Çelikkanat Nas, Ş. ve Yazıcı, N. (2021). The view of rhetorical relations of informative texts in Turkish language textbooks. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 9 (3),33-57.

Volume 9/3 September 2021

p. 33/57

Article History:

Received

13/07/2021

Accepted

31/07/2021

Available online

19/09/2021

THE VIEW OF RHETORICAL RELATIONS OF INFORMATIVE TEXTS IN TURKISH LANGUAGE TEXTBOOKS¹

Şenay ÇELİKKANAT NAS²

Nermin YAZICI³

Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to describe the diversity and frequency of rhetorical relations that ensure the consistency in informative texts in middle school (5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades) Turkish language textbooks. Semantic relations in the texts were examined within the framework of Rhetoric Structure Theory, and the outlook of rhetorical relations were defined according to grade levels. Only informative texts in the textbooks were selected. Listening texts and free reading texts were excluded from the study. The selection of informative texts was made on the basis of the text type classification determined by the Ministry of National Education. Informative texts at each grade level were identified and classified in terms of sub-text types. While some text types were represented at every grade level (such as articles), some text types were limited to one or a few grade levels (such as criticism, instructions). In the study, the paragraphs were handled as the basic unit, and the rhetorical relation views that ensure consistency in the whole and in the paragraph background were presented in a tabular form. It was observed that the relations used in the texts mostly clarified the text types and the rhetorical relations differed in terms of frequency and diversity distribution according to the grade levels. In addition, at the lower grade levels (especially the 5th grade), the genres (such as cartoons) familiar to the student were used in order for the student to have a positive attitude towards informative texts.

Keywords: Consistency, informative text, rhetorical relationship.

¹This study was produced from the master's thesis of the first author, which was prepared under the supervision of the second author.

² PhD Student, Gazi University /Turkish Teacher, Ministry of National Education / Turkey, celikkanatsenay@gmail.com, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2570-0017>

³ Prof. Dr, Hacettepe University, Department of Social Sciences end Turkish Language Teaching, nerminyazici@gmail.com, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0145-9772>

INTRODUCTION

Mother tongue education aims to develop basic language skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) through a planned and programmed education process. The main material that is frequently and widely used in the process of mother tongue education in school environments is textbooks. "Textbooks are the main reference source for the program to achieve its purpose" (Yaylı, 2010, p. 22). The content of Turkish language textbooks consists of mostly reading texts. For this reason, one of the aspects that should be emphasized first in the mother tongue education is to develop text knowledge and consciousness (Dilidüzgün, 2017).

Textlinguistics, which examines texts from many aspects, provides important theoretical information in the evaluation of the types and qualities of texts in Turkish language textbooks. Textlinguistics evaluates the text, which is the main research subject, as a whole, "which deals with the grammatical and semantic structures of oral and written texts and in this way the communicative dimension of the text" (Yazıcı, 2004, p. 7), it tries to explain how a text is structured while establishing semantic relations, and what kind of communicative functions these relations assume (Oraliş & Özil, 1992). Making use of the data of textlinguistics, which makes the text the subject of research, contribute to making these texts more functional (İşeri, 2010). Therefore, it reveals the necessity of benefiting from the possibilities of textlinguistics in terms of recognizing the structural features of the types of texts in Turkish language textbooks and acquiring a genre-specific reading style.

By looking at the literature, it is observed that researchers make various classifications about text types (Akyol, 2014; Bozkurt, 2018; Dilidüzgün, 2017; Güneş, 2013; Korkut, 2016). Texts in Ministry of National Education (MoNE) Turkish Language Curriculum classified under three main headings as informative texts, narrative texts and poetry (MONE, 2018a).

The students encounter many different types of texts in the school environment, especially through textbooks, and by examining these texts at various levels, they learn how to approach texts both in the field of literature and mass media (Yılmaz & Topal, 2010). Having knowledge about the text type and structure (the communication purpose of the text, the rhetorical structures specific to the text, the use of language, etc.) enables the text recipient to understand what he/she reads and reach a deep structure (Sara Kuzu, 2004). Thanks to the fact that the reader, who has a wide knowledge of text type, is aware of the purpose and structure of the text, the reader enters the world of the text and makes sense of what he/she reads. Therefore, the knowledge of the text type enables the reader to realize how to approach informative and narrative texts and open a schema in the reader's mind. Informative texts contribute to the knowledge world of the reader by enabling the reader to create functional information that he/she can use by questioning and discussing the information he/she has learned on any subject (Sara Kuzu, 2004). These types of texts are produced to inform the recipient of the text, to make them think, to prove or change the ideas put forward. Informative texts present scientific, historical and technical information with terms while conveying information to the text recipient, and It also uses superiority-contrast, cause-effect and problem-solution structures while delivering the information to the text recipient (Tok & Küçük, 2014). These structures show the semantic relations in the text and the reader must be able to notice these relationships in order to make sense of the text. The processing of the established relations by the reader is possible by reaching the semantic structure of the text. Therefore, the frequency of the reader's

encounter with the semantic relations presented and the activities to make these relations aware are determinative in making sense of the text.

The Rhetorical Structural Theory (RST), which examines the coherence and semantic relations in the text, focuses on the hierarchy and relations between propositions. In terms of informative texts, the rhetoric structure is a theory that provides a productive analysis of text structure, and it has a distinct advantage, especially for text production that includes didactic/informative texts (Nicholas, 1994). For this reason, rhetorical relations can be observed more clearly in these text types, since the relation networks of informative text types are more frequent and clear. Recognizing and processing rhetorical structure relations improves reading skills by providing meaning to the text. In this context, since learning/information increases with the development of reading skills, it has been observed that thanks to the knowledge gained through reading, what is heard becomes more understandable in the listening process, and the production of speaking and writing becomes more qualified in the speaking and writing processes (Sadiku, 2015). Therefore, reading comprehension skill is an important linguistic skill that should be given weight and priority and that also develops other skills.

It was seen that in the Turkish Language Curriculum (MoNE, 2018a, pp. 52-63), it was aimed to make students encounter various text types and improve their reading skills: "He/she reads the text in accordance with the characteristics of the genre. Distinguishes the text types. Summarizes what he/she reads. Comments on texts/Interprets the content of the texts. Makes comparisons between the texts. Makes inferences about what he/she reads. Produces different solutions to the problems discussed in the texts." It was observed that the acquisitions were included in all grade levels and most of them were repeated. As the grade level increases, new skills aiming at linguistic development are as follows: "Comprehends the steps of work and processing in the text. Determines the forms of expression in the text. Determines the ways of developing the thinking used in the text." these acquisitions at the 7th and 8th grade levels are the acquisitions for reading comprehension under the basic reading language skills. Since reading skills are developed through texts, the texts used in the textbooks are important both in terms of achieving the purpose of the program and improving reading-comprehension skills.

In this study, the semantic relations in the informative texts in the Turkish textbooks were examined according to the Rhetorical Structure Theory, and the variety of rhetorical structures exhibited by the texts and the appearance of this diversity at grade levels (5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades) were described. In the analysis of the rhetorical structures in the texts, the paragraphs were considered as the basic unit, and the rhetorical relation views that ensure consistency in the whole paragraph and in the paragraph background were defined.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Text and Textlinguistics

Textlinguistics is a branch of linguistics that determines all kinds of linguistic facts and rules in various text types by considering the function, structure of the text as a whole and the relations between the elements that make up the text. Textlinguistics deals with "structural and functional orders of the elements that make up the text, text types and sub-types, interdisciplinary studies in the processing of texts, stylistics and rhetoric relations" (İmer, Kocaman, & Özsoy, 2011, p. 190).

