Rubric for Evaluating Text Structure-Oriented Reading Tasks: A Study of Validity and Reliability

Zeynep Çetinkaya Edizer [i]
Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa

Melda Oryaşın [ii]
Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa

Şükran Dilidüzgün [iii]
Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa

Duygu Ak Başoğul [iv]
Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa

Abstract

In this study, it was aimed to develop a rubric for evaluation of text-based reading tasks and to provide proofs of validity and reliability. In the study, data were collected from the participants who studied at the undergraduate and graduate level in the field of Turkish education. In the development of the rubric, a literature review was conducted, and dimensions (text structure activities, task-based activities) and sub-dimensions (small-scale structure, large-scale structure and superstructure; general tasks and text-oriented reading tasks) were determined. A draft rubric was created by determining 5-point Likert-type score levels for these criteria. The draft rubric was rearranged by taking the opinions of 4 text structure language teaching, 4 task-based language teaching and 2 assessment-evaluation experts. The designed rubric was applied to the participants by using three text types (story, poem and article). Reading activities collected from the study group were scored by 6 raters within the framework of the rubric prepared. Validity (Lawshe, exploratory factor analysis) and reliability (consensus reliability analysis, Cronbach Alpha, correlation coefficient) analyses were performed on the collected data. As a result of Lawshe analysis, the content validity rate was between 0.80 - 1.00, and the content validity index was found to be 0.98. The KMO value for three types was found to be 0.898, and it was determined that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.919. The correlation coefficient varied between 0.501 and 0.836 and it was determined that there was a significant, positive and strong correlation at the level of 0.01 among the items. It was concluded that the developed rubric is a valid and reliable measurement tool.

Keywords: Text Structure, Reading Tasks, Rubric, Validity, Reliability

----

[i] **Zeynep Çetinkaya Edizer,** Assoc. Prof., Turkish Education, Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa, ORCID: 0000-0001-5449-5107

[ii] **Melda Oryaşın,** Research Assist. Dr., Turkish Education, Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa, ORCID: 0000-0001-9584-545X

[iii] **Şükran Dilidüzgün,** Prof. Dr., Turkish Education, Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa, ORCID: 0000-0001-6627-8337

[iv] **Duygu Ak Başoğul,** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Turkish Education, Istanbul University - Cerrahpaşa, ORCID: 0000-0003-4065-2030

Correspondence: duygu.akbasogul@iuc.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Reading, one of the building blocks of understanding, is a combination of physiological and cognitive features. This combination is a high-level thinking process in which the meaning is structured, planned, controlled and evaluated, and it is structurally defined as a cognitive task/action related to understanding the text (Moorman & Ashwin, 1994; cited in Uzun, 2009). This process includes "understanding and interpreting the written texts and using the meaning in the texts in accordance with the text type, purpose and situation" (Ertem, 2014, p. 52). In order to gain operation skills in this process, it is necessary to develop reading through education. In the context of Balcı's (2016, p. 16) "Understanding the text by analyzing and establishing meaning from the text depends on the development and use of certain skills." words, teaching understanding takes place by the coordinated operation of many factors such as program, textbook, teacher, equipment, etc. There are activities to answer questions about the text in the Turkish textbooks prepared in line with the learning outcomes in the Turkish Language Teaching Program (MEB, 2019a). In this case, the emphasis is mostly on the evaluation of understanding. Pressley (1997; cited in Güneş, 2009) states that students' understanding skills are generally evaluated in schools, and that some students cannot progress in understanding in this way. In the studies conducted, it was found that teachers could not effectively operate the text processing process in Turkish teaching (Coşkun & Alkan, 2010), they asked questions to the students most after the text was read (Baydık, 2011), and they generally asked questions that required basic mental processes (Akyol et al., 2013).), they did not use time effectively in terms of teaching understanding (Ateş & Akyol, 2013); and they did not constitute a systematic strategy teaching process (Ateş & Yıldırım, 2014). In this context, it can be stated that studies that relate text, strategy and task, which are variables of learning-oriented reading from a metacognitive perspective, are not sufficiently included in Turkish teaching (Dilidüzgün et al., 2019).

In the exams aimed at evaluating countries in the field of reading skills within the scope of the Program for International Students Assessment (PISA), it is seen that the majority of Turkish students who are at the second level or below in the reading scale have a lower average score in open-ended and short-answer questions that require high-level cognitive processes than in optional questions (Bozkurt, 2016). In a study, it is concluded that the activities supporting the use of thinking strategy in Turkish textbooks are 1/257, that is, 0.004%. (Lüle Mert, 2014). According to the results in Turkish in the 8th Grade (MEB, 2019b) Report of the Monitoring and Evaluation of Academic Skills (ABIDE) conducted in Turkey, it is seen that 1.6% of the students are below basic, 23.5% are basic, 41% are intermediate, 26.8% of them are upper-intermediate and only 7.2% of them are advanced.

Reading-comprehension is to be able to use a text in accordance with its meaning and function by analyzing the structure of the text as a result of a cognitive process; that is, it is an action in the nature of a duty. In this context, reading activities need to be scrutinized from two aspects: *content and structure.* Content is related to which of the text structure criteria of the activity is based on (Genç, 2019). The structure is the organization of the activity as a task in a way that will lead the student to a cognitive process. In this context, in the continuation of the study, *text structure and reading activities*, *task phenomenon and reading activities*, *text structure* and *reading tasks* will be emphasized.

