EVALUATION OF A TURKISH TEXTBOOK IN TERMS OF STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

(Research Article)

Seyhan SOĞANCI *

*Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Education, Samsun, Turkey

Abstract

The research aims to evaluate the characteristics of reading texts in a 4th-grade Turkish textbook in terms of students with specific learning disabilities. In line with this general purpose, answers to the following questions will be sought: 1. What is the text type distribution by themes? 2. What are the readability values, average sentence length, word length, and text length of the texts? 3. Is the main idea/ ideas included in the texts? 4. Are the texts adequately organized? 5. Are the pictures of the texts compatible with the texts? 6. What is the compatibility of the titles with the texts? 7. What are the cognitive strategies used in the processing of texts? 8. What are the types and distribution of end-of-text questions? As a result of research, the book's text genres are equally distributed. It was seen that most of the texts were far above the 4th-grade level. In some of the texts, it was determined that the pictures and titles were partially appropriate or not for the texts. In some of the texts, it was determined that the images and titles needed to be more appropriate or ideal for the reader. The end-of-text questions in most of the texts consisted of literal questions that did not require evaluation and inference skills.

Keywords: Turkish textbook; readability; text genre; learning disabilities

*Seyhan Soğancı. ORCID ID.: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7133-6033
    E-mail: seyhan.soganci@omu.edu.tr

1. Introduction

The schooling rate of students with special needs is relatively high in Turkey. Looking at the Ministry of National Education (MEB) statistics for the academic year 2021-2022, the number of students attending primary school and receiving education within the scope of integration/inclusion is 129,637. According to the Special Education Services Regulation, integration/inclusion means that students with special needs study full-time in general education classes or part-time in special education classes in general education schools with their peers provided that they also receive support education services. In integrative education, students follow the education program of the general education school. In addition, an Individualized Education Program is prepared according to the needs of the students, based on the program they follow, and support education is provided by making appropriate environmental arrangements. Although adaptations are made for students with special needs in the integration environment, they are responsible for the general education program (MEB, 2018). According to the Regulation on Textbooks and Educational Tools of the Ministry of National Education (2015), textbooks are created according to this program. The primary teaching material that students with special needs in an integrating environment will use, like their peers in their classrooms, are textbooks. It is stated that the most frequently and primarily used teaching material by teachers is textbooks (Özbay, 2003). For this reason, it is significant for all students, especially for students with special needs in an integration environment, that textbooks are prepared in a way that facilitates students' learning and motivates them to learn. Turkish textbooks, which aim to gain the skills to understand and use Turkish, which form the basis of success in all courses, are essential in this respect.

Students with specific learning difficulties (SLD) focused on in this study are expressed as one of the most common disability groups in the integration environment (EARGED, 2010). Considering the problems of students with SLD in understanding and using spoken and written language, it is necessary to create Turkish books, especially considering their learning characteristics and difficulties. The National Center for Learning Disabilities has also stated that the most common learning difficulties are in reading (NCLD, 2014). Studies in the literature indicate that many factors are at the root of the reading problems of students with SLD. These reading problems are in word decoding (Baydık, 2002), reading fluency (Baydık et al., 2012; Ceylan & Baydık, 2018; Gökçe-Sarıpınar & Erden, 2010; Ergül, 2012; Yılmaz, & Baydık, 2017) and reading comprehension (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012; Baydık et al., 2014; Dermitzaki et al., 2008). It was determined that students with SLD have more difficulty answering interpretive questions than literal ones (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012). Finding the text's main idea is one of the problems experienced by students with learning difficulties in understanding what they read (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012). Students with SLD show insufficient metacognitive skills such as planning for reading (Dermitzaki et al., 2008), monitoring comprehension (Cain & Oakhill, 2006; Dermitzaki et al., 2008), and evaluating their performance (Dermitzaki et al., 2008). This is another feature that distinguishes them from successful readers.

Apart from the student characteristics, the success of reading comprehension also affects the text characteristics, such as the text's readability, structure, and organization. Sentence and

word lengths, syntactic structure, number of unknown words, etc., determine the readability of the texts. The text should be readable for the level of the student. Clearly, writing the text in a way that does not require too much inference also reduces the need for prior information, making it easier to understand. In particular, including connectors such as prepositions and conjunctions makes the text more understandable. Thus, students with SLD with insufficient prior knowledge have less difficulty making inferences (Bursuck & Damer, 2007). The text type is another variable that has an effect on the student's comprehension. It has been observed that the reading comprehension difficulties of students with SLD are higher in informative texts than in narrative texts (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012; Sáenz & Fuchs, 2002). The third text feature that affects the success of reading comprehension is organization. Giving side thoughts and details around one or two main ideas makes the text easier to understand (Bursuck & Damer, 2007). Students with SLD have problems organizing information (Kudret Bahap & Baydık, 2016), finding the main idea (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012), and determining the main idea in written expression (Kudret Bahap & Baydık, 2016). Therefore, the texts in the books must be appropriate in these respects.