The texts are not only formed by the random ordering of propositions or sentences, they are coherent and consistent products in which sentences are in relation with each other in order to ensure communication. Uzun (2001) defined the text as “not an object with certain inherent characteristics, but an object that shows the feature of being or not being a text in line with the decisions made by the recipient for whether certain expectations are fulfilled or not” (p.197). Yazıcı (2004), on the other hand, defined the text as “a related linguistic integrity that includes linguistic and rhetorical arrangements in line with the communicative purposes it carries and the expectations that make these goals clear” (p.57). In this context, textlinguistics is a field that helps the text recipient to interpret and make sense of a text more easily in terms of its functionality (İşeri, 2017). In textlinguistics studies, whether the approaches focus on the grammatical dimension of the text or the communicative dimension of the text, the main subject of study of textlinguistics is the “text” (Oraliş & Özil, 1992).

One of the basic and primary fields of study of textlinguistics is text types. The text structure is shaped according to the purpose and schematic structure of the text and helps the interpretation process, this structure points out the genre characteristics of the text (Bozkurt, 2019). Text types are important both in terms of their arrangement according to communicative purposes and in directing the interpretation processes and expectations of the reader (Yazıcı, 2004).

Text types require different reading styles because their arrangement is different (Korkut, 2016). The text type, with its structural features, enables the reader to comprehend the text type and to perceive what kind of reading style it requires. “The type of text determines how the receiver (reader, listener) will interact with the text, and enables the receiver to open the appropriate frame in his/her mind and to establish the relevant text world in this way” (Yazıcı, 2004, p. 11). For this reason, it is important for the text receiver to recognize the type of text encountered and to recognize this type for the process of making sense of the text. Because being able to produce and understand a text also includes learning the genre features of a text (Dilidüzgün, 2017). The use of language and format suitable for the text type by the text producer reveals the necessity of the text receiver to gain a different reading skill and technique by understanding these types (Sidekli, 2018). While Bozkurt (2019) points out the importance of the text type in language education, he states that the researches made affect the reading and comprehension skills in Turkish language teaching. Therefore, it is revealed that the texts selected for the textbooks should provide the appropriate variety of text types, and the requirement of selecting texts that best represent the genre.

Textuality Criteria

The elements formed by the relations that make a reading paragraph a text and the components that enable communication with the receiver in the text are called textuality criteria. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) discussed the criteria of textuality with their qualities including the communicative aspect of texts. The textuality criteria are examined under two subheadings: text-centered criteria (cohesion and coherence) and user-centered criteria (purposefulness, informativeness, acceptability, intertextuality, contingency) (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981).

Cohesion

Cohesion is the grammatical bonds in the surface structure of the text to provide intertextual relations. These bonds are arranged with words and affixes in a way that preserves semantic integrity. Cohesion is related to the linking elements of the structural and logical relations between a text and its members, and the ordering of intralinguistic references in a way that provides linguistic integrity (Korkut, 2017).

Coherence

Coherence includes semantic/logical connections in the text and forms the basis of textuality criteria. Linguistic structures seen on the surface of the text may not always take place in the coherence relation, as in cohesion. For this reason, interpretation is needed to make sense of the text, since the relationship of coherence is not seen on the surface of the text at first (Onursal, 2003). The text receiver creates this interpretation with his/her cultural background, the text type knowledge and linguistic competence. If the text recipient does not have sufficient knowledge, he/she will have difficulty in making sense of the text. In other words, while the in-text context consists of the relations of language indicators with each other, in the non-text context, especially the communication environment, the speaker's/listener's world information, the purpose for which they participate in communication, etc. factors gain importance" (Subaşı Uzun, 1995, p. 31).

Coherence requires a listener or reader to be able to establish some kind of connection between an idea and the context in which that thought is expressed (Kehler, 1995). In order for the text recipient to establish this connection, the sentences that make up the text must be in relation with the sentences before and after them, and the semantic connections must be established correctly. The most important feature that determines these semantic connections, that is, coherence relation types, is the text type. The text type directly drives the in-text layout and arrangement in the text. Linguistic structuring and shaping in the narrative text type is quite different from the linguistic structuring and shaping in the informative text type. For example, narrative type texts (story, fairy tale, etc.) contain the narration of events based on temporal sequence, and it is established with the elements of person, event, time, space and narrator. Informative texts (essays, articles, criticisms, etc.), on the other hand, are texts that present a subject or idea by establishing a justification and causality relationship, contain claims or counter-claims, and whose subjectivity or objectivity varies according to the type of text, unlike narrative elements.

As briefly explained above, coherence is a concept related to many dimensions and appearance of the text. Coherence, which is the basic criterion for a text to be a text, has an important place both in textlinguistics and in theories of text and discourse.

The Rhetorical Structure Theory

Rhetorical Structure Theory is one of the theoretical approaches used to define coherence relations in texts. Rhetorical Structure Theory is one of the theories created by Mann and Thompson in the 1980s as a result of their detailed analysis of texts and examining the rhetorical relations between segments/blocks of discourse (Mann & Thompson, 1988). In the RST, there are relational propositions that affect the text recipient's understanding of the text's linguistic signs in the surface structure and the communicative content in the deep structure. Relational propositions are inferential propositions that are not clearly stated in the text but occur in the process of making sense of the text (Çeltek Kaili, 2014). One of the two structures that make up the relational proposition is called the Nucleus and the other is called the Satellite. The core is at the center of the rhetorical relation and is the structure that carries the purpose of the text generator. The satellite, on the other hand, is

the element that enriches the communicative function that serves this purpose. The more important structure in the pattern is the core, and the structure that supports this structure or facilitates interpretation is the satellite. A satellite is a supporting structure that provides consistency between propositions. While the core proposition cannot be subtracted from the text, in some cases, for example, in summary, satellite propositions can be subtracted from the text. Although the smallest unit in the theory is accepted as a sentence, each proposition or sentence in the discourse establishes a relationship in relation to other sentences, these connecting links form blocks and blocks are considered a unit (Turan, Zeyrek, & Bozşahin, 2012). Sometimes a clause may be in a rhetorical relationship with a clause or sentence, which highlights the functionality of the discourse parts (Çeltek Kaili, 2014). The RST also aims to describe these propositions that relate to each other, the coherence relations between sentences or paragraphs.

The RST uses nucleus and satellite hierarchy to seek coherence through semantic relationships established in the text. The linguistic structure limits of these relations (such as clause, sentence, paragraph) are controversial. Although there is no consensus on how the discourse segments/blocks will be, the definitions of the formation of these segments vary from theory to theory (Çeltek Kaili, 2014). Paragraphs are a concept specific to written language only, and since the formation of paragraphs can be arbitrary, the variety is limited when creating a pattern within the boundaries of a text; In addition, since paragraphs are a typological concept, individuals do not think in paragraphs, so they are called Discourse Block (Kaplan, 1972). Although there are significant discussions and objections about the paragraph in the literature, there are also studies based on the paragraph in many studies (Selvikavak, 2006; Can, 2012). In this study, which was carried out on written texts, the paragraph was taken as the basis of the rhetorical structure.