Text Structure and Reading Activities

Since language teaching requires language use (Kocaman, 1996), in Turkish teaching, texts that are the product of language use should have the best examples that comply with the text creation criteria (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981) and reflect the characteristics specific to their genres. The aim of teaching Turkish is for students to analyze and compose texts created in different contexts and for different purposes. Every text has a communicative purpose, and the text structure shaped by this communicative purpose determines the type of text. Uzun Subaşı (2006) points to the existence of "linguistic" relations between consecutive utterances in the small-scale structure of the text, "logical" relations that provide rhetorical structuring in the large-scale structure of the text and that affect the perception of the utterances in a semantic integrity, and "discursive" relations in the metatextual structure of the text that regulate its compatibility with intended uses. Reference, substitution, ellipsis,

conjunctions, parallelism, tense and aspect, functional sentence perspective, intonation are small-scale structural elements related to grammatical cohesion; and repetition and collocational patterning are small-scale structural elements related to lexical cohesion. Any analysis that will be made by considering the whole text such as plot, narrator, point of view, function, title, subject, keywords, main idea, content scheme, summary, style, concluding sentence is related to the large-scale structure (Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). The interpretation of the text and anything that can be said of genre-specific concerns the superstructure. These criteria are performed with different content in each text type. Reaching the meaning of the text requires analyzing the linguistic pattern that appears in the surface structure. As every text is original, the activities prepared for them should also be original (Dilidüzgün, 2011); however, it is seen that the reading activities in Turkish textbooks are not structured specific to the genre in parallel with the curriculum, and similar reading-comprehension activities are carried out for each genre (Dilidüzgün, 2013; Karagöz & Dilidüzgün, 2016).

The main purpose of reading education is to raise individuals who are aware of the characteristics of the text in the reading process and who can read effectively and critically (Çetinkaya Edizer et al., 2018). Individuals come together with different types of text in line with their reading purposes, and they determine the reading strategies to be applied by the structural features of the text, which differs according to the text types. In this context, teachers' knowledge of text types will contribute to supporting students' development on this subject (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). Kucan and Beck, in their study with narrative and explanatory texts, observed that students read genres in different ways (Cited by Grabe, 2002). While students tried to reach important information by making assumptions, inferences, predictions and comments in the narrative texts, they tried to understand the information given in detail in the explanatory texts. For this reason, reading tasks should be presented to students in reading education that will enable them to operate cognitive processes in accordance with the text structure criteria that change according to the purposes of the genres. This process is defined by Bamberger (1990, p. 13) as "supporting and encouraging the ability of reading in a way that preserves the ability to read in different genres and for different purposes throughout one's life". This means always dealing with the aspects of the language in the text dimension, producing texts suitable for students' communication status, and understanding the produced texts in language lessons, (Huber, 2008). Shokouhi and Jamali (2013) also state that reading from a metacognitive perspective is in question when texts, tasks, strategies and student characteristics are considered. Therefore, it can be said that the readers adjust themselves according to the text, text type and text genre (Hudson, 2015).

Activities prepared for each type of text must meet at least one text structure criterion. When the activities in Turkish textbooks are examined in this context, it is seen that the text structure specific to the text type is not taken into account, the meaning pattern of the text cannot be questioned because there are no reading order activities, and a monotype activity approach is adopted without considering the genre (Çetinkaya Edizer et al., 2018). Reading activities are considered as the repetition of the language outcomes, and the language elements in the surface structure of the texts are not used to make sense of the texts in the preparation of the activities (Dilidüzgün, 2010). As a result of this, it is seen that the reading education criteria and reading learning outcomes cannot be realized. The text structure criteria targeted in the reading activities in Turkish textbooks are generally limited to the first levels of PISA (Genç, 2019). In Turkish teaching, reading activities are insufficient to meet the learning outcomes based on the text structure (Dilidüzgün, 2010), and it is seen that the rate of activities in the context of text-oriented is 10.6% at the 6th grade level, 9.5% at the 7th grade level and 18.4% at the 8th grade level (Dilidüzgün, 2009).

Task Phenomenon and Reading Activities

The content of reading activities developed according to the text structure is not sufficient for the development of reading skills. What is more, there is also a need for activities that require students to analyze these structures themselves and involve them in the cognitive process. Metacognitive competencies are activated when readers reflect on reading activities, watch and organize reading activities to achieve a goal (OECD, 2010). In the Turkish Language Curriculum (MEB, 2019a, p. 8) in which the constructivist approach is adopted, this requirement is stated as "The structure and hierarchy

of the learning outcomes from the first grade to the eighth grade are arranged in a way that will contribute to the development of students' basic language skills as well as their high-level cognitive skills.". Teachers in constructivist classrooms act as a guide by creating situations or contexts that provide and facilitate the communication function between students through texts and activities (Demircan, 1990). Students, on the other hand, are the people who make the communication. They create their own and other students' interpretation processes interactively to control the language use process and ensure accuracy. While the teacher assumes a less dominant role in this process, the students take on a lot of responsibilities in realizing their own learning (Larsen Freeman, 2001). This is only possible by assigning certain "tasks" to students.

Ellis (2003) emphasizes that for a study to be a task, it requires a work plan, meaning orientation, actual language use, language skills, a specific outcome and cognitive process; in other words, a real linguistic input, a meaningful goal, a cognitive or psycho-motor process and a product at the end are required (Günay, 2007). According to Larsen Freeman and Anderson (2014), the principles of task-based learning are teacher's taking an input-providing role at the beginning of the lesson, students' involvement in the cognitive process for the purpose of making sense, observing students' level of achievement of the task, emphasizing the meaning dimension of the language and realizing the use of language by making use of basic language skills are stimulating outputs for communication, preparation for the real world, speaking and writing. At the last stage, students analyze the language they use for the task and make applications based on the necessary improvements and developments (Harmer, 2007). During the task, students read, listen, take notes, speak to a crowd and so on. (Yaylı & Yavuz, 2008). According to Willis (2004), three basic principles for task design are educationally space-taking, reaching a decision/solution, and creating general or text-oriented tasks. General tasks are listing, jumbles and sorting, matching, comparing, problem solving, sharing personal experiences, projects, and creative tasks. The cognitive processes and possible products created by general tasks are given in Table 1:

Table 1. Types of Tasks and Cognitive Processes (Willis, 1996; as cited in Dilidüzgün, 2009)

