups remained consistent across the post-test and retention test assessments.

With regards to the second sub-problem, the study's outcomes suggested that the activities conducted through the integration of 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading exerted a positive impact on the retention of reading comprehension skills among gifted fourth-grade students. While the pre-test positively influenced the retention of reading comprehension skills, no notable disparity emerged between the post-test and retention test scores of the experimental groups in relation to reading comprehension. This could be attributed to the advanced memory capabilities of gifted students (Sak, 2011; Ataman, 2004), enabling them to achieve high scores in the retention test by recalling memorized content from the pre-test. Despite the reduction in the retention test scores compared to the post-test scores, these values still exceeded the pre-test/post-test scores of the control group. As a result, it can be inferred that the experimental activities conducted through the integration of 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading had a positive impact on the reading comprehension skills of gifted fourth-grade students.

In the studies conducted by Kaldırım (2014), Paquette (2009), Dettra (2010), Harmon (2005) and Jordan (2005), there was a significant difference in favor of the experimental group in all sub-dimensions of the 6+1 AWE Model, and similar to this study, this model has a positive effect on the permanence of information. Have shown that it has an effect.

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the benefits of incorporating 6+1 AWEM with intertextual reading to enhance the reading comprehension skills of gifted students. The findings indicate that this integrated approach positively influenced both the immediate post-test scores and the retention of reading comprehension skills. The study contributes to the existing literature by showcasing the potential for boosting the reading comprehension skills of gifted students through tailored strategies, thus emphasizing the importance of addressing their unique learning needs.

Suggestions

Based on the research results, various recommendations were developed for practitioners and researchers. The recommendations focused more on the education of gifted students in line with the purpose of the study. The suggestions developed for practitioners are given below:

- First of all, reading comprehension activities can be included in the lessons to increase the existing potential of these students to higher levels, rather than acting with the idea that gifted students are already good at reading comprehension.
- In the reading comprehension activities of gifted students, activities prepared with the intertextual understanding that requires high-level thinking skills can be given more space.
- Again, activities suitable for 6+1 AWEM can also be included in the reading comprehension activities of gifted students.
- In order to improve the reading comprehension skills of gifted students, activities in which 6+1 AWEM integrated with intertextual reading can be included.

The following suggestions were also developed for researchers who want to study this subject.

- This study was conducted with gifted students. Similarly, studies can be performed with students with normal intelligence levels and different grade levels.
- Studies can also be conducted with different strategies/methods/models that will reveal the reading comprehension skills of gifted students.

Acknowledgment

Acknowledge: The study was produced from the PhD thesis carried out by the first author.

Ethics statement: In this study, we declare that the rules stated in the "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" are complied with and that we do not take any of the actions based on "Actions Against Scientific Research and Publication Ethics". At the same time, we declare that there is no conflict of interest between the authors, which all authors contribute to the study, and that all the responsibility belongs to the article authors in case of all ethical violations.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, 1st author & 2nd author; methodology, 1st author & 2nd author validation, 1st author & 2nd author; analysis, 1st author & 2nd author; writing, review and editing, 1st author & 2nd author: supervision, 2nd author

Funding: This research received no funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethics committee name: Hacettepe University Ethics Committee Commission, Ethics committee decision date: 27/04/2021, Ethics committee document number: 1552524.

Data Availability Statement: Data generated or analyzed during this study should be available from the authors on request.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest between the authors.”

References

Abilock, D. (1999). Librarians and gifted readers: Myths and facts. *Knowledge Quest*, 30-35.

Ak, B. (2008). Organizing and displaying data. Kalaycı, Ş. (Ed.), In *SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques* (pp. 3-47). Asil Publishing Distribution.

Akarsu, F. (2001). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklar, aileleri ve sorunları*. Eduser Yayınları.

Akça Üşenti, Ü. (2013). *Examining the effect of the differentiated Turkish teaching applications for on gifted and talented students* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. İstanbul University.