The RST, which examines the structuring of discourse, is flexible because it is developed based on data and observations, and it has a positive approach to tools produced to be used in data analysis (Turan, Zeyrek, & Bozşahin, 2012). For this reason, from 25 to 400 rhetorical relations can be diversified in the theory, and there may even be more than one relation between the propositions (Çeltek Kaili, 2014). Linguistic units marking these relations on the text surface are not always clearly coded. For example; "I've been looking for you all day, I couldn't reach you." "I've been looking for you all day, but I couldn't reach you." There is a negative expectation relationship in both sentences. In the first sentence, the text receiver can reach this meaning inferential, while the conjunction (but) in the second sentence makes this relationship more evident on the text surface and makes it easier for the text receiver to notice this relation. However, on the other hand, while some linguistic codes make it easy to interpret the semantic relation, some linguistic codes can cause misinterpretations (Nicholas, 1994). For example, the semantic functions of the conjunction "but" in the sentences "I want to come to you, but my mother won't let me" and "I love you but/very (in Turkish the word "ama=but" has also the meaning of "çok=very") much" play different roles. This semantic inference will be wrong, if the decoder only acts as the expectation negation relation of the conjunction "but". Nicholas (1994) also draws attention to the fact that conjunctions represent different semantic relations in sentences, as in the example. Therefore, the context must be taken into account when interpreting the coherence relations of the text receiver. In other words, this variation exhibited by the same linguistic units that encode the rhetorical relation should also be included in the teaching material.

As it mentioned before, the type of text determines how the type of rhetorical relationship is to be established. The same rhetorical relations may not exist in every text type, and the same rhetorical relation may not provide the same task and semantic relation, when it is

included in different texts. In fact, there may be more than one rhetorical relation nested in a sentence. Therefore, the same rhetorical relation recognized by the reader requires different processing in a different text type (Çakır, 2003). The reader's recognition of text types and rhetorical relations will contribute to this processing process. The Rhetorical Structure Theory "works on pieces of text that are composed of two or more text sentences and present a pattern, whether they are complex sentences marked with connectors, or independent sentences" (Uzun, 2019).

In the RST, rhetorical relations are handled in two categories: content or information-oriented semantic relations and presentational relations. While information-oriented semantic relations aim to inform the reader, presentational relations are more related to the Speech Act Theory and deal with the oral field (Nicholas, 1994). Some of these suggested relations aim to activate the reader, while others aim to inform the reader.

Content or Information Oriented Semantic Relations

1. Elaboration relation: They are two-ring structures. While presenting information content about an event or situation in the core structure, it aims to inform the reader by detailing the satellite structures such as group-member, framing-sampling, step-by-step, general-to-specific, whole-part/part-whole and object-object properties.

2. Framing relation in terms of time and place: While it provides information about an event or situation in the core structure, it provides information about the time and place of this event or situation in the satellite structure.

3. Circumstance relation: It is a relationship in which there is a condition for the event or situation in the satellite structure to occur in order for the event or situation in the core structure to happen.

4. Condition and otherwise relation: Failure of an event or situation in the core location causes the event or situation in the satellite structure to occur.

5. Solutionhood relation: While expressing a problem in the satellite structure in this rhetorical relationship, information about the solution of this problem is given in the core structure.

6. Purpose relation: The core-located structure should present an event or situation that has occurred, and a targeted event or situation should be included in the satellite structure. In other words, although the information about whether the event or situation in the proposition in the satellite position has taken place is not known, it is mentioned about a goal that is desired to be achieved.

7. Causality relation (cause bundle): This relationship is examined in four sub-headings in itself. It is in the form of optional cause, optional consequence, non-optional reason, non-optional result. In the causality relationship, information is given along with the reason why an event or situation happened between the propositions.

8. Interpretation relation: While an event or situation is transmitted in the core structure, information is given about the attitude towards this event or situation in the satellite structure. The most important point is that there is no semantic or referential link between core and satellite propositions. Information is accessed inferentially.

9. Evaluation relation: An event or situation is conveyed in the proposition in the core structure, while in the satellite structure, information is given about the attitude towards this situation based on the information in the core structure. The important point here is that core and satellite propositions are connected to each other in terms of semantic or referential.

10. Restatement relation: Both the proposition in the core structure and the propositions in the satellite structure express the same semantic expressions. However, both propositions repeat this information in a different way.

11. Contrast relation: There is a multi-core structure in this rhetorical relationship. In other words, there is no satellite position proposition. In this structure, all propositions have the same importance. Semantically, the similarities or differences between propositions are compared.

12. Summary relation: It consists of core-positioned propositions. The satellite-positioned propositions are included in the text to give details. In the text, the information previously conveyed with the core-positioned propositions is summarized, that is, it is repeated by making it more important. There may be more than one rhetorical relationship within a summarization relationship.

13. Sequencing relation: There is a multi-core structure in this rhetorical relationship. In other words, there is no satellite structure. The sequencing relationship is divided into two: the listing relationship and the narrative relationship. If there is no talking about an event, there is no sequentiality in time and there is informational content such as food items, shopping list, to-do list, etc., this rhetorical relationship is a listing relationship. However, if an event is in question and there is sequentiality in time, it is a narrative relationship.

14. Insertion Relation: Mann (1999) classified this relationship among multinucleated structures. It is a relationship in which information of equal importance is presented in addition to the basic information in the text.

Presentational Relations

1. Competence relation: An event or situation in the proposition in the core structure describes a competence that is expected to occur on the reader/listener. In the proposition in the satellite structure, the information that the reader/listener needs to realize and make sense of this competence is given. In short, if the receiver of the text realizes the information presented to him in this rhetorical relationship, he has the competence to be reached.

2. Direction or background relation: In this rhetorical relationship, propositions in the core and satellite structure support each other semantically. In other words, in order for an information to be accessible, a proposition in the satellite structure is needed. This semantic relationship either gives information about the background of the proposition in the core structure or directs the text receiver to the desired situation or behavior on any subject.

3. Counter-thesis relation: There is a comparison that takes place on core and satellite structures. In this relationship, the text producer aims to positively change the attitude of the text recipient through comparison.

4. Motivation relation: While giving information about an event or situation in the proposition in the core structure, it aims to activate the reader/listener to realize this event or situation in the satellite structure.

5. Justification relation: In the core structure, information is given about a subject. On the other hand, in the satellite structure, there is information showing that the text producer has the authority, knowledge, and right to transmit this information to the reader/listener and enables him to accept it.

6. Proof relation: In the core structure, there is a claim about a subject, event or situation. In the satellite structure, supporting information is given to prove this claim. The aim is to persuade the text recipient.

7. Negating the expectation relation: It is aimed that the text receiver displays a positive attitude by including contradictory statements in the core and satellite positioned propositions of the text producer. The text generator deliberately produces these contradictory statements. While one of these conflicting propositions contains a situation that should happen, the other proposition contains the information that this expectation does not come true.

METHOD

In this study, survey model, which is one of the descriptive research methods, was used. Scanning models are research approaches that aim to describe a situation that existed in the past or that still exists (Karasar, 2012). The qualitative dimension of the research was constituted by the document analysis of the textbooks used by the students within the framework of the basic principles and concepts of textlinguistics. The rhetorical relations in the informative texts in the Turkish textbooks used at the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades were handled as a unit, and the semantic relations in the paragraphs were described.

Research Object of the Study

The data of the study were obtained from the informative texts in the middle school 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grade Turkish language textbooks (2018b, MoNE; 2018c, MoNE; 2018d, MoNE; 2018e, MoNE Publications). In Turkish language textbooks, 7 texts at the 5th grade, 14 texts at the 6th grade, 13 texts at the 7th grade, and 10 texts at the 8th grade, a total of 488 paragraphs obtained from 44 texts were studied.