Task type	Cognitive process	Possible product
Listing	Brainstorming and finding information	Completed list, A draft mind map
Jumbles and sorting	Jumbles, organizing according to personal values, placing in groups, classification	List of information arranged according to certain criteria
Matching	Listening-matching, Reading-matching	Paired items
Comparing	Games based on finding similarities/differences	Identifying similarities/differences between subjects/pictures/texts
Problem solving	Analyzing, reasoning, decision making	Reaching a conclusion
Sharing personal experiences	Narrating, describing, exploring and expressing thoughts and attitudes	Interaction in a social context
Projects and creative tasks	Combination of processes such as brainstorming, finding information, jumbles, etc.	Project or extracurricular studies

Text-oriented tasks define why the text should be understood. These tasks allow students to identify large-scale propositions of texts and arrive at their general meaning, rather than focusing on local coherence relations between certain words or propositions selected from the text. The same goal is adopted in the Turkish Curriculum (2005, p. 158); "Understanding means understanding the whole of the text, not just reaching the meaning of parts (words, sentences, paragraphs). The parts must be considered in the whole. Therefore, in the learning process, the focus should be on the whole, instead of focusing on the parts that are separated from each other." Willis (1996) lists these tasks as prediction tasks, jumble tasks, restoration tasks, jigsaw/ split information tasks, comparison tasks and memory challenge tasks, and gives examples of possible tasks (see Table 2):

Table 2. Text-Oriented Task Types and Possible Tasks (Willis, 1996; as cited in Dilidüzgün, 2009)

Types of Text-Oriented Tasks	Possible tasks
Prediction tasks	Prediction from the title or first parts of the text, selected chapters, pictures or sound/silent movies
Jumble tasks	Unjumbling jumbled text parts Ordering jumbled summary sentences Sorting jumbled pictures by text
Restoration tasks	Completing the text by identifying the words, phrases and sentences removed/added in the text
Jigsaw/split information tasks	Reading/listening different parts of the text by different groups and then combining them to reach the whole
Comparison tasks	Comparing two different narrations of the same event Comparing the diagram/picture with the written text
Memory challenge tasks	After looking at the text for a short time, listing and telling what is remembered or asking questions

It is difficult to say that reading activities on texts in Turkish teaching have the nature of a task, since they are generally not sufficient to operate cognitive processes in structure. It is observed that most of the reading activities do not provide input that will allow students to enter the cognitive process by examining the text structure, students are evaluated on the result rather than the process by expressing reading learning outcomes as an activity, output is requested without giving sufficient input, and skill development is not achieved sufficiently (Dilidüzgün et al., 2016).

The characteristics that are expected to be seen in the individual at the end of the education-teaching process are called educational goals/learning outcomes (Demirel, 2012), and the goals assume a strategic role in terms of providing a start to the other elements of an education program. Bloom's Revised Taxonomy includes the dimensions of remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating (Anderson et al., 2014; Bümen, 2006). It is a requirement of the constructivist approach, which has been based in the Turkish education system since 2005, that reading activities are not only dependent on the text structure, but also as a task in which the student can operate these cognitive processes. In summary, text, task, cognitive dimensions and learning outcomes are concepts that need to be operated together in language teaching today.

It is observed that the principles and teaching processes of Turkish Lesson Curriculum and task-based language teaching overlap (Dilidüzgün, 2009). Students' building new knowledge on the one they have already acquired, developing students' cognitive skills such as understanding, ordering, relating, classification, prediction, analysis-synthesis, interpretation and evaluation, use of natural context, integration of skills, making meaning, motivation, group work, individual learning styles, reaching the product, and the teacher's role as a guide are common principles. Joint learning and teaching processes are considered as activating knowledge in students' mental schemas prior to engagement, operating cognitive processes such as elimination, selection, ordering, classification, matching, comparison, reasoning, evaluation, verification within the duty cycle, applying knowledge, reviewing and eliminating its deficiencies, making applications such as speaking, writing, and visual presentations as a report.

Text Structure and Reading Tasks

In Turkish textbooks, there are more definition and interpretation questions for understanding the content; there are almost no questions for analysis, explanation, inference and evaluation (Amanvermez İncirkuş & Özçetin, 2021; Deniz et al., 2019). Sallabaş and Yılmaz (2020) state that 32% of the sub-text questions are suitable for remembering, 35% for understanding, 11% for analysis, 18% for evaluation, and 4% for creation. In some textbooks, it is seen that the application and analysis dimension is almost never included (Çevik & Güneş, 2017). Reading activities on the text should also have the ability to analyze the text structure in order to reach the information in the texts, integrate and interpret the information, and evaluate the in-text and extra-text information together.

The tasks defined in literacy are also classified under three main headings as reaching information-remembering information, gathering information-interpreting and reflecting-evaluating information in parallel with the dimensions specified in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy (OECD, 2019). These tasks work in relation to the text structure:

- In *accessing information*, students identify and recognize basic elements such as character, place/time and setting, and then searches for the same words or concepts that may be synonymous/ antonym or closely related in the text. This action is collocational patterning studied under the lexical cohesion of the text.

- In *integration*, the consistency in the text is questioned. Coherence relations between sentences, connections between multiple texts are investigated. A title is selected or found for the text, or conversations within the text, the end of the text is predicted. It is studied on the function of subject change determinants such as "first, second" or "at the beginning, later, later, before" and so on in describing the order of instructions or events in the context of content structure or discourse determinants in the context of the fiction of the text. In the context of grammatical cohesion, tasks are organized that reveal the relationships between connectors such as causal, opposition, jumbles and so on and parts of a text. Studies can be done that introduce a graphic or table as a discontinuous text, determine its purpose, or interpret continuous and discontinuous texts together to extract the meaning. In the small-scale structure, student monitor the references, repetitions, relationships between propositions and create a hierarchy among them; so they can choose the most general, inclusive main idea from the given options. Such a task shows whether students can distinguish key ideas and details or recognize the main idea in a sentence or title. Students make inferences with the relations they have established in the context of consistency, make comments, and perform tasks that determine the evidence that their inferences may be correct. Student may also be asked to explain or interpret the author's stylistic use and identify the author's purpose and attitude (OECD, 2019).