Akdal, D. (2011). *The impact of intertextual reading on creative writing skills of 5th grades of students in primary education* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Ahi Evran University.

Akdal, D., & Şahin, A. (2014). The effects of ıntertextual reading approach on the development of creative writing skills. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 54, 171-186. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.54.10

Akyol, H. (2019). *Turkish teaching methods (9th edition)*. Pegem A Publishing.

Akyol, H. (2019). Intertextual teaching and meaning making. H.Akyol & A. Şahin (Ed.), *Turkish teaching* in (pp. 183-210). Pegem A Publishing.

Akyol, H., Yıldırım, K., Ateş, S., Çetinkaya, Ç., & Rasinski, T.V. (2014). *Evaluating reading.* Pegem A Publishing.

Albertson, L. R., & Billingsley, F. F. (2001). Using strategy instruction and self-regulation to improve gifted students' creative writing. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 12*(2), 90-101. https://doi.org/10.4219/jsge-2000-648

Almalı, H. (2020). *The effect of web 2.0 technologies used teaching geography topics ın social studies education on students academic achlevement and attitudes* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Cumhuriyet University.

Altman, D. G. (1980). Statistics and ethics research: III How large a sample?. *BMJ: British Medical Journal, 281*(6251), 1336-1338.

Altuner, G. Ş. (2017). *The effect of the 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model on classroom teaching students' written expression skills, self-efficacy and writing anxiety* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University.

Ataman, A. (2004). A model applicable in primary education for the gifted. M.R. Şirin, A. Kulaksızoğlu, & A. E. Bilgili (Ed.), *Gifted children: A book of selected articles*. Children's Foundation Publications.

Ataş, M. S. (2021). *Investigation of reading comprehension strategies of gifted and unidentified 4th grade students* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Hacettepe University.

Balcı, A. (2013). *Research in the social sciences: Methods, techniques and principles.* Pegem A Publishing.

Baş, Ö., Avşar Tuncay, A., & Akyol, H. (2014). Using Turkish Epics in education through ıntertextuality approach. *Cito Education: Theory and Practice*, 26, 23-36.

Baş, Ö., Avşar-Tuncay, A., & Şahin, A.E. (2015). The use of Asian-European origin tales in a structural intertextual reading perspective in primary education. *Bilig*, 73, 39-62.

Bi, B. (2020). *The effect of self-regulated strategy development model on improving gifted students' story writing skills* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Hacettepe University.

Bilge, H. (2019). *The relationship between reading, writing and speaking fluency and reading comprehension and vocabulary* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Gazi University.

Blasingame, J. B. (2000). *Six case studies of secondary teachers ımplementing the six-trait analytical model for writing ınstruction and assessment* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Kansas.

Brassell, D., & Rasinski, T. (2008). *Comprehension that works taking students beyond ordinary understanding to deep comprehesnion*. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education.

Braver, M. C., & Braver S.L. (1988). Statistical treatment of the Solomon four-group design: a meta-analytic approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 104 (1), 150-154. http://Psycnet.Apa.Org/Psycinfo/1988-34688-001

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2014). *Scientific research methods* (18th edition). Pegem Publishing.

Caldwell, J. S. (2008). *Comprehension assessment a classroom guide*. New York- London.

Can, B. (2018). Theory and models in teaching writing. Akyol, H. & Yıldız, M. (Eds.), In *Teaching writing from theory to practice* (30-51). Pegem A Publishing.

Cemiloğlu, M. (2001). *Teaching Turkish written expression and expression techniques in terms of linguistics*. Alfa Publishing.

Clark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. (1th Edition). USA.

Coe, M., Hanita, M., Nishioka, V., & Smiley, R. (2011). *An investigation of the impact of the 6+1 Trait Writing model on grade 5 student writing achievement (NCEE 2012–4010)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge Falmer.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* London.

Culham, R. (2003). *6+1 Traits of writing the complete guide*. Portland: NWREL.

