Students' Perceptions on the Effect of Text Length on their Vocabulary Success

Erkan Aydın[1], Mustafa Kaya[2]*

[1]*Ministry of National Education, Turkey*

[2]*Van Yuzuncu Yil University, Turkey*

Corresponding author: Mustafa Kaya, E-mail: m.kaya@yyu.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of text lengths on students' vocabulary and to reveal students' opinions about their vocabulary development considering text lengths. This study used exploratory sequential mixed method pattern, which combines quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques and combines research results. The study group constitutes 7th grade students studying at a secondary school in Turkey. Within the scope of the research, "Vocabulary Success Test (VST)" was used as quantitative data gathering tool, and "Structured Feedback Form (SFF)" was used as qualitative data tool. In the quantitative analysis of the research data, considering the structure of the data, t-tests were used in dependent and independent groups using SPSS-PASW Statistics 18. Descriptive analysis technique was used in the qualitative analysis of the research data. According to the results of this research, a statistically significant difference was found between the success scores of the short texts pretests and post-tests of the experimental group; it is concluded that there is no significant difference in long texts. The students in the research group stated that the short and concise texts in the course books increased their motivation towards the course.

Key words: Text Length, Vocabulary Instruction, Success

INTRODUCTION

Language is a unique tool used by humans, who are in a constant communication as a requirement of a social being. In addition to being a communication tool, language also provides the transferring of cultural and social values of societies to future generations. Thus, it functions as a social bridge between next generations and the material and spiritual values of the past. In addition, language develops and enriches not only social and cultural relations within the society but also social and cultural relations between communities. In order for language to fulfill this function adequately, a healthy and efficient communication channel must be constituted. In this context, teaching first language has an important place in the communication among the members of the society at a desired level.

The main purpose of Turkish course is to realize teaching the first language by providing students to acquire listening, speaking, reading and writing skills at a desired level. The texts in Turkish course books are considered as very important tools in terms of the acquisition of basic skills and effective teaching of the first language. One of the functions of the texts in the Turkish course books is vocabulary teaching. Adequate vocabulary learning of students depends on the structure of the text, the number of words, the characteristics of the language and style. In other words, it can be stated that students' vocabulary knowledge is directly related to the characteristics of the text.

A word is a group of letters that form a meaningful or charged structure. According to Günay (2007, p. 44), word is "a spoken or written language system produced by one or more persons from a specific communication context". According to Ayata-Şenöz (2005, p. 20), what is understand from the word *text* is*;* it is a written linguistic unit that consists of more than one sentences. The most meaningful units of these linguistic units are words. While Kaplan (1985, p. 212) considers word as an instrument that forms an opinion, Ergin (1999, p. 95) defines word as a sound or sound group that has a meaning and a function that can be used separately. Korkmaz (2007, p.144), on the other hand, states that it is a language unit that consists of one or more syllable sound phrases, which makes it possible to establish temporary relations between concrete or abstract concepts when used alone in the mind among people who speak the same language. Aksan (1990), emphasizes that the symbol named as word, is a concept, and a blended thought sound composition of every language with sound direction; a unit of understanding and expressing related to other elements in the language, and Kurudayıoğlu (2005, p. 8) defines word as a unit that corresponds to a certain concept or provide relationship between concepts and units that are not conjugated and ready

to be used in context. In these definitions, word is generally considered as a sound or meaningful structure unit built from sounds.

For the acquisition of basic language skills in Turkish education, some prerequisite acquisitions and learning are required. One of these is the development of vocabulary (Budak, 2000). According to Yapıcı and Yapıcı (2005, p. 87), many issues that exceed the limits of perception strength but remain within the limits of comprehension are perceived by the help of words. According to Özön (1967, p. 45), having a good command of language is directly proportional to having a rich vocabulary.

Vocabulary; whole words in a language, thesaurus, vocabulary set, vocab (*Turkish Language Association*, 2011, p. 2158). According to Korkmaz (2007, p. 144), vocabulary is all words in a language; the sum of words in the language knowledge of a person or community. While Vardar (1998, p. 190) defines vocabulary as all the words used by a person, Tosunoğlu (2000, p. 1) defines it as the words that people encounter and find ready in their environment since birth, the concepts that these words evoke, and the stereotypical expressions formed by words. On the other hand Onan (2013, p. 155) states that vocabulary consists of the words that are known by people. According to Özbay and Melanlıoğlu (2008, p. 33), vocabulary is the knowledge stored in memory as a result of the individual's learning experience. This knowledge can be increased and used in the most efficient way via Turkish lessons. Thus, students use the language well and their world of thought develops.

Humans think, speak and write utilizing words. People's understanding, explaining, comprehending and writing are all related to vocabulary (Dursunoğlu, 2010, p. 18). Vocabulary plays an important role in the ability of individuals to understand reading and listening texts, to express themselves to the desired extent in both spoken and written language and to be successful in lessons at school (Biemiller & Boote, 2006; Chechen, 2002: 8; Foil & Alber, 2002; Nelson and Stage, 2007). According to Öz (2003, p. 2), students who have a good vocabulary and who can use both spoken and written language well are likely to be successful in all of their lessons. Reading, comprehension and expression deficiencies, which are Turkish language skills, are the fundamental reason for the students' failure in many lessons. Students' understanding what they read or listen completely and accurately, effectively explaining what they understand, think and design verbally and in writing, depend on a rich vocabulary (Sever, 2000, p. 13). According to Yılmaz (1996, p. 189), there is a direct relationship between intelligence and learned words and concepts. People can think, understand, interpret what they know and reach some new conclusions as many words and concepts as they know. According to Karatay (2007, p. 143), there is a direct relationship between the thinking skills of people and the number of words they know. People need words to understand what is said and written, and to convey their feelings and thoughts to someone else. There is a close relation between the effective use of understanding and expressing, the effective use of basic language skills and a rich vocabulary. The effective use of

thinking processes, basic language skills of comprehension and expression depends on rich knowledge of words, in other words, vocabulary. Students who have poor vocabulary have difficulty in writing their thoughts and feelings; they cannot save themselves from using cliché words because they always write their ideas using certain words. Students with a rich vocabulary gain an ease of expression and the ability to understand what is read in school as well as in life (Karaalioğlu, 1990, p. 16). When there is not enough vocabulary, neither phonetic nor communication studies can be carried out (Aygün 1999, p. 7). It is possible to state that there is a direct relationship between the vocabulary that students have in both their ability to understand and explain at the desired level and to be successful in other courses. The number of words people know not only increases the level of comprehending the text read or listened, but it also enables the people to express themselves both verbally and in writing effectively. This situation enables the communication established by the individual to be healthy and efficient. According to Casson (2000, p. 23), rich vocabulary provides freedom, accuracy and clarity in expression.