Data Collection Process

Qualitative data of the study were obtained by examining the data of the research, the informative texts in the middle school Turkish textbooks used by students in the 2018-2019 academic year. During the analysis of the data, first of all, the texts in the textbooks that were the source of the research were analyzed using the RST. The texts in these books were determined as informative texts and sub-types of informative texts according to grade levels. 7 texts for 5th grade level, 14 texts for 6th grade level, 13 texts for 7th grade level, 10 texts for 8th grade level were determined, listening texts were excluded from the study. Subtypes of the informative texts were classified for each grade level. The paragraphs that made up the texts were numbered within themselves. By keeping the table with rhetorical relations and their explanations ready, rhetorical relations providing consistency were determined in the numbered paragraphs. At the same time, since more than one rhetorical relationship can be found in a sentence or paragraph, rhetorical relationships within/under the paragraph were also determined. Five paragraphs from the analyzed texts, grade levels and text types (such as essay, memoir, article) were presented to the opinion of three experts. According to the opinions of the experts, the analyzed texts were revised again. Expert opinion was sought again for the undecided relations in the subsequent descriptions. Based on the opinions of the experts consulted, final corrections were made, and the frequency and variety of rhetorical relations used in the informative texts determined at each grade level were described.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, data were obtained from informative texts in middle school 5, 6, 7 and 8 grade Turkish language textbooks. The texts were analyzed and described in the light of the principles of the Rhetorical Structure Theory developed by Mann and Thompson (1988). In this study, the classification of content or knowledge-oriented semantic relations and presentational relations made by Mann and Thomson was used. In addition, Mann (1999) classified rhetorical relations as single-core relations and multi-core relations. Content or information-oriented semantic relations 14 rhetorical relations (narrative and listing relations were evaluated separately) and presentational relations 7, which are not in the

classification of rhetorical relations, but in the classification of multi-core relations, were included in this study. Thus, a total of 22 rhetorical relations were used as data collection tools. Below is the table with the rhetorical relations.

Table1 *Rhetoric Relations*

Rhetoric Relations	
Content/Information Oriented Semantic Relations	Presentational Relations
1.Elaboration relation	16.Competence relation
2.Framing relation in terms of time and place	17.Direction or background relation
3.Circumstance relation	18.Counter-thesis relation
4.Condition and otherwise relation	19.Motivation relation
5.Solutionhood relation	20.Justification relation
6.Purpose relation	21.Proof relation
7.Causality relation	22.Negating the expectation relation
8.Interpretation relation	
9.Evaluation relation	
10.Restatement relation	
11.Contrast relation	
12.Summary relation	
13.Sequencing relation	
14.Narrative relation	
15.Insertion relation	

Data Analysis

In this study, textlinguistic concepts and theories were used in the analysis of informative texts in middle school Turkish language textbooks. The data obtained from the texts were analyzed by the content analysis. Content analysis is a technique frequently used in the analysis of data in qualitative research in the fields of social sciences. Content analysis is a type of analysis in which any written text or document is examined, interpreted and numerical data are obtained (Ekiz, 2015). Textbooks, essays, newspapers, novels, magazine articles, cookbooks, songs, political speeches, advertisements, pictures – in fact, the content of almost any communication – can be analyzed (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). In this study, the texts in Turkish language textbooks were examined through document analysis, content analysis was made, and the numerical findings obtained were tabulated.

FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

In this study, the texts in the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grade Turkish textbooks were examined, and rhetorical relations that ensure consistency in the whole paragraph were described. The number of informative texts according to grade levels and the number of paragraphs that made up these texts were presented in the table below.

Table 2 *Number of Informative Texts and Paragraphs according to the Grade Levels*

Grade Level	Number of Texts	Number of Paragraphs
5 th grade	7	100
6 th grade	14	136
7 th grade	13	148
8 th grade	10	104
Total	44	488

As seen in Table 2, there are 100 paragraphs in 7 informative text of the 5th grade level, 136 paragraphs in 14 informative text of the 6th grade level, 148 paragraphs in 13 informative text of the 7th grade level, and 104 paragraphs in 10 informative text of the 8th grade level. In this study, a total of 44 texts and 488 paragraphs were analyzed and interpreted in tables according to grade levels.

The View of Rhetorical Relations in Whole and Background of the Paragraphs

In the informative texts of the middle school Turkish language textbooks, an example was given for the views of rhetorical relations that provide paragraph unity, the most common knowledge or content-oriented semantic relations and presentational relations at each grade level. As stated before, since there might be more than one rhetorical relationship in a sentence, examples of appearance of both the whole paragraph and subparagraph rhetorical relations were presented together in this section.

While showing the rhetorical relations about the texts, first the grade level, then the text name, the page number in the textbook and the number of paragraphs in the text are shown. The whole relationship of the paragraph (PW) is presented directly by the item name (eg, the elaboration relationship), and the relationship in the paragraph background is shown as PB.

The View of the Most Common Rhetorical Relations at the 5th Grade Level

In the informative texts of the 5th grade Turkish language textbook, it was determined that the relation of elaboration from information or content-oriented semantic relations took place 41 times, and the relation of direction or background from presentational relations 13 times. Below are examples of two paragraphs that represent an elaboration relation and a direction or background relation.

In the example taken from the text titled "Uzayda Bir Gün" in the 5th grade Turkish language textbook, it was seen that while the elaboration relation was included in the whole paragraph, framing relation in terms of time and place and causality relation were exhibited in the paragraph (PB).

"Here is the section called 'Zvezda (Zivezda)', which is reserved as the living space for astronauts on the Space Station (PB: The framing relation in terms of time and place). Here is a kitchen counter, fridge, exercise equipment, sleeping cabin, toilet and bathroom! Astronauts eat three meals a day, just like on earth. The food menus are just like the menus on earth. Each of the food is prepared on earth in small packets of one portion. So that they last a long time, some of them are dehydrated and some are frozen. Therefore, food

may need to be added with water or heated before it is consumed (PB: Causality Relationship) (MoNE, 2018b, 5th Grade, Uzayda Bir Gün, p.104, 3rd paragraph)

The paragraph above, which is an example of the elaboration relation, details the living quarters of the astronauts on the Space Station and what they do in a day, in the order of framing-examplifying. Under the paragraph indicated by PB, the relation between framing relation in terms of time and place, and causality relation is clearly seen. There is a framing relation in terms of time and place, as information is given about the place introduced by the references of 'here' in the sentence and paragraph of "Here is the section called 'Zvezda (Zivezda)', which is reserved as the living space for astronauts on the Space Station." "So that they last a long time, some of them are dehydrated and some are frozen. Therefore, food may need to be added with water or heated before it is consumed." At the same time, the information about how they follow the way they consume food under the paragraph was included in the causality relation and it was made clear with the conjunction 'therefore'.

The example of a 5th grade direction or background relation paragraph was taken from the text "Reçete".

"We are in the rose season. Be careful, do not pass the season without even smelling a rose. Even not content with that, get those layered roses and boil a nice rose jam. You know, rose also has syrup. Syrup-sherbet is made from cranberry, rosehip, pomegranate and rose, all of which are flavorless, additive-free, for healing purposes, make a note of it." (MoNE, 2018b, 5th Grade, Reçete, p.229, 8th paragraph)

Throughout the paragraph, it is observed that the text producer directs the text recipient on what to do during the rose season.

The View of the Most Common Rhetorical Relations at the 6th Grade Level

In the informative texts of the 6th grade Turkish language textbook, it was determined that the narrative relation, which is an information or content-oriented semantic relation, takes place 41 times, and the direction or background relation from presentational relations 11 times. Below are two paragraphs representing the narrative relation and the direction or background relation as an example.