Currie, J. (2001). Early childhood education programs. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives,15*(2), 213-238. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.15.2.213

Çağlar, D. (2004). Characteristics of gifted children. *1st Turkey Gifted Children Congress selected articles book*. M. R. Şirin, A. Kulaksızoğlu, A. E. Bilgili (Ed.). (pp. 111-125). Children's Foundation Publications.

Davaslıgil, U., & Leana, M. Z. (2004). Gifted education project. *1st Turkey Gifted Children Congress selected articles book*. M. R. Şirin, A.Kulaksızoğlu, A. E. Bilgili (Ed.). (pp. 85-100). Children's Foundation Publications.

Demirci, M. (2019). *Intertextual figures in 5th grade Turkish language course book and an investigation of the effects of intertextuality on reading comprehension* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Giresun University.

Dettra, N. (2010). *A program evaluation that explores the effectiveness of the six traits of writing on the lower school students at Merrit Island Christian School* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. UMI Dissertation Publishing.

Eltaş, Ö. (2021). Comparison of the Mann-Whitney U Test and Independent Sample T (Student's-t Independent Test) test in terms of power in small samples used in biostatistics studies. *Atatürk University Journal of Veterinary Sciences, 16*(1), 88-94. DOI: 10.17094/ataunivbd.876777

Erbasan, Ö., & Erbasan, Ü. (2020). Difficulties experienced by teachers in primary literacy teaching. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 8(1), 113-125. https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.628267

Ertem, İ. S., & Özen, M. (2014). The effect of reading texts from the screen on meaning construction. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies,* 24, 319-350. http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS2161

Fair, G. C. (2010). *Readıng ın a mıddle school social studies classroom: connections between intertextuality, reader stance, and instructional strategies* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kentucky University.

Fehrenbach, C. R. (1991). Gifted/average readers: do they use the same reading strategies? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35* (3), 125-127. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629103500303

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to desıgn and evaluate research in education.* New York.

Fox, J., & Guyer, M. (2014). Repetition priming in the lexical decision task: The role of affective dispositions and individual differences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 60-71.

Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2011). *Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis,* (2nd Edition). Routledge.

Görgüç, Ç. (2016). *The effect of analytical writing and evaluation on 6th grade students' writing attitudes and writing success.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dokuz Eylül University.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, L. F. (2001). *Reading for Academic Purposes: Guidelines for the ESL/EFL Teacher*. M.Celce-Murcia (Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Güleryüz, H. (2000). *Programmed first literacy teaching in Turkish.* Pegem A Publishing.

Güneş, F. (2004). *Literacy teaching and brain technology*. Ocak Publishing.

Hagen, A. M., Braasch, J. L.G., & Braten, I. (2014). Relationships between spontaneous note-taking,

self-reported strategies and comprehension when reading multiple texts in different task conditions. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 37 (1), 141-157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2012.01536.x

Hallesson, Y., & Visen, P. (2018). Intertextual content analysis: an approach for analysing text-related discussions with regard to movability in reading and how text content is handled. *International Journal of Research ve Method in Education*, 41 (2), 142-155, https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2016.1219981

Harmon, A. (2005). *An examination of students writing and the 6+1 Trait™ Writing Model* [Unpublished master's thesis]. UMI Dissertation Publishing.

Harris, P., & Trezise, J. (1997). Intertextuality and beginning reading ınstruction in the ınitial school years. *Journal of Australian Research in Early Childhood Education*, 1, 32-39.

Hartman, D. K. (1995). Eight readers reading: the ıntertextual links of proficient readers reading multiple passages. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30 (3), 520-61.

İlter, B. (2020). The use of bibliotherapy in specially talented people. In M. Leana Taşçılar, (Ed.), *Psychology of gifted children* (pp.291-322). Nobel Publishing.

Johnson, S. (2011). *Strugglıng mıddle school readers learnıng to make ıntertextual connectıons wıth texts* (Doctoral thesis). Nort Texas University.