Vocabulary acquisition is realized in the fastest and healthiest way only through texts, which are the basic materials of Turkish course. Text reading is learned not only with the sound or shape correspondents of the words learned; but via understanding meaning and meaning differences between other closely related words in a better and clear way. Therefore, it can be stated that text reading is the most efficient method in vocabulary development (Çeçen, 2002, p. 21). Although Turkish lessons play a key role in the development and enrichment of students' vocabulary, the importance of vocabulary in lessons and in all disciplines should be emphasized and awareness should be raised about this. Because the individual understands what he listens and reads with his vocabulary, and expresses what he wants to tell by speaking and writing, again based on the vocabulary (Tunagür & Kardaş, 2021). According to Özünlü (1983), literary texts that are rich in connotation and open to interpretation can be used in vocabulary teaching. Having a rich knowledge in terms of words and concepts enables people to be rich in imagination. Therefore, a special importance should be given to teaching vocabulary in Turkish education. Therefore Turkish educators must attach importance to teaching vocabulary in Turkish courses (Özbay, Melanlıoğlu, 2008, p. 31). According to Scott (2005, p. 69), encountering words in a text makes it easier to learn those words.

Texts are the fundamental way to enable student's vocabulary learning and enrich their vocabulary knowledge in Turkish courses. Students learn new words via texts. Therefore, word and word teaching has been included in Turkish course curriculum. Concerning the acquisition of vocabulary, which has a significant effect on students' expression and comprehension skills, *"The words learned in each lesson will be repeated doing exercises with the sentences in the following lessons."* expressions are included in the 1924 Primary School Turkish Course Curriculum Program, (Temizyürek & Balcı, 2015, p. 22). However in the 2019 Turkish Course Curriculum, which is currently

used, and among the general objectives of the course, this statement *"providing the students to develop their feelings, opinions and imaginations and reach language pleasure and consciousness enriching their vocabulary based on what they read, listen / watch"* takes place (MNE, 2019, p. 8). Since vocabulary education influences other skills directly and indirectly in Turkish education, it is seen that acquisitions regarding vocabulary are included in each program.

When the relevant literature was surveyed, it was seen that the vocabulary studies carried out in Turkey are studies conducted regarding the vocabulary of children's literature (Merten, 2009; Gokce, 2008; Go 2006), students' personal vocabulary in their written expressions (Çetinkaya, 2012; Anılan & Genç, 2011; Eğilmez, 2010; Temur, 2006; Kurudayıoğlu, 2005) and the vocabulary of Turkish course books (Öz, 2011; Yiğit, 2011; Apaydın, 2010; Kaya , 2008; Arslan-Kutlu, 2006; Yalçın, 2005; Ozer 2005), enriching vocabulary in teaching Turkish as a foreign language (Maden, 2020; Erol, 2021).

Words are the smallest meaningful means of communication. The richer the peoples' vocabulary is, the better they understand the texts read and listened, and also they express themselves better verbally and in writing. There is a direct relationship between the richness of one's vocabulary and the greatness of imagination. The more words the individual knows, the greater the world of imagination and thought is. No studies have been conducted before regarding whether short texts or long texts are more effective in enriching students' vocabulary knowledge, which has an important effect on student's acquiring basic language skills and being successful in other lessons as well. It is very important to determine the effect of the length of the texts on enhancing student's vocabulary and access the opinions of the students regarding this issue. Determining to what extent the length of the texts in Turkish course influences enhancing students' vocabulary and accessing students' views regarding this issue can be considered as an important criterion during the determination of the texts to be selected in the course books.

There are various views regarding whether the texts used as a tool for teaching four basic skills in Turkish course books to be long or short. According to Güneş (2003, p. 9; 2007, p. 219), the length of the text plays an important role in the development of students' language and mental skills. The student is in a long interaction with the text when the text is long. Short text means shortage of meaning. Based on this assumption, it can be stated that there are plenty of thoughts, events, information or words in a long text. The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of text lengths on students' vocabulary and to reveal students' opinions regarding the effect of text length on vocabulary development of students.

Objectives and Research Questions

In this research, it was aimed to examine whether the length of the text has an effect on students 'vocabulary success and to examine the students' views on this issue. Considering this purpose, answers were searched for the following sub-problems:

1. What is the effect of text length on students' vocabulary success?
2. What are the opinions of the students about the effect of text length on the development of their vocabulary?

METHOD

Research Design

Explanatory sequential mixed method pattern, which is a combination of quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques, was used in this study. According to Creswell (2006, p. 8), mixed method studies include the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. According to Plano, Clarv and Ivankova (2018, p. 122), the main purpose of this pattern is the subsequent use of qualitative data to detail, explain or verify quantitative results. With this pattern, researchers firstly apply quantitative and then qualitative stages.

Participants

The study group, which constitutes 7th grade students studying at a secondary school in Turkey. 7th grade students in the study group were selected according to the random sampling method, which is one of the probability-based sampling methods. According to Yıldırım and Şimşek (2016, p. 115), every "thing" in this population should have an equal chance of being included in any sample to be constituted. From a population that has these properties it is possible to select a sample, which has the size to represent the population, via a total random sampling.

Among these 7th grade students attending secondary school in the 2019-2020 academic year, 30 of them were selected as experimental group and 30 of them were selected as control group.

