

An Investigation of Vocabulary in Written Texts of Iraqi Arab Students Learning Turkish as a Foreign Language*

Huzeyfe BİLGE** İbrahim Dođukan DEMİREL***

Abstract. In this correlational study, the aim was to investigate the vocabulary of 31 Arab students who learned Turkish as a foreign language through lessons with distance education. Total words, different words, and the ratio of these two variables, word frequencies were all measured. The correlations between the variables, and the differences between the categories and word counts were analyzed. Lastly, the word list was given. According to findings, the students wrote 57,5 words per participant, which consisted of 41.3 different words on average. The ratio between these two variables was 73.8%. Students wrote a total of 506 different words and 1781 total words. The most used 44 words consisted of the 52.9% of all words used by all participants. There was no correlation between age and other variables while total words had significant relationships with different words and the ratio. Similarly, different words had a correlation with the ratio. There were significant differences between male and female students according to different word numbers, while they were similar in total word counts and in ratio. Students had significantly better results in different and total word numbers as their proficiency classes (A1 and A2) got higher.

Keywords: Turkish as a foreign language, Iraqi Arab students, vocabulary, writing skill

* This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 8th International Congress Of Teaching Turkish As A Foreign Language (ICOTFL22) held in Skopje, North Macedonia on September 15-16, 2022. Ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Kafkas University with the decision dated 07.12.2022 and numbered 25.

** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7664-488X>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Kafkas University, Department of Turkish Education, Türkiye, hbilge@outlook.com.tr

*** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2928-7514>, Dr., Türkiye, dogukan.ibrahim.87@gmail.com

Bilge, H., & Demirel, İ. D. (2022). An Investigation of Vocabulary in Written Texts of Iraqi Arab Students Learning Turkish as a Foreign Language. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 12(4), 963-981. doi: <https://doi.org/10.19126/suje.1180384>

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning a language is basically based on the teaching of two fundamental skills (reception and production) (M.E.B., 2021). According to M.E.B. (2021), writing is a productive skill and is divided into different subgroups. One of the required competence that effects the quality in writing is vocabulary. It is possible to say that the importance of words in communication, especially in learning a foreign language, is more than the importance of vocabulary in the first language. The basic reason for this is that even if the meaning of a word in the first language is not known exactly, it can be easier to guess from the context, other linguistic clues, etc. Nevertheless, it is more important to know the meaning of the word in foreign language learning, since it gets difficult to guess it due to the reasons such as the fact that the learner may not have enough command of the target language. Therefore, vocabulary is one of the most important steps for the development of four basic language skills in teaching Turkish as a foreign language as well.

The significance of vocabulary among the language skills is a widely accepted phenomenon. Numerous studies have revealed the relationship between vocabulary and language skills. For instance, Hestad (2014) and Duin (1986) found that teaching vocabulary improved students' writing skills. Beck et al. (1982) proved in their experiment that as the students' vocabulary improved, their reading comprehension improved as well. Bilge and Kalenderoğlu (2022) stated that vocabulary had a significant relationship with fluency and reading comprehension in reading, writing and speaking; therefore, that vocabulary had the highest number of correlations among these skills with others, and this demonstrated the importance of vocabulary in terms of language skills. Consequently, teaching vocabulary is a very basic subject for language skills.

If the teaching of vocabulary in the classroom is planned and carried out strategically, the efficiency will be improved. Whether it is for the Turkish students or foreigners, there are some points that need to be taken into account while teaching words in Turkish teaching. One of them is that it is essential to teach not only the pronunciation but also the comprehension of the words. According to Akyol (2015), both the recognition and differentiation of the word should be taught together in vocabulary teaching. It is possible to say that this issue has come to become even more important in teaching Turkish as a foreign language because, as stated above, the use of language clues in foreign language learning is more difficult than that of in the mother tongue. Therefore, recognition and use the words at the highest level in the vocabulary is to facilitate communication for the language learner in order to achieve the best comprehension.

It is possible to utilize innumerable different ways to improve vocabulary in learning Turkish as a foreign language. The American National Reading Panel (National Reading Panel, 2000) stated that different ways could be utilized in vocabulary teaching, such as explicit teaching of words, enabling the students to experience new words, and using the multimedia methods. In the same report, some important suggestions such as that it is

important to encounter words frequently in vocabulary teaching, that the learner should not stick to one method only, and that the learners should actively participate in vocabulary teaching activities have also been included. It is possible to use various methods in the development of vocabulary. For instance, Memiş (2018) found that teaching suffixes improved the vocabulary of foreigners learning Turkish. Furthermore, the use of activities has a significant role in students' perceptions. Students learning Turkish thought that they learnt vocabulary better through activities (Çal & Erdoğan, 2018). Therefore, using fun and useful methods will always generate positive results.