Jordan, J. (2005). *Seeing the trees within the forest: a teacher's story when implementing the six plus one writing traits model in the victoria independent school district* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. The Faculty of the College of Education University of Houston.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2018). *SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques*, Asil Publishing.

Kaldırım, A. (2014). *The effect of 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model on the sixth grade students' writing expression skills* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dumlupınar University.

Karatay, H. (2011). *Process-based writing models: planned writing and evaluation, writing training,* M. Özbay (Ed.). Pegem A Publishing.

Karasar, N. (2016). *Scientific research method*. Nobel Academia Publishing.

Kılıç, M. (2020). *The effect of original content activities on the skills of critical reading of superior talented and intelligent* [Unpublished master's thesis].. Yildiz Technical University.

Kitano, M. K., & Lewis, R. B. (2007). Examining the relationships between reading achievement and tutoring duration and content for gifted culturally and linguistically diverse students from low-ıncome backgrounds. *Journal for The Education of The Gifted, 30* (3), 295-325. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320703000302.

Kitiş, E. (2019). *An examination on effectiveness of intertextual reading practices on secondary school students* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Dokuz Eylül University.

Koçak, O., & Göktaş, Y. (2020). The effects of three-dimensional cartoons on pre-school children's conceptual development in relation to spatial perception. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, http://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2020.1814213

Kozlow, M., & Bellamy, P. (2004). *Experimental study on the impact of the 6+1 trait writing model on student achievement in writing.* Portland.

Köksal, M. S. (2013). A Comprehensive research design for experimental studies in science education. *Elemanatry Education Online*, 12 (3), 628-634. https://doi.org/10.17051/IO.69635

Kul, S. (2013). *Interpretation of statistical results: What is the p-value and confidence interval? Pleura Bulletin*, 8 (1), 11-13. https://doi.org/10.5152/pb.2014.003.

MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 4(1), 84. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84

Manak, J.A. (2009). *Intertextual connectıons: the ımpact of ınteractıve read alouds on the wrıtıng of thırd graders durıng wrıtıng workshop* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Unıversity Of Florida.

Mcguire, D. W. (1995). *A Comparison of scores on the Kansas writting assessment for word-processed and hand-written papers of eleventh- graders* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Kansas State University.

McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (2014). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*, (7th ed.). New. York.

Mısırlı Taşdemir, Ö., & Özmen, E. R. (2018). Comparison of comprehension levels and comprehension strategies of students with gifted and average achievement levels. *National Education*, Special Issue, 269-290.

MEB, (2018). *Turkish lesson teaching program* (Primary and Secondary School Grades 1-8). T.R. Ministry of National Education, Ankara. Retrieved from http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=332 on 30/05/2020.

Meehan, J. B. (2000). *Intertextualıty ın the classroom: students constructing meaning across multiple texts during class discussion* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Texas Woman's University.

MOE, (2021). Science and art center directive. *Journal of Notifications*, Number: 2747.

Moore, M. (2005). Meeting The educational needs of young gifted readers in the regular classroom. *Gifted Child Today 28* (4), 40-65.

Myers, J. L., Well, A., & Lorch, R. F. (2013). *Research design and statistical analysis*. 3rd ed. Routledge.

Ogurlu, Ü. (2014). Reading interest, attitude and critical reading skills of gifted and talented students. *Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences Journal of Special Education*. 15(2), 29-43. https://doi.org/10.1501/Ozlegt_0000000197

Olson, A. (2004). *Teaching writing effectively: Using the six traits with process approach to writing* [Unpublished master's thesis]. UMI Dissertations Publishing (1423309).

Orhan-Karsak, H. G. (2014). *The effect of using individual and cooperative blog to enhance average and gifted students' writing performance* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Yıldız Teknik University.

Ökcü, M. (2019). *Investigation the reading attitudes and reading comprehension skills of the gifted and nongifted students in the fifth grade* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Biruni University.