Considering the effects of text features on learning, as well as the learning characteristics of students with SLD, Turkish textbooks should be prepared to facilitate understanding both in terms of the texts they contain and other comprehension and learning activities. However, when we look at the findings of the studies in which Turkish textbooks are examined, it is seen that there are features in the books that make it difficult for students with SLD to understand what they read and gain comprehension skills. For example, Demir and Çeçen (2013) examined the readability levels of Turkish textbooks in 2010-2011. The examined textbooks are in the 1-5 grades. The study's readability calculations were made according to Ateşman's formula. When the study findings are examined, it is seen that the readability levels and average sentence lengths of the texts at all grade levels are not homogeneous. For example, the average word length in grade 1 is higher than in grades 2, 3, or even 5. Okur and Arı (2013) examined the readability of reading texts in 6th, 7th, and 8th-grade Turkish textbooks according to Ateşman's formula. As a result of the research showed that there was no balance in the grades according to the difficulty level and that the difficulty levels did not go from the lower grades to the upper grades by getting harder. Another striking point, which is related to the variability of the difficulty levels of the texts in the Turkish textbooks, is that most of the texts are not ideal for the level of the students. In one of the studies showing this situation, Bozlak (2018) examined the readability levels of the narrative texts in a Turkish textbook in 2016-2017 and the MEB 5th grade Turkish textbook of the 2017-2018 academic year with the Uzun-Çetinkaya formula. Bozlak (2018) found that only one narrative text in the book of 2016 was at the level of the students. In the book of 2017, he concluded that four texts were at the independent reading level, and the others were at the educational level. Okur and Arı (2013) concluded that not all reading texts in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade Turkish textbooks were appropriate for the grade level. Another striking finding about the texts in Turkish textbooks is that informative texts are more difficult to read than narrative texts. Çiftçi et all (2007) stated that the average sentence length of the informative texts in all three books in the sixth-grade Turkish textbooks they examined was higher than the narrative texts. In the books examined in this study, it was observed that there was a clustering towards "difficult" in informative texts

and "easy" in narrative texts. It is seen that the sentence lengths of the informative texts in the Turkish textbooks (1-5 grades) examined by Demir and Çeçen (2013) are mostly higher than those of the narrative texts. Another result reached in studies examining Turkish textbooks is that the distribution of text types in the books is unequal. However, although the distribution of text types varies according to themes in the Ministry of National Education Turkish Curriculum (MEB, 2018), it is stated that this distribution should be equal throughout the book. Aytan and Güneş (2017) stated that the 5th-grade Turkish textbook they examined included mostly narrative texts. Baş (2003) examined two different Turkish textbooks. In one of the books, 31 of the 36 texts are narrative, and 5 are informative. In another book, 3 of the 35 texts are informative, and 32 are narrative. Baydık and Bayraktar (2013) found that informative texts were given less space in the third-grade Turkish textbook of the 2012-2013 academic year. In addition to the problems mentioned above, it has been observed that some narrative texts in Turkish textbooks do not have the main idea in studies (Baydık & Bayraktar, 2013). The types of questions given at the end of the text are also a variable that affects comprehension and learning. However, in the studies conducted, problems were also encountered in these questions. Aslan (2006) examined the questions at the beginning and end of the text in the Turkish textbooks (1-5 grades) published by the MEB (Ministry of National Education). He found that there are many foreign words in the questions (although they have Turkish equivalents), and there are also punctuation and spelling mistakes as well as expression disorders in the questions. Another important feature that needs to be addressed regarding the texts is their relevance to the children and their expression. Çalışkan (2016), in his study examining the texts in the Primary Education Turkish Curriculum prepared by the MEB and the 5th-grade textbook published in 2009, concluded that most of the texts were written in a childlike language, far from the principle of child-appropriateness. It is also among the results of the same study that words of foreign origin are used in some of the texts, there are linguistic inconsistencies and incomprehensibility, and there are inconsistencies between paragraphs and sentences. Based on the findings, the researcher stated that teaching Turkish with these texts would make creating language sensitivity and reading habits difficult.