The narrative relation 6th grade paragraph example was taken from the text titled "Türk Askerinin Cesareti".

"There were cries and groans on our side. An injured British Captain caught between two trenches is out in the open: 'Help! Save me, help me!' he shouted. Someone shouted from the trenches: 'One of you should go and fetch the Captain!' The soldiers said to each other: 'Go, you bring it!', 'No, you bring it! I don't want to die... The Captain will die soon anyway. What is the need? They were saying, 'Let the commander bring it if he has the courage.'" (MoNE, 2018c, 6th Grade, Türk Askerinin Cesareti, p.44, 4th paragraph, Narrative relation)

It was observed in the paragraph that an event that developed during the war on the front was described in order of priority, and the sequentiality of this time was clarified with dialogues from time to time.

Direction or background relation 6th grade example paragraph was taken from the text "Bisiklet Zamanı". Under the paragraph, there is an elaboration relationship.

“Use the lanes for bicycles or ride where there is no motorized traffic – for example, in parks” (PB: Elaboration relationship).” (MoNE, 2018c, 6th Grade, Bisiklet Zamanı, p.205, 7th paragraph).

In the paragraph, the text generator directs to ensure the safety of cyclists. Also in the paragraph, “Use the lanes for bicycles or ride in areas where there is no motorized traffic—for example, in parks.” There is an elaboration relation by giving an example.

The View of the Most Common Rhetorical Relations at the 7th Grade Level

In the informative texts of the 7th grade Turkish language textbook, it was determined that the narrative relationship, which is an information or content-oriented semantic relation, took place 64 times, and the counter-thesis relation took place 8 times from presentational relations. Two paragraphs representing the narrative relation and the counter-thesis relationship were given below as an example.

The narrative relation Grade 7 example paragraph was taken from the text titled "Ordular İlk Hedefiniz".

“Everyone is so excited that in fact, no one can see the real situation of the Commander-in-Chief. In fact, he gives some orders to his aides, trying not to show it to anyone:
—Don't forget to call Bekir Sami, aide!
Then he shouts as if football were the most important event for him at that moment:
- Alas, foul, foul!..
Then he squints his lips and whispers to his squire again:
—No one will ever know!
- It's exactly two o'clock. In Fevzi Pasha's room! Goal, goal, goal!.. Finally, our guys scored too, boy! Goal!" (MONE, 2018d, 7th Grade, Ordular! İlk Hedefiniz, p.45, 5th paragraph, Narrative relation).

In the paragraph, it was observed that the event of organizing a football match in wartime was conveyed by considering the sequentiality in time, and the sequentiality relation was clarified by giving place to the dialogues between the heroes of this event.

The counter-thesis relation 7th grade paragraph example was taken from the text titled "Yeni Dünya". Under the paragraph, there is a competence relation.

“Virtual reality is now used not only in entertainment, but also in medicine and design. In the future, virtual reality will be as mundane as cinema.” (PB: Competence relationship). (MONE, 2018d, 7th Grade, Yeni Dünya, p.146, 15th paragraph).

In this paragraph, virtual reality is compared in terms of places of use. In this paragraph, it is aimed to change the reader's attitude that virtual reality is not limited to a single field, but is multifaceted. Under the paragraph, “In the future, virtual reality will be as mundane as cinema.” If this versatility is noticed in the sentence, while it is stated that future cinemas will be different from today, there is a relation of competence.

The View of the Most Common Rhetorical Relations at the 8th Grade Level

In the informative texts of the 8th grade Turkish textbook, it was determined that the elaboration relation from information or content-oriented semantic relations took place 25 times, and the relation of direction or background from presentational relations 10 times.

Below are examples of two paragraphs that represent an elaboration relation and a direction or background relation.

The example of the 8th grade elaboration relation was transferred from the text titled "Selimiye Camii". In this paragraph, along with the elaboration relation in the whole paragraph, a contrast relation was also observed under the paragraph.

"The courtyard consists of two rectangular areas that are approximately equal to each other. The most magnificent of the doors entering the courtyard opens to the west. When you enter through the door here, you come across a bowl-shaped fountain made of white marble without a roof. This hexagonal fountain is one of the most beautiful designs of the Classical Period of Ottoman Architecture (PB: Contrast relation). There are 18 domes and 16 columns in the courtyard with the fountain. The outer courtyard of Selimiye surrounds the mosque on three sides." (MONE, 2018e, 8th Grade, Selimiye Camii, p.110, 5th paragraph).

In the above paragraph, information on how the mosque courtyard and the fountain was built was presented. It was observed that this information was elaborated by making use of the whole-part relation. Under the paragraph, "This hexagonal fountain is one of the most beautiful designs of the Classical Period of Ottoman Architecture." The contrast relation has been determined by using the emphasis that the design of the fountain described with the sentence is more beautiful than the similar ones.

The 8th grade direction or background relation sample paragraph is taken from the text called "Selimiye Camii". Under the paragraph, there are relations of framing in terms of time and place and negating the expectations.

"Selimiye tiles are the production of İznik's heyday and were ordered from here with an edict dated 1572 (PB: framing relation in terms of time and place). The sultan who built the mosque Selim II ordered that there should be tiles up to the windows and that Surah Fatiha should be written on the windows with tiles. Despite the measured use seen in this practice in the heyday of Turkish tile art, the quality and pattern of the tile panels and the decoration program are the only examples of today (PB: Negating the expectations relation). Selimiye Mosque tiles have a very special place in Turkish tile art with its unique and Ottoman architecture that is not found in other buildings." (MONE, 2018e, Grade 8, Selimiye Camii, p.122, 10th paragraph).

Throughout this paragraph, background information about Selimiye Mosque was given. Under the paragraph, there is a framing relation in terms of time and place with the expressions "1572 and İznik". In the paragraph, "Despite the measured use seen in this practice in the heyday of Turkish tile art, the quality and pattern of the tile panels and the decoration program are the only examples of today." In the sentence, it is thought that this situation will not be the same as before due to the measured use of tile art, and contrary to popular belief, the relation of negating the expectations was determined.

The View of Rhetorical Relationship Variety and Frequency in Informational Texts in terms of Grade Levels (5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Grades)

In this section, the rhetorical relationship variety and frequency of informative texts according to grade levels were shown in tables. In addition, the frequency and variety of selection of sub-types of informative texts at each grade level were discussed.

The element that reveals the text type is related to how the language is used formally, structurally and semantically according to the purpose of communication. "The communicative purposes of the text determine the type of the text, and the text type determines the language usage specific to that text" (Yazıcı, 2004, p. 11). Therefore, since the text types and rhetorical relations are symmetrical, it is usual to see the diversity of the relations followed according to the characteristics of the text types and differences in the level of representation. For example, in an article type text, the purpose relation is used in the section where the purpose of writing the article is stated, and the elaboration relation is used in the sections where the presentation of the information in the article is detailed by various methods (eg, exemplification, group-member). In memoir type texts, since an event is conveyed with elements of sequentiality in time, the relation between narrative and framing in terms of time and place is one of the expected rhetorical relations.

When we look at the text types at the 5th grade level, there are one example each of the paper, guide/description, brochure and conversation types, and three examples of the article type.