Data Collection Tool

A "Vocabulary Success Test (VST)" was used as quantitative data collection tool, and "Structured Interview Form (SIF)" was used as qualitative data tool.

Vocabulary Success Test (VST)

The «Vocabulary Success Test (VST)" developed by the researcher was used to measure the effect of text lengths on students› vocabulary success. During the test development process, texts that were selected from Turkish course books, were used, which were approved by the Ministry of National Education and were not previously studied by students in the study group but utilized in schools in different provinces. A total of 15 texts were selected from Turkish course books making a point of choosing different themes and genres. After the texts were selected, they were presented to 5 experts specialized in Turkish education for their opinions. Experts were asked to score the suitability of the texts from 1 to 5 according to the purpose of the study and the levels of the students. After scoring, 10 texts with the

highest scores were selected to be used within the context of the research. Then, a vocabulary success test was prepared by 3 Turkish education experts and 2 Turkish teachers regarding the selected texts. The questions in the vocabulary success tests prepared were brought together and sent to the experts once more. Experts were asked which questions could be used to measure the vocabulary success test of the text to be processed. The questions that the experts agreed on were used to measure students' vocabulary success. The texts selected for students' vocabulary test and the numbers of words in the related text (Text Word Number) (TWN) are given in Table 1.

Structured Interview Form (SIF)

In the research, a "structured interview form (SIF)" was utilized. The YGBF used in this research was developed by the researcher. During the preparation of SIF, questions that could serve the purpose of the study were formed. The questions prepared were sent to a qualified lecturer specialized in qualitative research methods, a specialized lecturer in Turkish education and a Turkish teacher who had 10 years of experience. As a result of the feedback obtained from these experts, whose views were consulted, some questions were removed from the form and the SIF was finalized. Afterwards, 28 volunteer students from the control group and the experimental group were handed these interview forms and they were collected. The structured interview form includes the following questions:

1. What are the issues that motivate you to study during the application?
2. What are the issues that decrease your motivation during the application?
3. Would you like the same application to be performed in other texts in the Turkish course? Explain why?
4. Did the application contribute to the enrichment of your vocabulary? What is your opinion regarding this issue?
5. Do you think this activity is better or the vocabulary activities in Turkish lesson? Explain why?

Data Collection Process

Within the scope of the research, a long and a short text was processed for the experimental and control groups in the first two weeks. After the texts were processed, word success test was conducted for both texts. This part constitutes the pretest of the experimental study. Then, a short text was processed for four weeks with the experimental group and a vocabulary success test was conducted for each text. In the control group, a long text was processed for four weeks and a vocabulary success test was conducted for each text. After the application of the experimental study was completed, the application which was made in the pretest was conducted to both the experimental group and the control group again. This stage constitutes the final test of the experimental study.

The 7-Week Course Process in the experimental and control groups is presented in Table 2.

Data Analysis

In the study, a quantitative data gathering tool and a qualitative data gathering tool were used. These are the *Vocabulary Success Test (SBT)* and *Structured Interview Form (YGBF)*. In order to determine which types of statistical tests should be used during data analysis, the distribution of students' scores in the pretest and post-test were examined. Depending on whether the distribution indicated normality or not, the test types used in the analyses were determined. Skewness and kurtosis values that determine the normality value of the pretest and post-test scores regarding the experimental and control groups' short text vocabulary success are shown in Table 3.

Skewness and kurtosis values that determine the normality value of the pretest and post-test scores regarding the experimental and control groups' long text vocabulary success are shown in Table 4.

While skewness and kurtosis values between -2 and +2 are considered to be sufficient for a normal distribution (Yerevan-Damar & Aydın, cited in George & Mallerry

Table 1. Texts processed in the study and the number of words in the texts

	Experimental Group			Control Group	
	Text Name	**TWN**		**Text Name**	**TWN**
Short Texts	Kaplumbağayla İki Ördek (Pretest for short text)	251	Long Tests	Kaplumbağayla İki Ördek (Pretest for short text)	251
	Sığırtmaç Mustafa'nın Öyküsü (Pretest for long text)	601		Sığırtmaç Mustafa'nın Öyküsü (Pretest for long text)	601
	Çiçek Dürbünü	394		Ana İşsiz Kalınca	688
	İki Tekerlekli Özgürlük	446		Mürefteli Kadınlar ve Emin Astsubay	763
	Futbolcu Olmaya Karar Vermiştim	413		Tahta Bisiklet	988
	Karlı Dağların Arkadaşı Ol	330		Adını Göklere Yazdıran Çocuk	812
	Okumanın İşlevi	343		A Harfi	1244
	Kaplumbağayla İki Ördek (Post-test for short text)	251		Kaplumbağayla İki Ördek (Post-test for short text)	251
	Sığırtmaç Mustafa'nın Öyküsü (Post-test for long text)	601		Sığırtmaç Mustafa'nın Öyküsü (Post-test for long text)	601

2015, pp. 281-282), Kline (2005, p. 63) states that skewness value between -3, +3; and kurtosis value smaller than 10 is adequate. Considering these references, it can be stated that skewness and kurtosis values of the experimental and control groups indicated a normal distribution.

In this study, which examines the effect of text lengths on students' vocabulary success, "SPSS-PASW Statistics 18" statistical package program was used in order to test whether there was a significant difference between the experimental group where short texts were studied and the control group students where long texts were studied. While dependent groups t-test was utilized in order to check the differences among the groups, independent groups t-test was utilized in order to determine the difference between the groups. Significance level was accepted as 0.05 at least.

Table 2. Five-week course processing in the experimental and control groups

Weeks	Experimental and Control Group	
Weeks 1 and 2.	Experimental and control groups studied the texts titled "Kaplumbağayla İki Ördek" and "Sığırtmaç Mustafa'nın Öyküsü". Then, vocabulary success tests were performed for both texts, respectively.	
	Experimental Group	**Control Group**
Weeks 3, 4, 5, 6	Every week, a short text was studied with the students in the Experimental Group and a vocabulary success test regarding that text was carried out.	Each week, a long text was studied with the students in the Control Group and a vocabulary success test regarding that text was carried out.
	Experimental and Control Group	
Week 7	In the last week of the application, after the application conducted within the scope of the experimental study, the applications carried out in the pretest both to the control group and the experimental group were repeated.	