Although the studies were carried out with books published in different years and belonging to different publishers, the evaluations show that the readability of the texts in Turkish textbooks is not homogeneously distributed at the grade levels. In addition, it has been shown that text readability does not change systematically according to grade levels, average sentence lengths are too high in some texts, some texts are too long, and text types are not evenly distributed in the books. Apart from these features, which are thought to prevent reading comprehension and learning, it is thought that the absence of the main idea in some texts, the fact that some texts are not related to the pictures, and the text titles are not related to the content, which will make the learning of students with learning difficulties even more difficult. In this context, it was necessary to determine whether similar problems in Turkish textbooks exist in newly prepared and widely used books. The problem of the research is to examine the reading texts in Turkish textbooks, the preparatory and end-of-text questions related to these texts, and other activities related to the texts in terms of language, expression, and learning-teaching features. In line with this problem, the general purpose of the research is to evaluate the characteristics of reading texts in a 4th-grade Turkish textbook in terms of

students with SLD. In line with this general purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1.   What is the text type distribution by themes?

2.   What are the readability values, average sentence length, word length, and text length of the texts?

3.   Is the main idea/ ideas included in the texts?

4.   Are the texts adequately organized?

5.   Are the pictures of the texts compatible with the texts?

6.   What is the compatibility of the titles with the texts?

7.   What are the cognitive strategies used in the processing of texts?

8.   What are the types and distribution of end-of-text questions?

2. Method

2.1. Research model

In the study, a qualitative research method was used, and document analysis was carried out. One of the commonly used methods in qualitative research is document analysis. The document review method is defined as obtaining, reviewing, questioning, and analyzing various documents that comprise the research data set. The analytical process in document review includes finding, selecting, evaluating (making sense of), and synthesizing the data in the documents (Özkan, 2019).

2.2. Research material

A total of 31 texts, including stories, informative, and narrative information types in a 4th grade Turkish textbook published by MEB for the 2018-2019 academic year, was examined in the study. This book was also used as a textbook in the 2022-2023 academic year. There are eight themes in this book. Each theme includes four reading texts, one evaluation text, and one listening/monitoring text. Listening/ monitoring texts and evaluation texts were excluded from the study. Of the remaining texts, 7 are poetry, 15 are informative, and 10 are narrative texts. Within the scope of the study, 15 informative and 8 narrative texts were included. One cartoon and one playbook (Hacivat and Karagöz) were excluded from the study. In the study, besides the texts, the activities given for processing the texts and the end-of-text questions were also evaluated.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

The data collection process in the study was carried out through document analysis. The descriptive analysis method was used to analyze the data. The readability levels of the texts were calculated using the New Readability Formula (Bezirci & Yılmaz, 2010). This formula is

implemented with a computer-based program. The program also calculates the number of sentences, the number of words, and the number of syllables in the texts. In this study, the number of sentences, words, and syllables in the text was calculated by this program. In order to calculate the average sentence length of the texts, the total number of words was divided by the total number of sentences. To calculate the average word length, the total number of syllables in the text was divided by the total number of words. The program also gives readability levels according to Ateşman's formula. The readability ranges of Ateşman are given as Very Easy (100 -90), Easy (89-70), Moderate (69-50), Difficult (49-30), Very Difficult (29-1) (Bezirci & Yılmaz, 2010). According to the New Readability Formula, readability levels are given directly as grade levels.

The type of the texts in the book, the main idea in the texts, the text organization, the picture-text compatibility, the title-text compatibility, the types of strategies used in the processing of the text and the end-of-text questions were analyzed by both the author and an academician in the field of special education and divided into categories related to the variables. The categories created by the researchers regarding the variables were combined and compared. As a result of the comparison, the categories related to the variables were finalized. In order to ensure the reliability of the research, the inter-coder reliability was calculated. For this purpose, the last categories of research variables were reanalyzed by an academician who has experience in qualitative research and is an expert in reading difficulties. Reliability calculations were performed by comparing the encoders' pairings with each other. Based on the comparison results, the numbers of consensus and disagreement were determined. Inter-coder reliability was calculated using the formula of Miles and Huberman (1994) [Consensus/(consensus + disagreement) * 100]. The inter-coder reliability coefficient was found to be 93%. In cases where the agreement obtained in this formula is 90% or more, it is considered that a desired level of reliability is achieved.