- *Reflecting and evaluating* involves using intertextual knowledge, ideas or attitudes to relate information in the text to one's own conceptual and experiential frameworks. Reader evaluates the author's use of a particular genre and textuality to achieve a particular purpose.

In line with all this theoretical framework, the aim of the research is to develop a "Text Structure-Oriented Reading Tasks Evaluation Rubric" as a valid and reliable measurement tool in which reading activities can be evaluated as content (text structure) and structure (task) in order to create and evaluate reading activities adopted by contemporary approaches in reading education. The designed rubric was applied using three text types (narrative, informative and poetry) which are based on the Turkish Lesson Curriculum (MEB, 2019a) and frequently found in Turkish textbooks. The rubric is the first study in the field to measure the applicability of the constructivist approach in Turkish teaching.

METHOD

Research Model

Rubric is a scoring tool that lists the criteria of a work and evaluates these criteria in terms of quality. Since rubrics are powerful tools for teaching and assessment, they appeal to both students and teachers (Goodrich Andrade, 1997). In this study, an evaluation rubric was developed for text structure-oriented reading tasks in order to guide the teaching and evaluation of reading.

In the research, first of all, literature was scanned, were determined, criteria were created by determining the dimensions and sub-dimensions of the rubric, the score levels for the criteria were determined, a draft rubric was created, expert opinions were taken, the structure was restructured,

reading activities were collected from the study group, scoring was carried out within the framework of the rubric prepared by the experts, and validity and reliability analyzes were carried out on the collected data.

Study Group

In the development process of the rubric, expert opinions were used to ensure content validity, and rater evaluations were used for reliability. In the pilot application, data were collected from the participants who received undergraduate and graduate education in the field of Turkish Education. These people constitute the study group of the research. In the determination of the study group, criterion sampling, one of the purposeful sampling methods, was taken as the basis. While creating the sample in criterion sampling, the purpose of the study, the people, events, objects, or situations related to the problem it focuses on are taken into consideration (Büyüköztürk, 2012). Accordingly, the criterion of having worked in the fields of text structure and/or task-based language teaching was prioritized in the selection of experts and raters. In the pilot implementation process, volunteering and professional (Turkish teacher candidate, Turkish teacher and academician) and educational (undergraduate, graduate, doctoral) diversification were given importance. For this reason, it was tried to reach volunteer students studying at undergraduate and graduate levels in different universities, and volunteer Turkish teachers and academicians working in different cities. The information of the study group is as follows:

- The opinions of 10 experts were consulted, including 4 in the task-based language teaching model, 4 in the text structure and 2 in the measurement-evaluation fields.

- Of the 6 raters, 4 are academicians and 2 are Turkish teachers.

- In the pilot application, participant information differs according to the text type. For this reason, the table given about participant information (see Table 3) has been prepared as genre-oriented:

Table 3. Participant Information Regarding the Pilot Implementation

Variables		Story/f	Poetry/f	Article/f
Gender	Female	106	86	81
	Male	59	46	44
Profession	Student (Turkish Teacher Candidate)	88	59	58
	Turkish Teacher	63	62	55
	Academician	14	11	12
Education	Undergraduate	115	85	83
	Master's	34	34	28
	Doctorate	16	13	14

In Table 3, the participant information obtained from the participant information forms is based on the text type by considering the gender, profession, and education variables. presented. These variables differ according to the genres. The preferences of the participants were effective in this. The majority of the participants prioritized preparing activities for the story (f=165) genre. Participant returns decreased in activity practices for poetry (f=132) and article (f=125) genres. Female participants predominate in all genres. In terms of professional and educational aspects, it is seen that the participants at the undergraduate level, namely Turkish teacher candidates, predominate.

Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool of the research is the "Text Structure-Oriented Reading Tasks Evaluation Rubric". This rubric basically consists of two dimensions; *text structure activities* and *task-based activities.* Text structure activities have three sub-dimensions as *small-scale structure* (7 items), *large-scale structure* (12 items), and *superstructure* (3 items). Task-based activities, on the other hand,

consist of *general tasks* (7 items) and *text-oriented reading tasks* (6 items). The prepared rubric contains 35 items in total.

An important feature of rubrics is to create score levels (Moskal, 2000, p. 3). The rubric prepared in this study also states, "0: Very insufficient. 1: Insufficient. 2: Moderately sufficient. 3: Enough. 4: Very enough." is scored.

For the rubric, first of all, the literature was scanned, the dimensions and sub-dimensions of the rubric were determined, and the items were prepared. The items were presented to expert opinions and restructured in line with the corrections and feedback given by the experts, and the rubric was given its final form. Since data will be collected from human participants during the development of the rubric, approval was obtained from the Istanbul University-Cerrahpaşa, Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee (Document number: 74555795-050.01.04- Document date: 12.11.2019). Afterwards study group was presented with the short story "Last Birds (Son Kuşlar)" by Sait Faik Abasıyanık (2012), the informative text named "Mass Communication Tools (Yığın İletişim Araçları)" by Önder Şenyapılı (1981) and the poem "I'm Listening to Istanbul (İstanbul'u Dinliyorum)" by Orhan Veli (1953), and they were asked to prepare reading activities. The texts, together with the participant information form, were sent to the participants via e-mail. For some participants who are studying at the undergraduate level, they were applied face-to-face in the classroom environment for three weeks, respectively, as stories, poems, and articles. These activities, prepared by the participants, were scored within the framework of rubrics by two experts in each text type. The collected data were analyzed with exploratory factor analysis based on principal component analysis, Lawshe analysis, consensus reliability analysis, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient and intraclass correlation coefficient.

RESULTS

In this section, the findings related to the validity and reliability obtained from the research are presented.