Table 3. Normality tests regarding the total scores of the experimental and control groups' short texts vocabulary success tests

Groups	Test type	Skewness	Kurtosis
Experimental Group	Pretest	-0.920	0.532
	Post-test	-0.906	0.250
Control Group	Pretest	-0.682	0.204
	Post-test	-0.520	-0.857

Table 4. Normality tests regarding the total scores of the experimental and control groups' long texts vocabulary success tests

Groups	Test type	Skewness	Kurtosis
Experimental Group	Pretest	-0.326	-0.358
	Post-test	-0.578	-0.368
Control Group	Pretest	-0.398	-1.042
	Post-test	-0.016	-0.827

Content analysis, which is one of the qualitative data analysis methods, was used in the study. Content analysis can be defined as a systematic, repeatable technique in which some words of a text are summarized with smaller content categories based on certain rules-based encodings. It is a technique in which an objective and systematic recognition of certain features of a message is made (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016).The data obtained were analyzed and interpreted in the relevant study. The opinions of the students, whose opinions were consulted within the context of the research, were aimed to be presented directly. Thus, it was aimed to ensure that the data gathered would reflect the actual condition. The answers given by the students, whose views were asked regarding the development of the vocabulary of the text lengths, were turned into categories and sample views were included for each category. In the process of analyzing the data of the study, the answers of the students were coded as "S1, S2, S3…".

FINDINGS

In this part, the findings obtained from the data are discussed and various interpretations are presented. In addition, findings related to the opinions of the students, whose opinions were asked about the effect of text lengths on the development of their vocabulary, were discussed and the results are presented in tables.

Effect of Text Lengths on Students' Vocabulary Success

Independent measurements t-test results indicating the difference between the short text pretest average of the experimental and control groups are given in Table 5.

In the unrelated groups t-test which was conducted in order to test whether there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups' short-text pretest scores, no significant difference was found between the experimental group (M= 76.20) short-text pretest the average scores and the control group (M= 73.60) short-text pretest score average [$t(58) = 1.012$ (p= .316)]. Considering these results, according to the short text pretest, it can be stated that the vocabulary comprehension levels of the students in the experimental and control groups were close to each other.

Dependent measurements t-test results related to the distribution of the pretest and post-test scores of the experimental group's short texts vocabulary success are presented in Table 6.

In the related groups t-test which was conducted to test whether there was a significant difference between the short-text pretest and post-test scores of the experimental group, a significant difference was found between short-text pretest score average of the experimental group (M= 76.20) and post-test average score (M= 84.03) of the experimental group [($t(29)$ =-3.702 (p= .001)]. This situation indicates that short texts have an influence on students' level of vocabulary comprehension.

Dependent measurements t-test results related to the distribution of the vocabulary success pretest and post-test scores of the control group are presented in Table 7.

According to Table 7, it is possible to state that statistically there is no significant difference between pretest and post-test scores of the reading comprehension levels of the control group students who have attended courses with short texts throughout the application [$t(29) = -1.453$ ($p= .157$)].

Independent measurements t-test results indicating the difference between post-test averages scores of short texts of experiment and control groups are given in Table 8.

In the t-test conducted for unrelated groups in order to test whether there was a significant difference between short-text post-test scores of the experimental and control groups, a significant difference was found between short-text post-test score averages of the experimental group ($M= 84.03$) and short-text post-test score averages of the of the control group ($M= 76.67$) [$t(58) = 2.382$ ($p= .021$)]. This situation indicates that short texts have an effect on students' level of vocabulary comprehension.

Pretest averages independent measurements t-test results of long texts vocabulary success of experiment and control groups' are given in Table 9.

Table 5. Comparison of experimental and control groups' short text pretest

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Experimental	30	76.20	8.265	58	1.012	.316
Control	30	73.60	11.398			

Table 6. Comparison of experimental group's short text pretest and post-test mean scores

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p*
Experimental (Pretest)	30	76.20	8.265	29	-3.702	.001
Experimental (Post-test)	30	84.03	10.37			

*$p < .05$

Table 7. Dependent measurements t-test indicating the difference between the vocabulary success of the control group's short texts pretests and post-tests

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Control (Pretest)	30	73.60	11.398	29	-1.453	.157
Control (Post-test)	30	76.67	13.412			

Table 8. Independent measurements t-test indicating the difference between the experimental group and the control group's vocabulary success post-tests of short texts

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p*
Experimental	30	84.03	10.34	58	2.382	021
Control	30	76.67	13.41			

*$p < .05$

Table 9. Independent measurements t-test indicating the difference between experimental group and the control group's vocabulary success pretests of long texts

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Experimental	30	74.43	12.39	58	.719	.475
Control	30	71.90	14.47			

In the t-test conducted for unrelated groups in order to test whether there was a significant difference between long text pretest scores of the experimental and control groups, no significant difference was found between the experimental group long text pretest score averages ($M= 74.43$) and the control group long text pretest score averages ($M= 71.90$) [$(t(58) = .719$ ($p= .475$)]. According to these results, it can be stated that the vocabulary comprehension levels of the experimental and control group students are close to each other according to the long text pretest.

Dependent measurements t-test results related to the distribution of pretest and post-test scores of long texts of the experimental group are given in Table 10.

According to Table 10, it can be stated that statistically there was no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the students' vocabulary comprehension levels of the experimental group students who studied with long texts throughout the application [$t(29) = -1.493$ ($p= .146$)].

Dependent measurements t-test results related to the distribution of pretest and post-test scores of long texts of the control group are given in Table 11.

According to Table 11, it can be stated that statistically there was no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the vocabulary comprehension levels of the control group students who studied with long texts throughout the application [$t(29) = -.916$ ($p= .367$)].

Independent measurement t-test results of experimental and control groups' post-test long texts vocabulary success score averages are given in Table 12.