However, attention has to be paid to what kind of method should be used while developing vocabulary. It is because the presence of methods that do not have a serious impact in the relevant literature is also mentioned. For instance, even though Tıraşoğlu (2019) attempted to improve the vocabulary through a technological application, he did not find a significant difference. Therefore, it would not be entirely inaccurate to say that the positive perception towards technological tools/application is not always true. However, one of the basic principles in vocabulary teaching is that the language learner should experience the target words frequently (Karadağ, 2013). Based on this principle, it is necessary to ensure that words are frequently encountered for receptive vocabulary, and words should be used frequently for productive vocabulary.

Various arguments can be suggested as to how many words should fundamentally be recognized and known in foreign language learning. The most basic point here is to start with the most frequently used words. It is simply because most of the written and spoken texts consist of frequently used words. For instance, Thornbury (2005) stated that the 50 most frequently used words in English constituted approximately 50% of conversations, while the first 2500 words comprised approximately 95% of all daily conversations. Nation (2013) stated that 8000-9000 words were required in English for an ordinary text to be comprehended by 98%, and 6000-7000 words were needed for 95% comprehension. He also stated that the most frequently used 1000 words encompassed 78-81% of narrative texts and 81-84% of oral texts. Similar to these findings, Çetinkaya (2011) found that the 100 words most frequently used by 4th and 5th grade students comprised 61% of all words. Based on this, it is clear that the studies on word frequency in teaching Turkish as a foreign language are crucially significant in terms of both comprehension and narrative skills.

There are some studies in Turkey on vocabulary teaching in learning Turkish as a foreign language. For instance, Göçen (2016) investigated the vocabulary in narrative works of students between the A1-C1 levels. According to the findings of the study, while the total number of different words used by all students at A1 level varied between 532-637, this number was between 657-1050 at the A2 level. Thornbury (2005) stated that the productive vocabulary was half of the receptive vocabulary. Therefore, regarding the participants of Göçen (2016), it was stated that A1-level students recognized around 1200 words, while A2-level students remembered between 1200-2100 words.

Serin (2017), on the other hand, investigated the vocabulary in the narratives of students learning Turkish as a foreign language. He stated that A1-level students wrote 185-word texts in four different narratives and used, on average, 33 different words. At the A2 level, it was revealed that the students wrote in 5 different narratives with an average of 251 words and using 42 different words.

It was found that the values in question were slightly more advanced at the B1 level. Serin stated that the 100 words most frequently used by the students at A1 level constituted 60.48% of the narratives, and the 100 words most frequently used by the students at A2 level constituted 57.4% of the total narratives. These values were slightly more advanced at the B1 level. These values are slightly more advanced at the B1 level. There are also some other studies on vocabulary in teaching Turkish as a foreign language (Erol, 2014; Güvendik, 2019; Kılınç, 2011; Seyhan, 2018; Tüfekçioğlu, 2018; Yahşi, 2020). From general point of view, it is possible to state that there are similarities between the studies in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. It is noticeable that the participating students in these studies are from different nationalities. Various factors such as relations between languages, the fact that language families are close/common can impact the size of the vocabulary of students from different nationalities. The findings of Memiş (2018) demonstrated that language origins and language structures of language learners impacted learning Turkish. Furthermore, Tüfekçioğlu (2020) found that native speakers of Arabic recognized more words in some subjects than the students of other languages. As far as this point of view is concerned, for instance, it is possible to expect an Iranian student to learn many words in Turkish easily because a good deal of words has been exchanged between Persian and Turkish. Similarly, it is possible for students from Turkic Republics to learn vocabulary faster thanks to their familiarity with the language. Nevertheless, it may be slightly more challenging for a European student who has no familiarity to Turkish language to learn Turkish. Moreover, the term called learning burden (Nation, 2013) in foreign language vocabulary learning calls to attention. Accordingly, there exist different levels of difficulty for learning each word in foreign language vocabulary learning.