3. Results

The order of the research questions gives the research findings. The answers to the first and second questions of the research are shown in Table 1. Considering Ateşman's readability formula as in Table 1, 7 of the 15 informative texts are easy, 6 are medium difficulty, and 2 are difficult. One of the 8 narrative texts is very easy, 5 are easy, and 2 are medium difficulty. Average sentence lengths are between 6.30 - 13.16 for informative texts and 4.46 - 11.65 for narrative texts. The average sentence lengths of the texts vary significantly in both text types. There is no remarkable finding for average word lengths. While text lengths vary between 79 - 436 words in informative texts, this length varies between 137 - 460 in narrative texts. For both genres, some texts are long, and some are short.

Looking at the levels obtained with the New Readability Formula, two texts are at the 4th-5th grade level, two texts are at the 5th-6th grade level, four texts are at the 6th-7th grade level, one text is at the 7th-8th grade level, two texts are at the 8th -9th grade level, four texts are at the 9th -10th grade level, one text is at the 10th -11th grade level and one text is at the 13th -14th grade level. (In Table 1, each text is numbered. In other tables, these numbers are used instead of texts' name).

Table 1. Distribution of text types by themes, readability values, average sentence and word lengths, text length

Theme	Text No	Text Title	Text Type	Readability		Average Sentence Length	Average Word Length	Text Length
				Ateşman	NRF			
Reading Culture	1	Asım'ın Nesli Kitap Dostudur	Informative	73.39 (E)	7.99	8	2.62	232
	2	Konuşan Kitap	Informative	78.95(E)	5.48	6.30*	2.57	410
	3	Şermin 1914	Informative	70.92(E)	8.12	11.43	2.46	263
National Struggle and Atatürk	4	Çok Kitap Okurdu	Informative	42.92(D)	13.18	13.16**	3.02	79*
	5	Efelerin Efesi, Hey Gidinin Efesi	Informative	78.08(E)	6.49	8.10	2.54	300
	6	Vecihi Hürkuş	Informative	72.85(E)	6.28	7.22	2.75	383
Moralities	7	Güneşi Bile Tamir Eden Adam	Narrative	70.93(E)	6.88	7.08	2.75	326
	8	Kaşağı	Narrative	89.03(E)	4.3	4.46*	2.54	438
Science and Technology	9	İcat Nasıl yapılır?	Informative	75.53(E)	8.08	8.89	2.49	436*
	10	Robotların Efendisi: Cezeri	Informative	59.33(M)	9.97	11.47	2.75	241
Nature and the Universe	11	Kaybolan Cennet	Informative	61.42(M)	9.16	10.14	2.79	345
	12	Dağdaki Kaynak	Narrative	91.39(VE)	4.34	4.54	2.40	350
	13	Evini Arayan Ardıç Tohumu	Informative	74.17(E)	5.97	7.25	2.60	370
National Culture	14	Hep Büyük Efsanesi	Narrative	67.05(M)	9.92	11.65**	2.53	303
	15	Bir Fincan Kahve	Informative	67.06(M)	9.33	11.88	2.57	309
	16	Oğuz Kaan Destanı	Narrative	78.25(E)	6.44	8.62	2.48	388
Health and Sports	17	Gizemli Canlılar	Informative	48.45(D)	10.46	10.29	3.07	175
	18	İlk Güreşçimiz Koca Yusuf ve Başarısının Sırrı	Informative	69.12(M)	8.84	10.26	2.68	154
	19	Şifa Niyetine	Narrative	86.7(E)	4.93	5.26	2.54	137*
	20	Mezgit Mehmet	Narrative	69.13(M)	6.65	7.30	2.81	460*
Art	21	Nedir Bu Sanat?	Informative	68.93(M)	8.13	9.55	2.61	325
	22	El Sanatlarını Yaşatalım	Informative	61.53(M)	8.96	10.21	2.76	419
	23	Aras'ın Özdemir Asaf'la Tanışması	Narrative	79.88(E)	5.59	6.75	2.55	304

NRF: New Readability Formula. Ateşman's readability ranges: Very Easy (100 -90), Easy (89-70), Moderate (69-50), Difficult (49-30), Very Difficult (29-1).

* The shortest, ** The longest

The answers to the research's third, fourth, fifth, and sixth questions are given in Table 2. According to Table 2, it is seen that there are main idea/ideas except for 3 of the 23 texts examined. However, it was observed that the main ideas were presented implicitly. When the texts are examined in terms of expression and organization, it has been determined that 11

texts are appropriate in expression and organization, 10 are partially appropriate, and 2 are not. It was observed that the pictures given with the texts were appropriate for 17 texts, partially appropriate for 5 texts, and not appropriate for 1 text. Text titles are appropriate for 16 texts, partially appropriate for 5 texts, and not appropriate for 2 texts.