In the t-test conducted for unrelated groups in order to test whether there was a significant difference between long-text post-test scores of the experimental and control groups, no significant difference was found between long-text post-test score averages of the experimental group ($M= 76.53$) and the long-text post-test of the control group ($M= 74.00$) [$(t (58) = .891$

Table 10. Dependent measurements t-test indicating the difference between the experimental group's vocabulary success pretest and post-test of long texts

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Experimental (Pretest)	30	74.43	12.392	29	-1.493	146
Experimental (Post-test)	30	76.53	9.860			

Table 11. Dependent measurements t-test indicating the difference between the control group's vocabulary success pretest and post-test of long texts

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Control (Pretest)	30	71.90	14.782	29	-.916	.367
Control (Post-test)	30	74.00	12.060			

Table 12. Independent measurements t-test indicating the difference between the experimental group and the control group's vocabulary success post-tests of long texts

Groups	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Experimental	30	76.53	9.86	58	.891	.377
Control	30	74.00	12.06			

(*p*= .377)). This situation indicates that long texts have no effect on students' level of vocabulary comprehension.

Student views regarding the effect of text lengths on vocabulary success

The opinions of the students, whose opinions were asked about the issues that motivate the students during the application phase of the experimental study, are given in Table 13.

In Table 13, opinions of secondary school students about the subjects that increase their motivation during the experimental study are given. More than half of the students (f = 16) stated that the shortness of the texts attracted their attention, they understood the texts better, and the texts were more understandable. While 7 of the students stated that the interesting subjects in the texts motivated them, 5 of them stated that they felt motivated when the text was fluent and understandable.

The findings regarding the opinions of the secondary school students, with whom the application was carried out, and the issues that decrease their motivation during the application are given in Table 14.

In the table, opinions of secondary school students about the subjects that decreased their motivation during the experimental study are given. More than half of the students (f = 16) stated that they had difficulty in long texts, they were bored because the texts were long, and they were distracted. They also stated that the length of informative texts reduced their desire for reading. Eight of the students stated that the lack of time reduced their motivation, while 4 students stated that the noise and crowded classroom decreased their motivation.

Table 13. Students' views regarding the issues that motivate students during the application

Category	f	Views
Short Texts	16	We can read and finish the short text, but when we read long texts and somebody makes a noise, we get distracted (S1, S24, S27, S28). I can read short texts more than once. But there is not enough time to read long texts twice, and performing the vocabulary success test after the exam allows more information to get in our minds (S2). We can read and understand the short texts, but it takes some time to understand the long texts. The vocabulary test increases my motivation (S3, S7, S9, S13, S23). I think we can repeat the parts we don't understand because the short text ends quickly (S4). I find short texts more interesting. The vocabulary test increased my motivation (S5, S10, S14, S21). Short texts are more understandable than long texts (S6).
Interesting Subjects	7	The subject is interesting; there is a person or subject that I like; including the life of celebrities (S12, S15, S18, S19, S20, S25). Its subject is interesting (S22).
Comprehensible and fluent text	5	Fluent text (S11, S26). Comprehensible texts (S8, S16, S17).

The opinions of the students whose opinions are asked whether they wanted the same application to be carried out or not in the other texts in the Turkish lesson are given in Table 15.

In Table 15, the opinions of secondary school students about the same application to be conducted in the other texts in the Turkish lesson are given. The great majority of students (f = 16) stated that the texts in Turkish should be short and concise. 7 of the students stated that long texts should be interesting while 4 of them stated that the texts should be both short and long.

The opinions of the students whose opinions were asked about the application's contribution to their development of vocabulary are given in Table 16.

In Table 16, the opinions of secondary school students whether the application contributes to their vocabulary or not are given. The great majority of the students (f = 24)

Table 14. Students' views regarding the subjects that decreased their motivation during the application

Category	f	Views
Long Texts	16	I have difficulty in long texts, I find them boring (S3, S4, S7, S13, S14, S23, S27). The length of some texts takes away my desire to read the whole text (S5, S18). Long informative texts influenced my motivation (S8). Since long texts are distracting I start from the beginning again and again and it decreases my motivation to read. (S9, S11, S15, S16, S17, S19).
Inadequate Time	8	I had trouble with time (S6, S10, S12, S20, S21, S25, S26, S28).
Noise and Crowd	4	Noise (S1). Crowded classroom (S2, S22, S24)

Table 15. Student opinions about the same application to be carried out in other texts in Turkish lesson

Category	f	Views
Texts are short and concise	16	I would like the texts to be short and concise. I want the texts to be about one of the topics that I find interesting (S1, S10, S12, S18, S23, S25, S27, S28). I would like the informative texts to be short and concise. Because I would like to have topics that I find interesting in other texts (S3, S9, S11). I would like the informative texts to be short (S4). I would like other texts to be one of the topics that I find interesting (S5, S20). I would like the informative texts to be short (S6, S8).
Interesting long texts	7	I would like long texts to be more interesting (S2, S7, S13, S15, S19, S26). I would like the informative texts to be long (S14).
Both long and short texts	4	I would like both short and long texts to be given. Short texts end quickly, I am not distracted; I am excited about in long texts because I feel curious about the end (S16, S21). The texts should be distributed equally; I think there should be both long and short text (S17, S20, S22).

Table 16. Student opinions regarding the contribution of the application to the development of their vocabulary

Category	f	Views
Yes	24	Since some words are interesting for me, they improve my vocabulary (S1). I think it has improved. Because the more we practice, the more information we get (S2). Yes, it has improved. We learned the meaning of words well (S3, S9, S12, S14, S18, S22, S23). Yes, it has improved. The fact that we were asked to use the words in a sentence helped us learn the words well (S5, S13, S19, S25, S28). It has developed; thanks to this test I learned more words (S6, S8, S17, S20). Yes, it has improved. Words of which meanings I did not know were given clearly there (S7). It definitely enriched; I would like more of such activities. We had the opportunity to match the words and it was just like a puzzle (S10, S21). My vocabulary has improved because when I started learning I started to like this practice more (S15, S16). It enriched; short and instructive activities of the text refresh the current knowledge (S27).
No	4	No, there were words I already knew. But I still learned a few words (S4). No, I had trouble with time in long texts (S11, S24, S26).