Findings Related to Validity

Validity "is the degree to which what is intended to be measured can be measured; is that what is wanted to be measured can be measured without mixing it with other things." (Karasar, 2012, p. 151). Validity is one of the basic qualities that a good measurement tool should have, and it most commonly relies on three types of evidence: content, structure, and criterion (Moskal & Leydens, 2000). In order to determine the suitability, meaningfulness and usefulness of the rubric developed within the scope of the study, the criteria of content validity and construct validity were applied.

Content validity is about determining the suitability of the items in a measurement tool and reflecting the area to be measured, and expert opinions are taken to reach the result (Büyüköztürk et al., 2013; Karasar, 2012). In this context, the rubric in draft form includes the criteria of text structure (small-scale structure, large-scale structure, and superstructure) and the tasks foreseen by the task-based learning approach (general and text-oriented tasks). The items listed in the rubric were created by scanning the literature. 22 items on text structure were written based on Dilidüzgün (2018), Genç (2019), Dilidüzgün and Genç (2019); 13 items created in the context of task-based learning approach were written based on Ellis (2003) and Willis (2004). In this context, a draft rubric consisting of 2 basic and 5 sub-dimensions, and 35 items was prepared. Dimensions was designed as a 5-point likert "Very sufficient=4; enough=3; moderately sufficient=2; insufficient=1; very insufficient=0". Prepared rubric was sent to 4 experts in the field of task-based teaching model, 4 experts in the field of text structure and 2 experts in the field of measurement-evaluation with an "expert opinion form". The draft rubric was restructured in line with the specified corrections and feedback. Field experts suggested lexical and semantic rearrangement of some items. In this direction, some items in the rubric were changed and clarity was ensured. In the writing of the items related to task-based learning, all field experts suggested a partnership. Considering this suggestion, regulations were made. Assessment

experts, on the other hand, found the rubric appropriate. Opinions of 10 experts were received on whether the criteria for the prepared rubric were appropriate for the purpose and whether each criterion was related to the sub-dimensions determined. In this direction, the content validity rate and the content validity index developed by Lawshe (1975) were calculated. This technique, also known as the Lawshe technique, is calculated using the formula CVR$=\frac{N_G}{N/2}-1$. N_G used here is the experts who said that the item is necessary, and N is the number of experts who gave their opinion. According to this technique, the opinion of a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 40 experts is required.

Table 4. Content Validity Rates (CVR) and Content Validity Index (CVI) of the Rubric

Item	Expert Opinion (Appropriate)	Expert Opinion (Needs to be adjusted)	Expert Opinion (Not appropriate)	CVR
1	10	-	-	1
2	9	1	-	0.80
3	10	-	-	1
4	9	1	-	0.80
5	9	-	1	0.80
6	10	-	-	1
7	10	-	-	1
8	10	-	-	1
9	10	-	-	1
10	10	-	-	1
11	10	-	-	_
12	9	1	-	0.80
13	9	1	-	0.80
14	9	1	-	0.80
15	9	-	1	0.80
16	9	1	-	0.80
17	9	1	-	0.80
18	9	1	-	0.80
19	10	-	-	1
20	10	-	-	1
21	10	-	-	1
22	9	-	1	0.80
23	9	1	-	0.80
24	9	1	-	0.80
25	9	1	-	0.80
26	9	1	-	0.80
27	9	1	-	0.80
28	9	1	-	0.80
29	9	1	-	0.80
30	10	-	-	1
31	9	1	-	0.80
32	10	-	-	1
33	9	1	-	0.80
34	10	-	-	1
35	10	-	-	1
		Total Number of Experts 10		
		Content Validity Index 0.98		

According to the CVR calculation converted into a table by Veneziano and Hooper (1997), the minimum critical point of CVR was determined as 0.62, since the opinions of 10 experts were taken in the project, and the content validity rate was seen to range from 0.80 to 1.00. Accordingly, it was concluded that the criteria determined reflect the purpose. The content validity index was found to be 0.98.

Construct validity reveals how accurately the scores obtained from the test can measure the concept (structure) to be measured (Büyüköztürk, 2002). One of the most commonly used methods for construct validity is factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis is used to reveal the factor structure of the scale. In the study, KMO values and Bartlett Test results were examined for each type of text (story, poem, article), as well as for the entire data set.

Table 5. KMO and Bartlett Test Results

Criteria	KMO	Bartlett (sig.)
Story	.780	.000
Poetry	.732	.000
Article	.717	.000
All	**.898**	**.000**

For story, poem, article types and the entire data set, firstly descriptive statistical results have been looked at. All questions were included in the factor analysis since no variable with a variance of 0 was found in other criteria except for poetry. In poetry type, since the standard deviation of an item (i7) was found to be 0, this variable was not included in the factor analysis in order to use exploratory factor analysis.

As seen in Table 5, the KMO value for the story was found to be 0.780, and it was concluded that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The KMO value for poetry was found to be 0.662 (weak). The KMO value takes a value between 0 and 1, and the closer it is to 1, the more suitable the sample is for factor analysis. Therefore, in order to increase the coefficient, important variables explaining the total variance of the data were determined. The total variance values were examined, and it was concluded that there were 13 items that could represent better instead of 35 items. In order to find out which variable these 13 factors correspond to, the component matrix was examined, and it was concluded that the items i1, i8, i9, i10, i12, i13, i14, i15, i17, i18, i24, i28, i33 would better represent the data. Thereupon, factor analysis was carried out once again with 13 determined variables. As a result of the size reduction and analysis, the KMO coefficient increased to 0.732. The KMO value for the article was found to be 0.717, and it was concluded that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The KMO value for the entire data set was found to be 0.898, and it was determined that the data were suitable for factor analysis.

After the content and construct validity processes were completed, the rubric's compliance with the face validity was checked once again, and the validity process was completed.