Table 2. Including the main idea in the texts, appropriateness of the title and pictures, organization of the text

Theme	Text No	Main Idea	Expression and Organization	Text Picture	Text Title
Reading Culture	1	+	PA	A	NA
	2	+	PA	PA	NA
	3	-	NA	PA	PA
National Struggle and Atatürk	4	+	A	A	A
	5	-	NA	PA	PA
	6	+	A	A	A
Moralities	7	+	PA	A	A
	8	+	A	A	A
Science and Technology	9	+	A	A	A
	10	+	A	A	A
Nature and the Universe	11	+	PA	PA	A
	12	-	PA	A	A
	13	+	A	PA	PA
National Culture	14	+	A	A	A
	15	+	PA	A	A
	16	+	PA	A	A
Health and Sports	17	+	PA	NA	PA
	18	+	A	A	A
	19	+	A	A	A
	20	+	P A	A	A
Art	21	+	A	A	A
	22	+	PA	A	PA
	23	+	A	A	A

A: Appropriate, PA: Partially Appropriate, NA: Not Apropriate

The data on which cognitive strategies are used in the processing of the texts discussed in the study are given in Table 3. In Table 3, it is seen that the strategies of activating prior knowledge (n=18), clarifying (n=18), answering questions (n=18), determining the main idea (n=16), and determining the subject of the text (n=16) are mostly used by the students. However, using images (n=7), generating questions (n=4), making comparisons (n=4), establishing cause-effect relationships (n=4), and making predictions about the subject of the text using titles and visuals (n=4). 3) suggesting a solution to the problem (n=3), making an analogy (n=3), exemplifying (n=2), specifying the type of text (n=2), and determining the text structure (n=2) were used less in the text. There is no strategy use in the book about texts that are not included in the Table 3. Therefore, there are 18 texts in the table.

Table 3. Cognitive strategies used in the processing of texts

Text No (N=18) Strategies	1	2	4	5	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	17	18	19	21	22	23	Total
Activating Prior Knowledge	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	18
Clarifying	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	18
Answering Questions	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	18
Generating Questions	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	4
Specifying The Type Of Text	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Determining The Text Structure	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Determining The Main İdea	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	16
Determining The Subject Of The Text	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	16
Finding A New Title For Text	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	4
Using İmages	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	7
Making Comparisons	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	4
Narrating The Text	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Drawing Attention To İmportant Places	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	5
Doing Research On The Subject	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	3
Predictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	3
Predict The Rest Of The Text	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Establishing Cause-Effect Relationships	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	4
Suggesting Solutions To The Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	3
Exemplifying	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	2
Underlining İmportant Points İn The Text	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	2
Analogy	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	3

The number of questions at the end of the informative texts varies between 3-7. The number of literal questions changed between 3-5, and the number of inferential questions was between

1-5 for the informative texts. Ten of the 14 informative texts do not include inferential questions. The number of questions at the end of narrative texts varies between 3-4. There is no activity in the book that uses comprehension questions about texts that are not included in the Table 4. Therefore, there are 18 texts in the table.

Table 4 shows the features related to the comprehension questions at the end of the texts examined in the study. When the findings were examined, it was determined that no inferential questions were included in ten texts. The number of inferential questions were between 1-3, and the number of literal questions were between 2-5. On the other hand, the evaluative questions took place only twice in one text. Creative comprehension questions were not used in any text.

Table 4. Types and distribution of end-of-text questions

Text No (N=18)	Question Type				Total
	Literal	Inferential	Evaluative	Creative	
1	2	3	2	-	7
2	2	1	-	-	3
4	3	1	-	-	4
5	3	1	-	-	4
7	2	2	-	-	4
9	3	-	-	-	3
10	4	-	-	-	4
11	3	1	-	-	4
12	3	-	-	-	3
13	4	-	-	-	4
14	5	-	-	-	5
15	2	2	-	-	4
17	5	-	-	-	5
18	4	-	-	-	4
19	4	-	-	-	4
21	3	1	-	-	4
22	4	-	-	-	4
23	4	-	-	-	4

4. Discussion

The findings from this research show some of the features of a 4th-grade Turkish textbook recommended to be used as a course book by the MEB. The primary aim of this research is to discuss the textbook's features and the book's texts for students with SLD. Of the 23 texts in the book examined in the study, 15 are informative, and 8 are narrative. Considering the difficulties of both students with SLD (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012) and students without learning disabilities (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012; McNamara et al., 2004; Temizyürek, 2008) in understanding informative texts, focusing on these types of texts is vital for students. It is thought that it will help them learn text structures and understand these texts. However, it has been determined that the failure of students with SLD to determine the text structure

negatively affects their reading comprehension success (Cain & Oakhill, 2006). Comparing them with different structures is very important for them to learn them.