Table 17. Student opinions about the vocabulary activities in the Turkish lesson and the vocabulary activities within the scope of the research

Category	f	Views
Vocabulary Success Test	20	The activities in the application were more instructive and improved my vocabulary more (S3, S21, S24). I liked the vocabulary test more (S4). I liked this application more (S5, S22). In application, the vocabulary success test was better than the activities in the dictionary (S6, S8, S9, S18, S28). Activities in the application were better. Because there is a more detailed explanation, the questions were more qualified and instructive (S10, S15). The activities in the application are better because everyone is doing the activity they know (S11, S12, S14, S19, S26). I think the activities in the application are better; a few people practice and pass the activities in the course books (S13, S23).
Vocabulary Activities in Course Books	8	The activities in the course book are better because there are fewer and more explanatory texts (S1, S7, S17, S20, S27). The activities in the course books are mostly text based (S2, S16, S25).

stated that the application improved their vocabulary, while 4 of the students stated that there was no contribution due to the long texts.

Students' opinions whether the secondary school students find the vocabulary activities in the Turkish course book or the vocabulary success test within the scope of the application are given in Table 17.

The opinions of the students within the scope of the research about the vocabulary success test and vocabulary activities in Turkish course books are given in Table 17. While the majority of the students (f = 20) stated that the vocabulary success test within the scope of the application is better, 8 of the students stated that they had better vocabulary activities in the course books.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Within the scope of the research, the effect of text lengths on students' vocabulary success and the opinions of students about this application were examined and the results are summarized below.

At the beginning of the experimental process, no statistically significant difference was found between vocabulary success scores of pretests of experimental and control groups in short texts [t (58) = 1.012, p <.05 (p = .316)]. At the end of experimental process, a statistically significant difference was found between vocabulary success scores of post-tests of the experimental and control groups in short texts [(t (58) = 2.382 p <.05 (p = 0.021). At the beginning of the experimental process, no statistically significant difference was found between vocabulary success scores of pretests of experimental and control groups in long texts [(t (58) = 719 p <.05 (p = .475)). At the end of the experimental process, no statistically significant difference was found between vocabulary success scores of experimental and control groups regarding long texts [(t (58) = .891 p <.05 (p = .377).

When the relevant literature is examined, it is possible to encounter many studies that coincide with the results of the research. Payza (2015) states that text length makes the situation difficult for students regarding four basic language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing). Also emphasized that the length of texts must be reviewed and shorter texts must be included. Karaboğa (2009) states that since the length of texts in coursebooks is above the student level, this situation distances the texts from their main purpose. Karakuş (2014) stated that attention should be paid to the length of texts to be added to the coursebook, in a way not to exceed 10 minutes of the course. As a result of their research Solak and Yaylı (2009) found that Turkish books contain very long texts. In their study Akkaya & Susar (2007) stated that the general of teachers expressed that texts in coursebooks were long.

The students stated that while the texts studied were short and concise, their motivation towards the lesson decreased their motivation because the length of the text caused them to have difficulty managing time or they get bored. On the other hand some students stated that both long and short texts should be included in Turkish course books. However, they stated that long texts should be interesting and fluent. In the study of İşeri (2006) it was stated that most complaints about the course books were related to the length of the texts. Kırmızı and Akkaya (2009) stated that the reading texts in the Turkish course books of the teachers, whom they applied for their opinions about the Turkish Curriculum, were long. Hamouda (2013), on the other hand, stated that

English learners, whose opinions were asked regarding the listening texts, had difficulties with time due to the length of the texts. In Kaya and Kardaş's (2019) study, which was carried out with both teachers and prospective teachers regarding the texts in Turkish course books, it was stated that texts should not be long in the course books. As a result of Kaya and Çiftçi›s (2020) study, teachers and students stated that the listening texts in the Turkish course books are long. Although these results support the findings obtained in this study, in the study of Durukan (2011) it was stated that the students, whose opinions were asked regarding the texts in the Turkish course books, found the texts in the course books long.

The students stated that the comprehensiveness and fluency of the texts and interesting subjects increased their motivation to read. As a result of their research on Turkish prospective teachers' perceptions of texts Tok and Yılmaz (2014) stated that the prospective teacher candidates expressed that the factors required in texts are comprehensibility, simplicity and level appropriateness. As a result of their study Kaya and Kardaş (2019) stated that texts should be fluent, comprehensible and interesting. As a result of their study in which the texts in the Turkish course books were evaluated in terms of literary pleasure and pleasantness according to the opinions of teachers, Coşkun and Çetinkaya (2020) stated that teachers found the texts insufficient to encourage students to read other texts. This situation can indicate that fluent, comprehensible and interesting texts have an important effect on motivating the students.

Throughout the application the students stated that crowd and noise made it difficult for them to understand the texts. It was seen that several studies conducted support this view of students'. According to Güçlü (2002), the amount of time spent by the teacher for individualized teaching is decreasing in crowded classrooms. As a result of Özdayı's research (2002) it was stated that 31% of the students complained about crowded classrooms. Mackay (1997) stated that noise is an important factor in distraction. This situation not only reduces the students' interest in the lesson but also makes it difficult for them to understand the text.

Students stated that the vocabulary success test enriched their vocabulary knowledge and also they learned more words thanks to this vocabulary success test. In addition, most of the students stated that the vocabulary success test is better than the vocabulary activities in the course books. As a result of their work, Yılmaz and Doğan (2014) stated that both teachers and course book writers should approach the vocabulary studies in the course books systematically, and more and further systematic studies should be included. In the study of Ertem & Akyüzaru (2014), it was stated that there was no systematic planning for vocabulary teaching. As a result of certain studies, it was determined that teachers use traditional methods and do not use different methods and techniques during vocabulary teaching (Başoğlu et al., 2014; Yağcı et al., 2012). Göçer (2010) stated that teachers should give up traditional practices and create functional learning environments in which students are effective in teaching Turkish language. Akyol (2008) states that using different teaching methods and techniques during vocabulary teaching will make the words easy to make sense in mind and provide a permanent learning. Findings in these studies support students' views.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of the research, various recommendations for the researchers and the application were presented:

The texts to be selected for Turkish course books should be chosen from comprehensible and fluent texts that attract the attention of the students. In addition, short texts should be included rather than long texts that would distract the students and cause them to get bored. In Turkish course books, texts that would improve students' vocabulary and which students would enjoy while reading should be selected.