Table 3 *The Rhetorical Relation Variety and Frequency of 5th Grade Level Informative Texts*

Rhetoric Relations			Paragraph Whole (PW)	Paragraph Background (PB)
Content/Information Relations	Oriented	Semantic		
1.Elaboration relation			41	7
2.Framing relation in terms of time and place			7	3
3.Circumstance relation			-	11
4.Condition and otherwise relation			-	-
5.Solutionhood relation			2	3
6.Purpose relation			2	8
7.Causality relation			12	12
8.Interpretation relation			-	3
9.Evaluation relation			-	-
10.Restatement relation			1	2
11.Contrast relation			6	4
12.Summary relation			1	1
13.Sequencing relation			4	-
14.Narrative relation			-	2
15.Insertion relation			-	9
Presentation Relations				
16.Competence relation			4	2
17.Direction or background relation			13	9
18.Counter-thesis relation			1	-
19.Motivation relation			4	7
20.Justification relation			-	-
21.Proof relation			1	1
22.Negating the expectation relation			1	-
Total			100	84

When the rhetorical relations table of the 5th grade level 7 informative texts is examined in Table 3, there are 100 rhetorical relations in the whole paragraph, and 84 relation variations in the paragraph background, due to a total of 100 paragraphs.

It was observed in the table that the elaboration relation, which was displayed 41 times in the whole paragraph and 7 times in the paragraph background, is the most frequently displayed rhetorical relation. This is due to the typical feature of the informative text type of the texts. The causality relation was exhibited 12 times both in the whole paragraph and in the paragraph background. As with the elaboration relation, the frequent display of causality is one of the genre features of informative texts. It was observed that the framing relation in terms of time and place was observed 7 times in the whole paragraph and 3 times in the paragraph background. In the types of papers, diaries and articles, the event or situation cited in the texts, as a feature of the genres, becomes evident in terms of time and place. Although the conditional relation is not included in the whole paragraph, it is represented 11 times in the paragraph background. While the listing relation was followed 4 times in the whole paragraph, it was not followed in the paragraph background. The listing relation clarified the genre feature of brochure and description type texts.

Direction or background and motivation are presentational relations, and these relations are frequently exhibited in texts of notice and instructions since they aim to activate the text recipient in terms of attitude and behavior. The direction or background relation was exhibited 13 times in the whole paragraph, 9 times the paragraph background, the motivation relation was displayed 4 times in the whole paragraph, and 7 times in the paragraph background. Condition and otherwise, evaluation, justification relations were never encountered.

There are 14 informative texts at the 6th grade level. Two of these texts were determined as memoirs, three brochures, one notice, one autobiography, three articles and anecdotes, one travel, one essay, one interview, one guide/description.

Table 4 *The Rhetorical Relation Variety and Frequency of 6th Grade Level Informative Texts*

Rhetoric Relations			Paragraph Whole (PW)	Paragraph Background (PB)
Content/Information Relations	Oriented	Semantic		
1.Elaboration relation			31	16
2.Framing relation in terms of time and place			5	16
3.Circumstance relation			2	16
4.Condition and otherwise relation			1	1
5.Solutionhood relation			3	3
6.Purpose relation			3	25
7.Causality relation			10	25
8.Interpretation relation			3	5
9.Evaluation relation			4	4
10.Restatement relation			1	2
11.Contrast relation			3	17
12.Summary relation			-	1
13.Sequencing relation			8	3

14.Narrative relation	41	6
15.Insertion relation	1	15
Presentational Relations		
16.Competence relation	2	3
17.Direction or background relation	11	4
18.Counter-thesis relation	1	2
19.Motivation relation	6	10
20.Justification relation	-	4
21.Proof relation	-	1
22.Negating the expectation relation	-	2
Total	136	182

As can be seen in Table 4, 136 rhetorical relations were found in parallel with the number of paragraphs in the whole paragraph, and 182 rhetorical relation diversity and frequency in the paragraph background. According to the findings, narrative relation is the most common rhetorical relation in the texts. The narrative relation was observed 41 times in the whole paragraph and 6 times in the paragraph background. It was determined that this relationship mostly took place in the genres of memoir, autobiography and travel. This is due to the fact that the arrangement of these genres was in the form of a narration. The elaboration relation was followed 31 times in the whole paragraph and 16 times in the paragraph background. Since this relation reflects the genre feature of informative texts, it is the most frequently encountered and expected rhetorical relation. The framing relation in terms of time and place was used 5 times in the whole paragraph and 16 times in the paragraph background, making the texts presented in narrative form such as memoir, autobiography and travel clear in terms of time and place. It was observed that the purpose and causality relations were found in the paragraph background twenty-five times, and as in the condition relation, it is more frequent in the whole paragraph. This situation arises from the fact that condition, purpose and causality relations are exhibited as a relation between propositions in the texts examined as in the condition relation. While the contrast relation was used 3 times in the whole paragraph, the reason why it was found in the paragraph background 17 times is because it represents the relationship between the two core structures by making comparisons. While the listing relation was used 8 times in the whole paragraph, it was observed that it was represented three times in the paragraph background. This relation is mostly obtained from brochure and description type texts in the paragraphs examined, and it was observed that the listing relation clarified the genre characteristics of the brochure and description type texts. While the addition relation was used once in the whole paragraph, it took place 15 times in the paragraph background. The difference in the whole paragraph and background of this relation was created by adding core-structured information to the core structure knowledge in order to make the information added in the analyzed texts more visible than the other information.

The direction or background relation, which is one of the presentational relations, was found 11 times in the whole paragraph and 4 times in the paragraph background. It was observed that this relation was represented in texts such as conversations, statements, descriptions and brochures that aimed to guide the reader in terms of attitude and behavior. The motivation relation was observed 6 times in the whole paragraph and 10 times in the paragraph background. Motivation relation is a presentational relationship as in the direction or background relation, and it was frequently represented in such texts as it was aimed to mobilize the reader in some texts.

It was observed that in 6th grade level informative texts, all rhetorical relations appeared at least once in whole or background of the paragraph. It was observed that rhetorical relations with high frequency made the text types they represented clear.

There were 13 informative texts at the 7th grade level. These informative texts were classified as two memoirs, three articles and anecdotes, one autobiography, two essays, one diary, one letter, one criticism, two travel genres.

Table 5 *The Rhetorical Relation Variety and Frequency of 7th Grade Level Informative Texts*

Rhetoric Relations	Paragraph Whole (PW)	Paragraph Background (PB)
Content/Information Oriented Semantic Relations		
1.Elaboration relation	32	6
2.Framing relation in terms of time and place	15	14
3.Circumstance relation	-	13
4.Condition and otherwise relation	-	2
5.Solutionhood relation	6	1
6.Purpose relation	3	17
7.Causality relation	7	27
8.Interpretation relation	-	7
9.Evaluation relation	-	4
10.Restatement relation	1	6
11.Contrast relation	2	32
12.Summary relation	2	8
13.Sequencing relation	-	-
14.Narrative relation	64	7
15.Insertion relation	-	10
Presentational Relations		
16.Competence relation	2	4
17.Direction or background relation	1	6
18.Counter-thesis relation	8	6
19.Motivation relation	2	2
20.Justification relation	-	-
21.Proof relation	2	2
22.Negating the expectation relation	1	4
Toplam	148	178

As seen in Table 5, there were a total of 148 paragraphs in the informative texts in the 7th grade Turkish language textbook. Therefore, it was observed that there were 148 rhetorical relation diversity in the whole paragraph, and 178 rhetorical relation diversity in the paragraph background.

The most frequently used rhetorical relationship in the analyzed texts was the narrative relation with 64 times in the whole paragraph and 10 times in the paragraph background.