Findings regarding the readability levels of the texts differed according to Ateşman's formula and the New Readability Formula. Most of the texts are easy when Ateşman's formula is used. All values obtained with the New Readability Formula are well above the grade level. As Özbek and Ergül (2018) stated, it is considered appropriate to use very different formulas and to take into account different variables (unknown word number, different word count, etc.) in readability calculations. Readability is essential for reading success. Durukan (2014), in his study using the texts in the 7th-grade Turkish textbook, found that the readability levels of the texts affect reading speed and reading comprehension success. For this reason, it is thought that it would be appropriate to use formulas that handle different variables, such as unknown words (for example, Sönmez's formula (2003)). Although a clear interpretation of readability could not be made in the study, it was observed that the text lengths differed significantly for both text types. For both genres, some texts are long, and some are short. In addition, it was determined that the average sentence lengths for both text types were very long (e.g., 13.6). It is challenging to remember and understand long sentences and long texts, especially for those with memory problems, such as students with SLD. Güneş (2000) stated that sentences longer than eight words for the primary school level are difficult to understand, and short and simple sentences will be more understandable.

Except for 3 of the 23 texts examined, it was observed that there were main idea/ideas. However, semantic integrity and organization problems in abbreviated texts will make finding the main idea/ideas difficult. However, one of the biggest problems experienced by students with SLD in reading comprehension is finding the main idea/ideas (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012; Pesa & Somers, 2007). Finding main ideas is one of the high-level comprehension skills (Rubin, 2000), and primary school students are expected to acquire this skill primarily (Boulware-Gooden et al., 2007).

When the texts are examined in terms of expression and organization, it has been determined that 11 texts are appropriate in expression and order, 10 are partially appropriate, and 2 are not. Expression and organization problems were mostly observed in abbreviated texts. This situation will make it very difficult for students with SLD who have problems organizing information.

It was observed that the pictures given with the texts were appropriate for 17 texts, partially appropriate for 5 texts, and not appropriate for 1 text. Visuals increase the reader's interaction with the text and provide an entertaining context (Sever, 2012). In addition, making predictions about the text by looking at images or pictures is a cognitive strategy used by students and facilitates understanding (Baydık, 2011). For this reason, it is expected that the images or pictures provided with the texts are related to the content.

Text titles are appropriate for 16 texts, partially appropriate for 5 texts, and not appropriate for 2 texts. It is stated that guessing about the text by looking at the title is a cognitive strategy students use (Baydık, 2011). In the analyzed Turkish textbook, activities were given for students to use this strategy. However, to use this strategy, the title must be compatible with the content of the text.

In the processing of the texts discussed in the study, it is seen that the students mostly use the strategies of activating prior knowledge, clarifying, answering questions, determining the main idea, and determining the subject of the text. On the other hand, the strategies of using images, generating questions, making comparisons, establishing cause-effect relationships, making predictions about the subject of the text using titles and images, suggesting a solution to the problem, making analogies, exemplifying, determining the type of text and determining the text structure are included in less text. Considering the problems of students with SLD in using the mentioned cognitive strategies (Baydık, 2011), it would be appropriate for activities related to texts to include the use of these strategies.

Considering the types of comprehension questions at the end of the texts examined in the study, it was determined that most of the texts did not include evaluative questions, and in some texts, the number of literal questions was higher. Aslan and Polat (2008) stated that the primary purpose of the Turkish teaching course is to provide training in thinking, asking questions, questioning, and criticizing while improving reading comprehension and oral expression skills. The researchers stated that the texts, activities, and questions about the text in Turkish textbooks have an essential place in the development of critical thinking skills in students. In addition, it has been determined that students with SLD have more difficulty answering questions requiring interpretation than simple literal questions (Baydık & Seçkin, 2012). For these reasons, it is thought that it would be appropriate to distribute the question types equally and to include questions that require interpretation and evaluation as well as literal questions.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, the book's text genres are equally distributed. It was seen that most of the texts were far above the 4th-grade level. In some of the texts, it was determined that the pictures and titles were partially appropriate or not appropriate for the text. In some of the texts, it was determined that the images and titles were partially appropriate or not ideal for the reader. As a result of the study, it was seen that the end-of-text questions in most of the texts consisted of literal questions that did not require evaluation and inference skills. Moreover, the texts are challenging for all students. Due to the lack of inferential questions, students with SLD can have few opportunities to meet these questions. Some of the pictures and titles are partially appropriate or not appropriate. This situation makes it difficult for students with SLD to understand and think about the text.