For example, a foreign learner who hears the words 'door' and 'foot' for the first time will probably have more difficulty learning these words than s/he will have when learning the words 'doorman!' and 'shoe'. This simply has to do with the fact that words represent a pattern and knowledge to the learner (Nation, 2013). Therefore, the concept of learning load is ruled out in the evaluation of students from different nationalities in the studies conducted in teaching Turkish to foreigners.

In the literature, it can be seen that vocabulary studies in the Turkish as a foreign language field were conducted with heterogeneous students (i.e., students with different countries). Additionally, these studies were included students who had instructions during face-to-face sessions. However, it is important to find out how distance education during Covid-19 effected the written vocabulary of the student. Moreover, investigating students from one nationality may reveal more detailed informations about vocabulary

acquisition. This is because mother language could affect the speed of acquisition of Turkish, as mentioned earlier.

In the present study, it is important to note that the vocabulary of only Iraqi Arab students has been addressed. In this sense, the research question of the present study is as follows:

- What is the vocabulary proficiency level in the narrative texts of the Iraqi Arab students at the level of A1-A2 who learn Turkish as a foreign language?
- What is the relationship between the vocabulary proficiency of these students in their narrative texts and various variables?

2. METHOD

In this study, it is aimed to investigate the productive vocabulary of A1 and A2 level Iraqi Arab students learning Turkish as a foreign language. Within the scope of the study, it was also aimed to examine the data based on the demographic variables of the students, analyze the relationships between the data and include the frequency lists of the words used by the participants. Therefore, the study was conducted in the form of relational survey (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Participants

The participants of the study were 31 Iraqi students learning Turkish as a foreign language in a private language course in the province of Ankara. 14 of the students were male and 17 of them female. They were aged between 23-59, with an average age of 29.5 years. There were 10 participants from A1 level and 21 participants from A2 level in the study. Ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Kafkas University with the decision dated 07.12.2022 and numbered 25.

Data Collection Tools

Within the scope of the study, the demographic variables of the participants were obtained from the registration system with the permission of the language course. The data obtained for the vocabulary, this time, were collected from the free narrative texts within the framework of the question the learners were asked to write in which they introduced the region they lived in.

Procedure

Participants were informed that participation in the study was on a voluntary basis. They were also told that there would be no grading or anything etc. Due to the distance education implemented, the participants put the data down in their notebooks at home and e-mailed the photographs of what they wrote to the researchers. No time limit was set for the students' narratives and they were not allowed to use a dictionary.

The narrative texts of the students were transferred to the Simple Concordance Program by the researcher. During the transfer procedure, each student was checked one by one to see if typos were made, and the detected errors were corrected.

Some restrictions were implemented in the analysis of the data. While counting the words, the TDK dictionary was used as a reference point. Proper names (such as Imam Ali), cities and persons, and abbreviations such as km. were not included in the count. The figures written with numbers were excluded from the analysis. In the figures written with numbers, one hundred, thousand, and million ones were combined with the first number.

For instance, a number such as “one million two hundred thousand four hundred and eighty-five” was calculated as one million + two hundred thousand + four hundred + eighty + five. This was because each of these numbers represented a separate digit. In proper place names, only the name describing the place was used and the proper name part was omitted.

For instance, in a pattern such as “İmam Hüseyin Mosque”, only the word “mosque” was counted. The reason for this was that the proper name should not be counted as a Turkish word, but because the words such as mosque and palace were included in the Turkish Dictionary, they should be counted. In counting of the words, if the noun-verb form of the word was in the dictionary, it was addressed separately. For instance, since the suffix “-mak” (to) was added to the word “oku” (read), it was counted separately from the verb “oku-” (read). The sign “-” was used as an infinitive in the notation of words.

Data Analysis

In the descriptive analysis of the data, the minimum and maximum values, averages, totals and frequencies were all investigated. While examining the relationships, the Mann Whitney U and correlations were investigated. Due to the small number of people in the data set, the normality distribution was not considered in the comparison of the differences between the groups; instead the non-parametric Mann Whitney U was used. In the correlation analysis, the normality distribution was investigated before the analysis of the data. For the correlation analysis, the Pearson correlation was used when the data were normally distributed, while the Spearman Brown correlation was used when data were not normally distributed. Cohen's (1988) criteria were used in order to interpret the correlations.

Limitations

The study had some limitations. First of all, since the participation was voluntary, the number of participants with only 31 students was the biggest limitation. The use of non-parametric tests can be seen as a limitation due to the small number of participants. Furthermore, the fact that the data were collected remotely due to distance education was another limitation of the study.

3. FINDINGS

In this section, the findings of the study are presented.