It was observed that the narrative relation was the most frequently exhibited relation in texts such as memoirs, autobiographies, travels and diaries. This relation is significant as these text types were arranged in the narrative form. Exhibiting the elaboration relation, which is frequently encountered in informative texts, 32 times in the whole paragraph and 6 times in the paragraph background is a significant relation in terms of text type and rhetorical relation type. The framing relation in terms of time and place was exhibited 15 times in the whole paragraph and 14 times in the paragraph background. This relation is significant in terms of the genre characteristics of these genres, as it requires framing in terms of time and place in the texts such as memoirs and autobiographies. While the purpose relation was observed 7 times in the whole paragraph and 27 times in the paragraph background, the purpose relation was displayed 3 times in the whole paragraph and 17 times in the paragraph background. It was observed that causality and purpose relations established a relation either between two propositions or between two sentences. The contrast relation was observed 2 times in the whole paragraph and 32 times in the paragraph background. This difference observed in the whole paragraph and the paragraph background of the contrast relation is related to the fact that the contrast relation was formed as a result of establishing a relation between two core structures.

Among the presentational relations, the counter-thesis relation was represented 8 times in the whole paragraph and 6 times in the paragraph background. Since the presentational relations are rhetorical relations that are frequently encountered in the act of speaking, the level of representation in written texts is limited. However, it was observed that the counter-thesis relation was represented more frequently than other presentational relations. This finding was obtained from critical texts.

It is one of the findings that the variety and frequency of rhetorical relations in the informative texts at the 7th grade differed according to the types of text represented, as in other grade levels.

There were 10 informative texts at the 8th grade level. These texts consist of three interviews, two criticisms, four articles and anecdotes, and a biography.

Table 6 *The Rhetorical Relation Variety and Frequency of 8th Grade Level Informative Texts*

Rhetoric Relations	Paragraph Whole (PW)	Paragraph Background (PB)
Content/Information Oriented Semantic Relations		
1.Elaboration relation	25	7
2.Framing relation in terms of time and place	8	12
3.Circumstance relation	2	7
4.Condition and otherwise relation	1	2
5.Solutionhood relation	-	1
6.Purpose relation	1	4
7.Causality relation	4	16
8.Interpretation relation	4	19
9.Evaluation relation	5	5
10.Restatement relation	-	-
11.Contrast relation	3	22

12.Summary relation	2	3
13.Sequencing relation	-	-
14.Narrative relation	17	3
15.Insertion relation	-	2
Presentational Relations		
16.Competence relation	1	-
17.Direction or background relation	10	12
18.Counter-thesis relation	8	4
19.Motivation relation	3	3
20.Justification relation	4	6
21.Proof relation	4	2
22.Negating the expectation relation	2	5
Total	104	135

As seen in Table 6, a total of 104 paragraphs were observed in the 8th grade informative texts, hence 104 rhetorical relations in the whole paragraph and 135 rhetorical relations in the paragraph background.

It is significant that the elaboration relation is the most frequent rhetorical relation with 25 times in the whole paragraph and 7 times in the paragraph background, as expected in informative texts. It was observed that the framing relation in terms of time and place was exhibited 8 times in the whole paragraph and 12 times in the paragraph background, making these texts clear in terms of time and place. Interpretation relation was observed 4 times in the whole paragraph and 20 times in the paragraph background. The reason why the interpretation relationship was observed more in the paragraph background is that the relation between sentences does not affect the whole paragraph in terms of semantics. The contrast relation was exhibited 3 times in the whole paragraph and 22 times in the paragraph background. As stated on the theoretical basis, the contrast relation has a multi-core structure, so it is meaningful to observe it frequently in the paragraph background because it establishes a relation between two nuclei. The narrative relation was observed 17 times in the whole paragraph and 3 times in the paragraph background.

The direction or background relation was followed 10 times in the whole paragraph and 12 times in the paragraph background. Conversation type, which is an extension of this relation, was frequently detected in texts. The counter-thesis relation was observed 8 times in the whole paragraph and 4 times in the paragraph background. It was observed that this relationship frequently took place in the texts of criticism, as it was aimed to change the attitude of the reader.

As can be understood from the data obtained from the informative texts of the 8th grade level, significant differences were observed in the variety and frequency of some rhetorical relations. This is a meaningful relation considering the diversity in text types.

It is significant that the sub-types of informative texts differed at all grade levels, depending on the frequency and variety of rhetorical relations represented. It is usual to follow these rhetorical relations because the frequency of appearance of information or content-oriented rhetorical relations is higher than the presentational relations, and because informative texts contain knowledge. Since presentational relations are related to the act of speaking,

it was observed that these relations were frequently observed in the texts where the text producer addressed the reader and included the reader in the text.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The informative texts in the middle school (5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades) Turkish language textbooks published by the Ministry of National Education in the 2018-2019 academic year were described in terms of the frequency and variety of rhetorical relations according to grade levels. In this study, which is based on the text type classification made by the Ministry of National Education, under the heading of informative texts, essays, biographies, autobiographies, articles, blogs, petitions, brochures, e-mails, news and advertisement texts, ephemera, diary, postcard, guides, travel writing, letter, anecdote, conversation, memoir, social media messages, quotations etc. text types were included (MONE, 2018a).

When the Turkish language Curriculum (MoNE, 2018a) was examined, it was observed that the texts such as notices and criticism were not included. However, although it was not included in the Turkish Language Curriculum, when the Turkish language textbooks were examined, it was observed that the examples of the types of notices were given at the 5th and 6th grade levels, and the examples of the criticism types were given at the 7th and 8th grades. When the rhetorical relations in these texts were examined and the findings obtained were considered, it was observed that the relations that made the genre clear were encountered.

In the light of the information obtained by examining the informative texts, as can be seen in the table below, rhetorical relations vary in terms of variety and frequency at each grade level.

Table 7 The View of Rhetorical Relations in the Whole Paragraph according to Grade Levels

Rhetoric Relations	5th Grade	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade
Content/Information Oriented Semantic Relations				
1.Elaboration relation	41	31	32	25
2.Framing relation in terms of time and place	7	5	15	8
3.Circumstance relation	-	2	-	2
4.Condition and otherwise relation	-	1	-	1
5.Solutionhood relation	2	3	6	-
6.Purpose relation	2	3	3	1
7.Causality relation	12	10	7	4
8.Interpretation relation	-	3	-	4
9.Evaluation relation	-	4	-	5
10.Restatement relation	1	1	1	-
11.Contrast relation	6	3	2	3
12.Summary relation	1	-	2	2
13.Sequencing relation	4	8	-	-
14.Narrative relation	-	41	64	17
15.Insertion relation	-	1	-	-

Presentational Relations

16. Competence relation	4	2	2	1
17. Direction or background relation	13	11	1	10
18. Counter-thesis relation	1	1	8	8
19. Motivation relation	4	6	2	3
20. Justification relation	-	-	-	4
21. Proof relation	1	-	2	4
22. Negating the expectation relation	1	-	1	2

This usage is common, as elaboration and causality relations are rhetorical structures that highlight the generic features of informative texts, which were frequently encountered at every grade level. When informative texts are considered in terms of their structure, content and linguistic features, it is an expected result to encounter these relations in terms of detailing the information presented with the elaboration relation and presenting it in a causality relation. The framing relation in terms of time and place is the rhetorical relation that is frequently encountered in the genres of memoir, biography, autobiography and travel. This relation is significant because the listing relationship is frequently used in brochure and instruction types of texts.