Acknowledgements

References

Aslan, C. (2006). Türkçe ders kitaplarında Türkçe olmayan sözcüklerin kullanımı üzerine bir inceleme. *Dil Dergisi*, 133, 7-19.

Aslan, C., & Polat, D. (2008). *Content analysis on primary education Turkish course books from the point of acquiring critical thinking skills*. (pp. 147-160). Issues on education and research, vol 1, ed. G. T. Papanikos. Athen: Athens Institute for Education and Research.

Aytan, T. & Güneş, G. (2017). 2017 Türkçe öğretim programına göre hazırlanan 5. Sınıf Türkçe ders kitabındaki metinlerin temaları ve türleri üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, 3(11), 256-275.

Baş, B. (2003). Altıncı sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metin türleri üzerine bir inceleme. *TÜBAR*, 13, 257-265.

Baydık, B. (2002). *Okuma güçlüğü olan ve olmayan çocukların sözcük okuma becerilerinin karşılaştırılması*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Baydık, B. (2011). Okuma güçlüğü olan öğrencilerin üstbilişsel okuma stratejilerini kullanımı ve öğretmenlerinin okuduğunu anlama öğretim uygulamalarının incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 36(162), 301-318.

Baydık, B., & Bayraktar, A. (2013, 8-11 April). *Evaluation of texts in Turkish teaching course books in terms of reading comprehension instruction*. The International Journal of Arts & Sciences (IJAS) Conference for Academic Disciplines. Paris, France.

Baydık, B., & Seçkin, Ş. (2012, 5-9 July). *An examination of reading skills of students with reading difficulties in informative and narrative texts*. International Journal of Arts & Sciences (IJAS) Conference for Academic Disciplines. Florence, Italy.

Baydık, B., Demirok, M., Seçkin, Ş., & Nuri, C. (2014, 6-9 December). *Reading comprehension skills of students with reading difficulties who were thought beginning reading and writing by using different teaching methods*. 6th World Conference on Educational Sciences (WCES), Valletta, Maltese Islands.

Baydık, B., Ergül, C., & Bahap Kudret, Z. (2012). Okuma güçlüğü olan öğrencilerin okuma akıcılığı sorunları ve öğretmenlerinin bu sorunlara yönelik uygulamaları. *İlköğretim Online*, 11(3), 778-789.

Baydık, B., & Seçkin, Ş. (2012, 5-9 July). *An examination of reading skills of students with reading difficulties in informative and narrative texts*. International Journal of Arts & Sciences (IJAS) Conference for Academic Disciplines. Florence, Italy.

Bezirci, B. & Yılmaz, A. E. (2010). Metinlerin okunabilirliğinin ölçülmesi üzerine bir yazılım kütüphanesi ve Türkçe için yeni bir okunabilirlik ölçütü. *DEÜ Mühendislik Fakültesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(3), 49-62.

Boulware-Gooden, R., Carreker, S., Thornhil, A., & Joshi, M. (2007). Instruction of metacognitive strategies enhances reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third grade students. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 70-77.

Bozlak, Ü. G. (2018). 2016-2017 ve 2017-2018 eğitim ve öğretim yıllarında 5. Sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki hikaye edici metinlerin Üzun-Çetinkaya formülü ile okunabilirlik düzeyleri/düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Akra Kültür Sanat ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 14(6), 209-234. https://doi.org/10.31126/akrajournal.357526

Bursuck, W. D. & Damer, M. (2007). *Reading instruction for students who are at risk or have disabilities*. Boston: Pearson.

Ceylan, M., & Baydık, B. (2018). Examination of reading skills of students who are poor readers in different text genres. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 13(2), 422-435.

Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. (2006). Profiles of children with specific reading comprehension difficulties. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 683-696. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905X67610

Çalışkan, G. (2016). Türkçe dersi öğretim programı ve Türkçe ders kitapları: 5. sınıf Türkçe ders kitabına yönelik bir inceleme. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4(2), 200-214.