One of the main objectives of the Turkish course is to enrich student's vocabulary. In order to enrich the vocabulary of the students, general activities in the same form are included in the Turkish course books. Different and enhanced activities should be included in the Turkish course book in order to teach new vocabulary in the text.

REFERENCES

Aksan, D. (1990). *Her yönüyle dil*. TTK Yayınları.

Akyol, H. (2008). Türkçe ilk okuma yazma öğretimi. Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Akkaya, N. ve Susar Kırmızı, F. (2007). Yeni program doğrultusunda hazırlanan ilköğretim 4. ve 5. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarının öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Millî Eğitim,* (174), 232-249.

Anılan, H. &Genç, B. (2011). Türkçe dersinde öğrenilen yeni sözcüklerin yazılı anlatımlarda kullanım durumu. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 12*(1), 111-132.

Apaydın, N. (2010). *6. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarının söz varlığı açısından incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Arslan-Kutlu, H. (2006). *MEB ilköğretim 6, 7. ve 8. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarında yer alan metinlerin söz varlığı açısından değerlendirilmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Ayata-Şenöz, C. (2005). *Metindilbilim ve Türkçe*. İstanbul: Multilingual Yayınları.

Aygün, M. (1999). Yabancı dil dersinde sözcük öğretimi ve sözcük dağarcığını geliştirme teknikleri. *Dil Dergisi*. (78), 5-16.

Baş, B. (2006). *1985-2005 yılları arasında çocuk edebiyatı sahasında yazılmış tahkiyeli metinlerin söz varlığı üzerine bir araştırma*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Başoğlu, N.,Kaplan, T.,&Okur, A. (2014). İlköğretim birinci kademede sözcük öğretimi ile ilgili çalışmaların incelenmesi, *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *2*(4), 50-65.

Biemiller, A. & Boote, C. (2006). An effective method for building meaning vocabulary in primary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *98*(1), 44–62.

Budak, Y. (2000). Sözcük öğretimi ve sözlüğün işlevi. *Dil Dergisi*, 92, 19-26.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F., (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi Yayınevi.

Casson, H. N. (2000). *Söz söyleme sanatı* (Çev. Vedat Yılmaz). Kariyer Yayıncılık.

Coşkun, H.&Çetinkaya, V. (2020). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin edebî zevk ve hoşa giderlik açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Kültürü ve Medeniyeti Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 1 (1), 255-272.

Creswell, J. W. (2006). Understanding mixed methods research (Chapter 1). In J. W. Creswell & V. L. Plano Clark (Eds.), *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* içinde (pp. 1-19). Sage.

Çeçen, M. A. (2002). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinde kelime hazinesinin geliştirilmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Çetinkaya, Z. (2012). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe altıncı sınıfta ana diline ait sözcüklerin öğrenilmesi ve kavranılmasına ilişkin bir araştırma* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.

Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2017). *Metindilbilim ve Türkçe öğretimi – uygulamalı bir yaklaşım*. Anı Yayınları.

Dursunoğlu, H. (2010). *Kelime hazinesini geliştirmede şarkıların rolü ve şarkılarımızdaki söz varlığı*. Vizyon Yayınevi.

Durukan, E. (2011). Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin öğrenci görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 24*(1), 209-216.

Eğilmez, İ. (2010). *İlköğretim Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki söz varlığının ilköğretim dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatımlarına aktarımı*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi. Uludağ Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bursa.

Ergin, M. (1999). *Türk dil bilgisi*. Bayrak Basım.

Erol, S . (2021). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde söz varlığı ve sözcük öğretimi üzerine bir değerlendirme: 1981-2021 lisansüstü tezler. *Aydın Tömer Dil Dergisi, 6*(1), 103-120.

Ertem, İ. S.&Akyüzaru, S. (2014). Türkçe ders kitaplarında kelime hazinesini geliştirmeye yönelik planlamanın incelenmesi. *Elektronik Türkçe Çalışmaları. 9*(3), 675-695.

Foil, C. R. & Alber, S. R. (2002). Fun and effective ways to build your students' vocabulary. *Intervention in school and clinic journal, 37*(3), 131-139.

George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update*. Pearson.

Göçer, A. (2010). Türkçe eğitiminde öğrencilerin söz varlığını geliştirme etkinlikleri ve sözlük kullanımı. *International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 5*(1), 1007-1036.

Gökçe, B. (2008). *Gülten Dayıoğlu'nun çocuk öykülerinde değer eğitimi ve öykülerin Türkçeye katkısı* [Yayımlan-

mamış yüksek lisans tezi]. İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Güçlü, M. (2002). İlköğretimde kalabalık sınıflar sorunu ve çözüm önerileri. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Sayı: 9, (52-58).

Günay, D. (2007). *Metin bilgisi*. Multilingual Yayınları.

Güneş, F. (2003). *Okuma – yazma öğretimi ve beyin teknolojisi*. Ocak Yayıncılık.

Güneş, F. (2007). *Türkçe öğretimi ve zihinsel yapılandırma*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Hamouda, A. (2013). An investigation of listening comprehension problems encountered by Saudi students in the EL listening classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 2*(2),113-155.

İşeri, K. (2006). Altıncı sınıf Türkçe ders kitabının ilköğretim Türkçe programının amaçlarının uygunluğunun değerlendirilmesi, *Dil Dergisi*.136,58-74.

Kaplan, M. (1985). *Kültür ve dil*. Dergâh Yayınları.

Karaalioğlu, S. K.(1990). *Kompozisyon sanatı*. İnkılâp Kitabevi.