The rhetorical relation that is frequently exhibited in the types of memoir, biography, autobiography, diary, travel and letter in the informative text type classification is the narrative relation. As it is known, the type of text is sensitive to certain rhetorical structures in text organization and production. These texts are narrative texts, and therefore, these types are the text forms in which the narrative relation is frequently followed. However, these texts were classified by the Ministry of National Education under the type of informative text, not the type of narrative text. It is thought that the reason for such a classification by the Ministry of National Education is related to the fact that these texts carry a reference to reality. In addition, although it was shown that the types of biography/autobiography could be found at the 7th and 8th grade levels in the program, an example of biography/autobiography was given in the form of cartoons in the 6th grade Turkish language textbook, and it was observed that the students were aimed to develop a positive attitude towards this genre. Considering the arrangement of some texts, it was observed that the genre features of texts such as conversation, caricature and narrative were used in the texts in order to attract the attention of the students and to develop a positive attitude towards the informative text. The narrative relation appeared for different purposes at different grade levels. Due to the generic characteristics of some texts, a narrative relation was encountered while concretizing the information presented for the purpose of exemplifying an event in some informative texts.

Direction or background relation, which is one of the presentational relations, was frequently observed in brochure and notice type texts, and the purpose was to guide the reader. One of the most frequently exhibited relationships was the counter-thesis relation, one of the presentational relations. This relation was most frequently represented in the texts of criticism. Considering the generic feature of the critique texts and the representation purpose of the counter-thesis relation, this relationship is meaningful.

The fact that some rhetorical relations were frequently encountered and some rhetorical relations were not encountered at all arose as a result of the text writer's transformation of the text into different forms, such as the origin of the texts' genre. The reader can recognize

these distinctions with the knowledge of the text type. For this reason, the diversity of text types used in school environments will enable students to develop their genre knowledge.

The communication between the text and the student takes place when the student realizes the structure of the text using his knowledge of the world and the rhetorical arrangements of the text. As it is known, each type of text has a genre-specific rhetorical arrangement. In order for students to make sense of these texts in the books, they need to realize the rhetorical relations. This awareness depends only on the frequency of encountering these relations in the text and the diversity of these relations. Therefore, reading skills develop by recognizing and making sense of these relations, and the development of reading skills also contributes to the development of writing, speaking and listening skills. For this reason, the higher the frequency and variety of rhetorical relations that the student encounters, the more he/she understands the text by using familiar rhetorical relations when he/she encounters a text type that he/she does not know. Therefore, the fact that the texts encountered by the students are rich in terms of genre diversity and rhetorical relations frequency will contribute to their reading and comprehension skills. For this reason, the texts to be selected for Turkish language textbooks are extremely important in terms of developing reading skills, understanding and remembering the text.

Recommendations. Since only the written texts were examined in this study, listening texts, the way the teacher conducted the lesson and the activities in the textbook were excluded from the study. Therefore, in terms of using rhetorical relations or raising awareness, examining the activities in the textbook, listening texts and rhetorical relations used by teachers with lesson observation method and their being the subject of new studies will contribute to the field.

REFERENCES

- Akyol, H. (2014). *Turkish teaching methods suitable for the program*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Beaugrande, R.-A. d., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. Londra: Longman.
- Bozkurt, B. Ü. (2019). Turkish teacher candidates' tendency to conceptualize text types and their genre awareness. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Faculty of Education Journal*, 86-102.
- Can, R. (2012). *Paragraph level coherence and consistency in the written expressions of secondary school students* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Gazi University: Ankara.
- Çakır, Ö. (2003). The effect of the pattern on focusing on the sub-topics of the text in the reading recall process. *Education and Science*, 28(129), 32-36.
- Çeltek Kaili, A. (2014). The importance of discourse structure in teaching Turkish. In D. Yaylı & Y. Bayyurt, *Teaching Turkish to foreigners: policy methods and skills* (pp. 139-168). Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2017). *Textlinguistics and Turkish teaching*. Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Ekiz, D. (2015). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-hill.
- Güneş, F. (2013). Learning with text instead of text teaching in Turkish. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, Special Issue of Teaching Turkish*, 603-637.

- İmer, K., Kocaman, A., & Özsoy, A. (2011). *Linguistics Dictionary*. Istanbul: Bogazici University Press.
- İşeri, K. (2010). Textuality features of texts in Turkish textbooks. *Analysis of Turkish textbooks* in H. Ülper (91-113). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- İşeri, K. (2017). *Word-to-text text*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric*. Karasar, N. (2012). *Scientific research method*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kehler, A. (1995). *Interpreting cohesive forms in the context of discourse inference*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Research in Computing Technology Harvard University.
- Korkut, E. (2016). Text linguistics and language teaching. E. Korkut, & İ. Onursal Ayırır. *Linguistics and language teaching* (p. 173-199). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.
- Korkut, E. (2017). *Word and identity*. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical Structure Theory: toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, 8(3), 243-281.
- Mann, B. (1999, August). *An Introduction to Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST)*. http://www.di.uniba.it/intint/people/fior_file/INTINT05/RST.pdf
- MONE. (2018a). Turkish language curriculum: <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=663>
- MONE. (2018b). 5th grade Turkish textbook for secondary and imam hatip secondary schools. Ankara.
- MONE. (2018c). 6th grade Turkish textbook for secondary and imam hatip secondary schools. Ankara.
- MONE. (2018d). 7th grade Turkish textbook for secondary and imam hatip secondary schools. Ankara.
- MONE. (2018e). 8th grade Turkish textbook for secondary and imam hatip secondary schools. Ankara.
- Nicholas, N. (1994). *Problems in the application of Rhetorical Structure Theory to text generation*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.
- Onursal, İ. (2003). Cohesion and consistency in Turkish texts. In A. Kıran, E. Korkut, & S. Ağildere. *Contemporary Linguistic Studies*, 1-20.
- Oralış, M., & Özil, Ş. (1992). An attempt to analyze a literary text with a textlinguistic approach. *Linguistic Studies*, p. 37-51.
- Sadiku, L. M. (2015). The importance of four skills reading, speaking, writing, listening in a lesson hour. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, s. 30-32.
- Sarar Kuzu, T. (2004). The effect of reading instruction in accordance with the Interactive Model on the level of understanding Turkish informative texts. *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 37(1), p. 55-77.
- Selvikavak, E. (2006). *An application on improving the paragraph writing skills of advanced students in teaching Turkish as a foreign language* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University: Ankara.
- Sidekli, S. (2018). Text teaching. In M. Yılmaz. *Teaching Turkish in the light of new developments* (p. 135-165). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Subaşı Uzun, L. (1995). *Textlinguistic structure of the Orkhon Inscriptions*. Istanbul: Simurg Book.
- Tok, M., & Küçük, B. (2014). Sources of student informative texts and evaluation of media elements. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences*.
- Turan, Ü. D., Zeyrek, D., & Bozşahin, C. (2012). Discourse and cohesion relations. *Linguistic Studies*, 41-65.
- Uzun, G. L. (2019). Ankara University open course materials. Textlinguistics Open Course

- notes. <https://acikders.ankara.edu.tr/course/view.php?id=2081>
- Uzun, L. (2001). Self-formations specific to scientific texts and the act of writing scientific text. *Anatolia: Journal of Tourism Studies*, 197-204.
- Yaylı, D. (2010). Turkish curriculum and textbooks. In H. Ülper. *Turkish textbook analyzes* (pp. 21-36). Ankara.
- Yazıcı, N. (2004). *Linguistic aspects that highlight the foreground and background in narrative texts: Observations on Turkish*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara: Ankara University.
- Yılmaz, E., & Topal, Z. (2010). Textlinguistic analysis in Turkish teaching application of the method. *Journal of Turkology Studies*, 27, 775-788.