Çiftçi, Ö., Çeçen, M. A. & Melanlıoğlu, D. (2007). Altıncı sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin okunabilirlik açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(22), 206-219.

Demir, M. & Çeçen, M. A. (2013). İlköğretim 1.-5. Sınıflar Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin okunabilirlik açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 197, 80-94.

Dermitzaki, I., Andreou, G., & Parskeva, V. (2008). High and low reading comprehension achievers' strategic behaviors and their relation to performance in a reading comprehension situation. *Reading Psychology*, 29, 471-492. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710802168519

Durukan, E. (2014). Metinlerin okunabilirlik düzeyleri ile öğrencilerin okuma becerileri arasındaki ilişki. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 2(3), 68-76.

Ergül, C. (2012). Okumada güçlük yaşayan öğrencilerin okuma performanslarının öğrenme güçlüğü riski açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(3), 2033-2057.

Gökçe-Sarıpınar, E. & Erden, G. (2010). Okuma güçlüğünde akademik beceri ve duyusal motor işlevleri değerlendirme testlerinin kullanılabilirliği. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 25(65), 56-66.

Güneş, F. (2000). *Çocuk kitaplarında okunabilirlik ölçütleri. açısından incelenmesi*. Basılmış bildiri. 1. Ulusal Çocuk Kitapları Sempozyumu: Sorunlar ve Çözüm önerileri içinde (s.334-349). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi ve TÖMER Dil Öğretim Merkezi Yayınları.

Kudret Bahap, Z. & Baydık, B. (2016). Başarılı ve başarısız dördüncü sınıf okuyucularının okuduğunu anlama ve özetleme becerileri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(3), 317-346. https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.268558

McNamara, D. S., Floyd, R. G., Best, R., & Louwerse, M. (2004). *World knowledge driving young readers' comprehension difficulties.* In Kafai, Y. B., Sandoval, W. A., Enyedy, N., Nixon, A. S., Herrera, F. (Eds.), Proceedings of the sixth International Conference of the Learning Sciences: Embracing diversity in the learning sciences (pp. 326–333).

MEB (2021). Milli Eğitim İstatistikleri:Örgün Eğitim. Ankara:Resmi İstatistik Programı yayını.

MEB (2015). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ders kitapları ve eğitim araçları yönetmeliği. Retrived from http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2016_01/12113913_yonetmelikderskitaplari.pdf

MEB EARGED (2010). İlköğretim okullarındaki kaynaştırma uygulamalarının değerlendirilmesi. Ankara: EARGED.

MEB (2018). Özel eğitim hizmetleri yönetmeliği. 7 Temmuz 2018 tarihli Resmi Gazete, sayı: 30471.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Sage Publications.

NCLD (2014). *The state of learning disabilities*. New York: National Center for Learning Disabilities Pub.

Okur, A. & Arı, G. (2013). 6, 7, 8. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin okunabilirliği. *İlköğretim Online*, 12(1), 202-226.

Özbay, M. (2003). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre ilköğretim okullarında Türkçe öğretimi*. Ankara: Gölge Ofset Matbaacılık.

Özbek, A. B. & Ergül, C. (2018). İlkokul 4. sınıf ders kitapalrının okunabilirliklerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(2), 653-668. https://doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.398401

Özkan, U. B. (2019). *Eğitim bilimleri araştırmaları için doküman inceleme yöntemi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi,

Sáenz, L. M., & Fuchs, L. S. (2002). Examining the reading difficulty of secondary students with learning disabilities: Expository versus narrative text. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23(1), 31-41. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193250202300105

Sever, S. (2012). *Çocuk ve edebiyat*. Ankara: Tudem.

Sönmez, V. (2003). Metinlerin eğitselliğini saptamada matematiksel bir yaklaşım (Sönmez modeli). *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 10, 24-39.

Pesa, N., & Somers, S. (2007). *Improving reading comprehension through application and transfer of reading strategies (A Research Project)*. Chicago, Illinois: Saint Xavier University & Pearson Achievement Solutions.

Rubin, D. (2000). *Teaching elementary language arts: A balanced approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Temizyürek, F. (2008). Farklı türdeki metinlerin ilköğretim 8. sınıflarda okuduğunu anlamaya etkisi. *Eurasian Joural of Educational Research*, 30, 141-152.

Yılmaz Seçkin, Ş. & Baydık, B. (2017). Okuma performası düşük olan ve olmayan ilkokul öğrencilerinin okuma akıcılıkları. *İlköğretim Online*,16(4), 1652-1671. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2017.342983