Findings Related to Reliability

Reliability is about how accurately a measurement tool measures the feature it wants to measure (Büyüköztürk et al., 2013). Reliability, which is one of the first conditions of scientific studies, helps to obtain the same results by following the same processes (Karasar, 2012). In order to determine the reliability of the rubric developed within the scope of the study, the level of significance was calculated by using the consensus-based reliability analysis to calculate the reliability of the items based on expert opinion, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for internal consistency, and the Spearman correlation coefficient using test splitting.

The reliability formula [Reliability=Consensus/(Agreement + Disagreement)] proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) was used to calculate the reliability based on the suitability of the criteria in the rubric, and it was observed that the reliability of the determined criteria ranged from 0.90 to 1.00.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficients calculated to determine the internal consistency of the rubric are presented in Table 6:

Table 6. Cronbach Alpha Coefficients Related to the Rubric

Criteria	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient
Story	.848
Poetry	.696
Article	.878
All	**.919**

According to Table 6, it is seen that the Cronbach Alpha coefficients obtained on the basis of all criteria of the rubric developed within the scope of the study vary between 0.696 and 0.919. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated over 35 items in the story, article, and the entire data set, and over 13 items in the poem, taking into account the items that were previously removed as a result of the validity study. While the threshold value accepted in the literature is 0.70, when the number of items is low, 0.60 and above are considered quite reliable (Durmuş et al., 2011). In line with these results, it can be said that the rubric has internal consistency and is reliable.

Spearman correlation coefficients for the story ranged between 0.537 and 0.753, between 0.501 and 0.899 for the article, and between 0.501 and 0.836 for the entire data set; and it was determined that there was a significant correlation at the level of 0.01 between the items. The correlation coefficient varies between -1 and +1. In this context, the correlation coefficient is positive correlation between 0 and 0.50, and it can be said that there is a strong positive correlation between the items with coefficients greater than 0.70 and 0.70. For poetry, it was seen that no items that had a significant correlation with each other were found.

CONCLUSION

In the process of making sense, reading activities should be created and evaluated in terms of content (text structure) and structure (task) within the framework of contemporary approaches. Therefore, in this study, it is aimed to develop a rubric for evaluating text structure-oriented reading tasks.

In the development of the rubric, a literature review was conducted in the context of text structure and task-based language teaching, and two main dimensions were determined: text structure activities and task-based activities. Text structure activities from these main dimensions are small-scale structure, large-scale structure, and superstructure; task-based activities' main dimension consisted of general tasks and text-oriented reading tasks sub-dimensions. Then, as "0: Very insufficient. 1: Insufficient. 2: Moderately sufficient. 3: Enough. 4: Very enough." in the form of a 5-point Likert-type score levels were determined. The created form was presented to the opinions of 4 text structure, 4 task-based language teaching and 2 assessment-evaluation experts.

Content validity rate and content validity index were calculated based on the opinions of 10 experts on whether the criteria were fit for purpose and whether each criterion was related to the determined sub-dimensions. Accordingly, since the content validity rate ranged from 0.80 to 1.00, it was concluded that the criteria reflected the purpose. The content validity index is 0.98. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to describe the factor structure of the rubric in the context of construct validity. Accordingly, in the study, KMO values and Bartlett Test results were examined for each of the story, poem, and article types and for the entire data set. The KMO values were 0.780 for the story, 0.732 for the poem, 0.717 for the article, and 0.898 for the entire data set. Therefore, it has been concluded that the rubric is a valid measurement tool in terms of content and structure. In addition, it was confirmed that the rubric had face validity in line with the opinions of the experts.

To determine the reliability of the rubric, reliability analysis based on the consensus of experts, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient and Spearman correlation coefficient were used. It was observed that the reliability of the criteria determined by the consensus-based reliability analysis ranged from 0.90 to 1.00. On the basis of all criteria, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients vary between 0.696 and 0.919. In line with these results, it can be said that the rubric has internal consistency and is a reliable tool. When looking at the relationship between the items for reliability, it was determined that the correlation coefficients for the story ranged from 0.537 to 0.753, for the article 0.501 to 0.899, and for the entire data set between 0.501 and 0.836. It was also determined that there was a significant, positive, and strong correlation at the level of 0.01 between the items. It was concluded that the developed rubric is a valid and reliable measurement tool.

The Assessment Rubric for Text Structure-Oriented Reading Tasks has two dimensions as *text structure activities* and *task-based activities*. The text structure activities consist of *small-scale structure* (7 items), *large-scale structure* (12 items) and *superstructure* (3 items); and task-based activities consist of *general tasks* (7 items) and *text-oriented reading tasks* (6 items). The prepared rubric (see Appendix-1) consists of 35 items in total and is a valid and reliable measurement tool that can be used in the creation and evaluation of text-based reading activities.

Conflicts of Interest: No potential conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

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

CRediT Author Statement: All authors contributed equally to each part of the article.

Ethical Statement: The ethical approval was obtained from the Istanbul University-Cerrahpaşa, Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee (Document number: 74555795-050.01.04- Document date: 12.11.2019).

REFERENCES

Abasıyanık, S. F. (2012). *Son Kuşlar*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Amanvermez İncirkuş, F. & Özçetin, K. (2021) Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Metni Anlama Sorularının Eleştirel Düşünme Becerilerine Göre İncelenmesi. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 22*, 290-311.

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R, Raths, J. & Wittrock, M. C. (2014). *Öğrenme Öğretim ve Değerlendirme ile İlgili Bir Sınıflama: Bloom'un Eğitim Hedefleri ile İlgili Sınıflamasının Güncelleştirilmiş Biçimi* (Trans. D. A. Özçelik) (2nd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Akyol, H., Yıldırım, K., Ateş, S. & Çetinkaya, Ç. (2013). Anlamaya Yönelik Nasıl Sorular Soruyoruz?. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9*(1), 41-56.

Ateş, S. & Akyol, H. (2013). Türkçe Dersi Öğretme–Öğrenme Sürecinin Anlama Öğretimi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 11*(3), 268-300.