Özdemir, B. (2014). *The effect of analytical writing and Evaluation method on pre-service Turkish teachers' writing skills and attitudes towards writing* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Gazi University.

Özdemir, O., & Baş, Ö. (2019). Reading education. H. Akyol & A. Şahin (Ed.), *Turkish teaching* in (pp. 29-54). Pegem A Publishing.

Özdemir, B., & Özbay, M. (2016). The effect of 6+1 analytical writing and evaluation model on the writing skills of Turkish teacher candidates. *Journal of Native Language Education*, 4(2), 261-276. https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.05703

Özkara, Y. (2007). *The Effect of 6+1 analytic writing and evaluatine model on enhancing 5th grade students' narrative writing skills* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Gazi University.

Paquette, K. R. (2002). *Cross-age tutoring writing program: ınvestigation of academic achievements and attitudes among elementary students* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. College Wilmington.

Reis, S. M., & Boeve, H. (2009). How academically gifted elementary, urban students respond to challenge in an enriched, differentiated reading program. *Journal for The Education of The Gifted, 33* (2), 203-240. http://doi.org/10.1177/016235320903300204.

Robison, A,. Shore, B. M., & Enersen, D. L. (2007*). Best practices in gifted education: an evidence-based guide*. Waco.

Sağlam, A., Baş, Ö., & Akyol, H. (2020). The effect of word drill technique on 3rd class gifted students' fluent reading levels. *Journal of History School (JOHS). 13 (XLVI),* 1605-1629. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/joh.42792.

Sak, U. (2011). *Trainings on the diagnosis of giftedness traits.* Maya Academia Publishing.

Sarikaya, İ., & Yılar, Ö. (2019). The ımpact of peer-assisted writing on 4th graders' writing achievement and performance: A pilot study. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education,* 7(4), 941-963. http://doi.org/10.16916/aded.589327

Sever, E. (2013). *Süreç temelli yazma modellerinin ilkokul dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatım ve yaratıcı yazma becerilerine etkisi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi.

Sever, E. (2013). *The effects of process-based writing models on the written expression and creative writing skills of fourth grade primary school students* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Bulent Ecevit University.

Sever, E., & Memiş, A. (2013). The effect of process-based writing models on fourth grade primary school students' spelling-punctuation skills and writing disposition. *Black Sea Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (9), 30-44.

Steineger, M. (1996). A way with words: ıntensive teacher training helps ensure staff and community buy-into a new method of writing assessment. *Northwest Education,* 2, (1), 20-24.

Süel, E. E. (2011). *Comparison of influence of phonological awareness levels on success of reading*

on gifted and standart intelligence students at first year of elementary school [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul University.

Traughber, B. K. (1998). *The effects of handwriting and word processing fonts an six-trait analytical scoring of direct writing assessment* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Kansas.

Türkben, T. (2019). Curriculum based on an effective reading skill teaching model: interactive reading model. *ZfWT*, 11 (1), 141-163.

Ünal, D. (2019). *Gifted students' attitudes towards reading habits and writing tendencies* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Sakarya University.

Van Tassel-Baska, J., Johnson, D. T., Hughes, C. E., & Boyce, L. N. (1996). A study of language arts curriculum effectiveness with gifted learners. *Journalfor The Education of The Gifted, 19,* 461-480.

Veneziano, L., & Hooper, J. (1997). A method for quantifying content validity of health-related questionnaires. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 21*(1), 67-70.

Yazar, Ö. (2004). *The significance and contrıbutıon of 6+1 traits of writing to the success of the studentes in writing courses in English language teaching* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University.

Yıldız, N. (2016). The effects of feedback and correction types on sixth grade students' writing skills. *Bartın University Faculty of Education Journal*, 5 (2), 312-327. https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.v5i2.5000189426

Yurdugül, H. (2005). *Using content validity indexes for content validity in scale development studies*. XIV. National Educational Sciences Congress, 1, 771-774.