Karaboğa, A. (2009). *Yeni Türkçe öğretim programına göre hazırlanan 6. ve 7. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin niteliği* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Niğde Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Niğde.

Karakuş, N. (2014). Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki metinlerin dil ve anlatım yönünden incelenmesi. *Tarih Okulu Dergisi*, 7 (18), 567-593.

Karatay, H. (2007). Kelime öğretimi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 27*(1), 141-153.

Kaya, E. (2008). *İlköğretim II. kademe ders kitaplarında söz varlığı incelemesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Kaya, M. & Kardaş, M. (2019). Türkçe Öğretmenleri ile Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarının Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Metinlerle ilgili Görüşleri. Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11(21), 323-342.

Kaya, M. & Çiftçi, Ö. (2020) Teachers And Students' Evaluation of Listening Texts in Turkish Textbooks. International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies, *8*(1), 84-94.

Kırmızı, S. F.&Akkaya, N. (2009). Türkçe Öğretimi Programında Yaşanan Sorunlara İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 25*(1).

Korkmaz, Z. (2007). *Gramer terimleri sözlüğü*. TDK Yayınları.

Kurudayıoğlu, M. (2005). *İlköğretim II. kademe öğrencilerinin kelime hazinesi üzerine bir araştırma* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Mackay, I. (1997). *Dinleme becerisi* (A. Bora, O. Cankoçak, Çev.). İlkkaynak Kültür ve Sanat Ürünleri.

Maden, A. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe söz varlığını zenginleştirme ile ilgili makalelerin analizi. *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi* (ASEAD), 7(5), 583-596.

MEB, (2019). *Türkçe dersi öğretim programı (güncelleştirilmiş ilkokul ve ortaokul 1-8. sınıflar)*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Mert, E. (2009). *Türkçenin söz varlığı açısından Eflatun Cem Güney'in derleyip yazdığı masallar* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Nelson, J. R. & Stage, S. A. (2007). Fostering the development of vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension though contextually-based multiple meaning vocabulary ınstruction. *Education and Treatment of Children*. *30*(1), 1-22.

Onan, B. (2013). Dil eğitiminin temel kavramları. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Öz, M. F. (2003). *Uygulamalı Türkçe öğretimi.* Anı Yayıncılık.

Öz, G. (2012). *İlköğretim sekizinci sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarının söz varlığı bakımından incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Özbay, M.&Melanlıoğlu, D. (2008). Türkçe eğitiminde kelime hazinesinin önemi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. *5*(1), 30-45.

Özdayı, N. (2002). Kaliteli Eğitim Arayışları İçinde Öğrencilerin Gözüyle Nasıl Bir Lise. 2000'li Yıllarda Lise Eğitimine Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar Sempozyumu'nda sunulan bildiri. Kültür Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Özer, M. (2005). *İlköğretim 6. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarının kelime serveti bakımından değerlendirilmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar.

Özön, M. N. (1967). Yazmak sanatı ve kompozisyona giriş. Remzi Kitabevi.

Özünlü, Ü. (1983). Yabancı dil öğretiminde yazınsal metinlerin yeri ve kullanılması. *Türk Dili Dil Öğretim Özel Sayısı*. 379-380.

Payza, T. (2015). *Ortaokul 5. Sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarında yer alan metinlerin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.

Plano Clark, V. L. & Ivankova, N. V. (2018). *Karma yöntemler araştırması- alana yönelik bir kılavuz.* (Çev. Ö. Çokluk-Bökeoğlu). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Scott, J. A. (2005). *Creating opportunities to acquire new word meanings from text.* In E. H. Ebert & M. L. Kamil, *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary* (pp. 69-91). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sever, S. (2000). *Türkçe öğretimi ve tam öğrenme*. Anı Yayıncılık.

Solak, M. & Yaylı, D. (2009). İlköğretim ikinci kademe Türkçe ders kitaplarının türler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *2*(9), 444-453.

TDK. (2011). *Türkçe sözlük.* Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

Temizyürek, F. & Balcı, A. (2015). *Cumhuriyet dönemi ilköğretim okulları Türkçe programları.* (2. Basım). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Temur, T. (2006). *İlköğretim 4 ve 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin yazı dilindeki kelime hazinelerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Tok, M. & Yılmaz, E. (2014). Türkçe öğretmen adaylarının metin algıları. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 11*(25)*, 245-263.

Tosunoğlu, M. (2000). Kelime servetinin eğitim öğretimdeki yeri ve önemi. *Millî Eğitim Dergisi*. *144*, 71-73.

Tunagür, M. & Kardaş, N. M. (2021). In Y. Fiziksel, Z. Süreçleri, M. Nuri Kardaş (Eds.), *Yazma Eğitimi* içinde (pp. 59-82). Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Vardar, B. (1998). *Açıklamalı dil bilim terimleri sözlüğü*. ABC Yayınları.

Yağcı, E., Katrancı, M., Erdoğan, Ö., & Uygun, M. (2012). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin kelime öğretiminde karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve kullandıkları yöntem-teknikler. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *2*(4), 1-12.

Yalçın, S. K. (2005). *İlköğretim 1. ve 5. sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki sözvarlığı unsurlarının eğitsel açıdan değerlendirilmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Fırat Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Yapıcı, Ş. & Yapıcı, M. (2005). *Gelişim ve öğrenme psikolojisi*. Anı Yayıncılık.

Yerdelen-Damar, S. & Aydın, S. (2015). Fen öğrenme yaklaşımlarının öğrenme ortamı algıları ve hedef yönelimleri ile ilişkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 40*(179), 269-293.

Yıldırım, A.& Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. (10. Basım).* Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, H. (1996). *İlkokul beşinci sınıf türkçe ders kitaplarının kelime ve cümle kadrosu* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Yılmaz, T.& Doğan, Y. (2014). 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin anlamını bilmedikleri kelimeler ve Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki kelime çalışmaları bağlamında kelime öğretimi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *11*(25), 279-295.

Yiğit, A. (2011). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı ilköğretim 8. sınıf Türkçe ders kitabındaki (2009) metinlerin kelime serveti açısından incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Atatürk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.