Ateş, S. & Yıldırım, K. (2014). Öğretmenlerin Sınıf İçi Uygulamaları: Strateji Öğretimi ve Anlama. *İlköğretim Online, 13*(1), 235-257.

Balcı, A. (2016). *Okuma ve Anlama Eğitimi.* Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Bamberger, R. (1990). *Okuma Alışkanlığını Geliştirme* (Trans. B. Çapar). Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Baydık, B. (2011). Okuma Güçlüğü Olan Öğrencilerin Üstbilişsel Okuma Stratejilerini Kullanımı ve Öğretmenlerinin Okuduğunu Anlama Öğretim Uygulamalarının İncelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 36*(162), 301-319.

Beaugrande, R. de & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Textlinguistics.* Longman: London.

Bozkurt, B. Ü. (2016). Türkiye'de Okuma Eğitiminin Karnesi: PISA Ölçeğinden Çıkarımlar. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 16*(4), 1673-1686.

Bümen, N. (2006). Üç Büyük İldeki Özel Okullarda Program Geliştirme Servislerinin Etkililiği ve Karşılaşılan Problemler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 6*(3), 615-667.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). Faktör Analizi: Temel Kavramlar ve Ölçek Geliştirmede Kullanımı. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 32*, 470-483.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). Örnekleme Yöntemleri. http://cv.ankara.edu.tr/duzenleme/kisisel/dosyalar/21082015162828.pdf

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E. Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (14th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Coşkun, E. & Alkan, M. (2010). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Türkçe Dersi Metin İşleme Sürecine İlişkin Bilgi Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *TÜBAR, 27*, 161-184.

Çetinkaya Edizer, Z., Dilidüzgün, Ş., Ak Başoğul, D., Karagöz, M. & Yücelşen, N. (2018). Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Okuma Etkinliklerinde Kullanılan Üstbilişsel Okuma Stratejileri ile Okuma Yöntem-Tekniklerinin Metin Türüne Uygunluk Bağlamında Değerlendirilmesi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 10*(29), 479-511.

Çevik, A. & Güneş, F. (2017). Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Etkinliklerin İncelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi, 5*(2), 272-286.

Demircan, Ö. (1990). *Yabancı Dil Öğretim Yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Ekin Eğitim-Yayıncılık.

Demirel, Ö. (2012). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme* (18th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Deniz, K., Tarakçı, R. & Karagöl, E. (2019). Okuma Kazanımları Açısından Ortaokul Türkçe Ders Kitapları. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 7(3), 688-708.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2009). Yapılandırmacı Yaklaşımla Hazırlanan İlköğretim Türkçe Öğretim Programı ve Ders Kitaplarında Metin Odaklı Görevlerin Yeri. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17*, 275-291.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2010). Türkçe Derslerinde Metin Etkinliklerinin Okuma-Anlama Kazanımlarını Gerçekleştirme Yeterliği – Bir Öykü Örneği. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 13*, 13-30.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2011). Türkçe Öğretiminde Yazın Eğitimi Bağlamında Karşılaştırmalı Metin Türü Çalışmaları. Sever, S. (Eds.) *3. Ulusal Çocuk ve Gençlik Edebiyatı Sempozyumu (Bildiriler ve Atölye Çalışmaları)*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Çocuk ve Gençlik Edebiyatı Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2013). Ortaokul Türkçe Derslerinde Oku(ma)dan Özet Yaz(ma)ya,. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 46*(2), 47-68.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2018). *Metindilbilim ve Türkçe Öğretimi*. İstanbul: Morpa Kültür Yayınları.

Dilidüzgün, Ş., Çetinkaya Edizer, Z., Ak Başoğul, D., Oryaşın, M. & Yücelşen, N. (2019). Metin Türü Bağlamında Okuma Yöntem-Teknikleriyle Üstbilişsel Okuma Stratejilerini İlişkilendirme Çalışması. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 8(3), 1796-1816.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. & Genç, Ş. (2019). Ortaokul Türkçe Dersi Okuma Etkinliklerinin Okuma Eğitimi Kapsamında Metindilbilimsel Bağlamda Değerlendirilmesi. *International Journal of Language Academy, 7*(2), 107-126.

Dilidüzgün, Ş., Karagöz, M. & Genç, Ş. (2016). Türkçe Ders Kitaplarında Yazınsal Metinleri Okuma-Anlama Etkinliklerinin Öğrenciler Üzerindeki Şiddet Etkisi. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken, 3*, 115-137.

Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, E. S. & Çinko, M. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ertem, İ. S. (2014). Okuduğunu Anlama ve Teknoloji. Ertem, İ. S. (Ed.). *Okuma Yazma Eğitimi ve Teknoloji*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Genç, Ş. (2019). *Ortaokul Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Okuma Etkinliklerinin Okuma Eğitimi Yeterliği Bağlamında Metindilbilimsel Analizi* (Master's thesis). İstanbul Üniversitesi-Cerrahpaşa, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Goodrich Andrade, H. (1997). Understanding rubrics. *Educational leadership, 54*(4) 14-17.

Grabe, W. (2002). Narrative and expository, macro-genres. John, A. M. (Ed.) *Genre in The Classroom: Multiple perspectives*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Günay, D. (2007). *The exploration of Tasks in the 4th Grade ELT Coursebook Used in State Primary Schools in Turkey* (Master's thesis). İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Güneş, F. (2009). *Hızlı Okuma ve Anlamı Yapılandırma*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). England: Pearson Longman.

Huber, E. (2008). *Dilbilime Giriş*. İstanbul: Multilingual.

Hudson, T. (2015). *Teaching Second Language Reading* (10th ed.). China: Oxford University Press.

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi* (24th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Karagöz, M. & Dilidüzgün, S. (2016). Alımlama Boyutlarıyla Metin Türüne Özgü Okumalar – Öğretime İlişkin Eleştiri ve Öneriler. Dilidüzgün, S. (Ed.). *Kuram ve Uygulama Bağlamında Türkçe Öğretimi* (pp. 30-39). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Kocaman, A. (1996). Dilbilim Söylemi. Kocaman, A., Ruhi, Ş., Zeyrek, D., Doltaş, D., Bengi- Öner, I. & Doğan, G. (Eds.). *Söylem Üzerine* (pp. 1-16). Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi.

Larsen Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar (3rd ed.). Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Larsen Freeman, D. & Anderson, M. (2014). *Dil Öğretiminde Teknik ve İlkeler* (3rd ed.) (Trans. M. Calp). Ağrı: Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personel Psychology, 28*, 563-565.

Lüle Mert, E. (2014). 8. Sınıf Türkçe Ders ve Çalışma Kitaplarının Üst Düzey Bilişsel Becerileri Geliştirme Yeterliliği. İşeri, K., Çetinkaya, G., Çelik, T., Demirgüneş, S., Daşöz, T. & Gençer, Y. (Eds.). *Türkçe Eğitiminde Kuramsal ve Uygulamalı Çalışmalar* (pp. 145-158). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as discourse, perspectives for language teaching*. USA: Routledge.

MEB (2005). *İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzu (1-5. Sınıflar)*. Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basımevi.

MEB (2019a). *Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar).* Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basımevi.

MEB (2019b). *Akademik Becerilerin İzlenmesi ve Değerlendirilmesi 8. Sınıf Raporu*. Ankara: MEB Yayınları.

https://nevsehirodm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2019_07/02153549_24142454_ABYDE_8_2018_ Raporu.pdf

Miles, M, B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded Sourcebook.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moskal, B. M. (2000). Scoring rubric: what, when and how? *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*(3), 1-5.

Moskal, B., & Leydens, J. A. (2000). Scoring rubric development: Validity and reliability. *Practical Assessment, Reseach & Evaluation, 7(10),* 71-81.

OECD (2010). *PISA 2009 results: What students know and can do.* http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/61/48852548.pdf

OECD (2019). *How does PISA define and measure reading literacy?* https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-for-development/8%20-%20How%20PISA-D%20measures%20reading%20literacy.pdf

Sallabaş, M. E. & Yılmaz, G. (2020). Türkçe Ders Kitabı'nda Bulunan Metin Altı Sorularının Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi'ne Göre İncelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi, 8*(2), 586-596.

Shokouhi, H. & Jamali, R. (2013). *Metacognitive reading strategies and the text type*. Shahid Beheshti University: Deakin University's Research Repository.

Şenyapılı, Ö. (1981). *Toplum ve İletişim*. Ankara: Turhan Yayınları.

Uzun Subaşı, L. (2006). Öğrencilerin Yazılı Anlatım Sürecindeki Metinleştirme Sorunları. *II. Ulusal Çocuk ve Gençlik Edebiyatı Sempozyumu Bildirileri* (pp. 693-701). Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi, Ankara.

Uzun, G. L. (2009). Yaratıcı Bir Süreç Olarak Okuma, *Dil Dergisi*, *143*, 007-019.

Van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension.* Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc.

Veli, O. (1953). *Bütün Şiirleri*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.

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

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for task-based learning*. Longman. Essex.

Willis, J. R. (2004). Perspectives on task-based instruction: undertaking our practices, acknowledging different practitioners. Leaver, B. L. & Willis, J. R. (Eds.). *Task-based instruction in foreign language education*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Yaylı, D. & Yavuz, M. A. (2008). Göreve Dayalı Öğrenme Yönteminin Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimine Uygulanmasına İlişkin Sorunlar. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2*(24), 58-68.

APPENDIX-1: Rubric for Evaluating Text Structure-Oriented Reading Tasks

1. TEXT STRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	0	1	2	3	4
Small-Scale Structure					
1.1.1. It supports distinguishing the functions of affixes.					
1.1.2. It supports the contribution of word types (noun, verb, forename, pronoun, adverb, preposition, conjunction, exclamation) to meaning.					
1.1.3. It supports the evaluation of the contribution of transition and connection expressions to the meaning of the text.					
1.1.4. It supports identifying the semantic disorders in the sentence.					
1.1.5. It supports associating words based on context.					
1.1.6. It supports the meaning relations in the word within the integrity of the text.					
1.1.7. It supports determining the contribution of idioms/proverbs/quotes to the text.					
1.2. Large-Scale Structure					
1.2.1. It supports questioning the purpose of writing the texts.					
1.2.2. It supports questioning the title and subject relationship.					
1.2.3. It supports determining the subject of the text.					
1.2.4. It supports identifying keywords in the text.					
1.2.5. It supports identifying the main idea/message of the text.					
1.2.6. It supports dividing the text into meaningful units.					
1.2.7. It supports interpreting the content of the text.					
1.2.8. It supports determining the order made within the semantic integrity of the text.					
1.2.9. It supports understanding the ways of emphasizing important points in the text.					
1.2.10. It supports making inferences about what they read.					
1.2.11. It supports determining the contribution of figures of speech to the meaning of the text.					
1.2.12. It supports making a summary of the text.					
1.3. Superstructure					
1.3.1. It supports the use of reading strategies suitable for the type of text.					
1.3.2. It supports distinguishing different text type features.					
1.3.3. It supports the evaluation of the text in terms of genre-specific features.					
TASK BASED ACTIVITIES					
2.1. General Tasks					
2.1.1. Listing tasks					
2.1.2. Jumble and classification tasks					
2.1.3. Matching tasks					
2.1.4. Comparing and contradiction tasks					
2.1.5. Problem solving tasks					
2.1.6. Sharing experiences tasks					
2.1.7. Creative tasks					
2.2. Text Oriented Reading Tasks					
2.2.1. Guessing tasks					
2.2.2. Jumble tasks					
2.2.3. Reconstruction tasks					
2.2.4. Jigsaw/split information tasks					
2.2.5. Comparison tasks					
2.2.6. Memory tasks					

0: Very insufficient

1: Insufficient

2: Moderately sufficient

3: Sufficient

4: Very sufficient