In Table 1, the descriptive statistics of the different and total word counts in the narrative texts of the participants are illustrated.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Participants' Different and Total Word Counts and Ratios

	Min.	Max.	<i>M</i>	Total
Numbers of different words	22	73	41,3	506
Total words	28	118	57,5	1781
Rate	56.7%	91,.%	73.8%	28%

As is clear in Table 1, while the student with the least variety of words in the narrative text used 22 different words, the student who used the most different words used a total of 73 different words. All of the students wrote the narrative texts using an average of 41.3 different words. In total, it is clear that 506 different words were used. When we look at the total words in the texts, it is seen that the student who wrote the shortest one wrote a text of 28 words, and the student who wrote the longest one produced a text of 118 words.

While the students in general produced texts with an average of 58 words, the total number of words used by all students was 1781. As far as the ratio of different words in the narrative texts written by the students in comparison to the total words, it was found that the student who used the least variety of words used different words at the rate of 56.7%; the student who used the most different words had a rate of 91.4%. The students had an average of 73.8%. The ratio of all different words in total to the total number of words was 28%.

In Table 2, the frequency information of the participants' word repetition is presented. Accordingly, it is seen that there are words that each participant has used once or twice in his/her narrative text. The number of people who used the same word three times in the text was 21. It is seen that the number of people who used the same word very frequently in their narrative text gradually decreased, and the number of participants who used a word 7,8 or 10 times was relatively low.

Table 2

Frequency table of word repetition used in texts

Word Usage Repetition	N
1	31
2	31
3	21
4	18
5	12
6	6
7	3
8	1
10	2

Table 3 illustrates the word diversity statistics of the participants. As far as Table 3 is concerned, there were a total 277 different words mentioned only once in the narrative texts of all participants. This number with a significant decrease in words that occurred twice dropped to 89. The number of words that occurred 7-97 times in total in all narrative texts was 44. These 44 different words, which were 8.7% out of the 506 words used by the students and which were different, constituted more than half of the total number of written words (52.9%). Of the 1781 written words, 942 were the words that were repeated 7-97 times.

Table 3

Word Variety Statistics for All Participants

Word frequency	Number of words	Cumulative Vocabulary	Cumulative Word Count	Vocabulary Percentage (%)	Word Count Percentage (%)
1	277	277	277	54.7	15.6
2	89	366	455	72.3	25.6
3	41	407	578	80.4	32.5
4	25	432	678	85.4	38.1
5	19	451	773	89.1	43.4

6	11	462	839	91.3	47.1
7	4	466	867	92.1	48.7
8	7	473	923	93.5	51.8
9	8	481	995	95.1	55.9
10	1	482	1005	95.3	56.4
11	1	483	1016	95.5	57
12	1	484	1028	95.7	57.7
13	4	488	1080	96.4	60.6
14	1	489	1094	96.6	61.4
15	1	490	1109	96.8	62.3
17	2	492	1143	97.2	64.2
18	2	494	1179	97.6	66.2
23	2	496	1225	98	68.8
27	1	497	1252	98.2	70.3
28	2	499	1308	98.6	73.4
46	1	500	1354	98.8	76.0
60	1	501	1414	99	79.4
62	2	503	1538	99.4	86.4
69	1	504	1607	99.6	90.2
77	1	505	1684	99.8	94.6
97	1	506	1781	100	100

For instance, while the word “and” was repeated 97 times, the word “city” was used 77 times. While the word “and” constituted 5.4% of the total number of words in all narrative texts, the word “city” had a rate of 4.4%. Therefore, it is clear that the most frequently used words constituted a large part of the total number of words in the narratives.

Table 4 illustrates the results of the analysis demonstrating the relations of the variables with each other. Since the descriptive statistics about the correlation analyzes were given in Table 1 previously, they are not repeated again here.

Table 4

Correlation analysis results of variables

	Age	Number of different words	Total word count
Age			
Number of different words	-.13 ^s		
Total word count	-.07 ^s	.94**	
Rate	-.09 ^s	-.27	-.57**

^s=Spearman Brown **= $p < 0.01$

According to Table 4, the age of the participants was not correlated with any of the variables. There was a nearly perfect correlation between the number of different words and the total number of words in the students' narrative texts ($r = .94, p < .01$). Based on this particular result, students who were able to produce longer narrative texts managed to transfer more different words to their productive vocabulary. A negative and high-level correlation was found between the total number of words used by the participants and the ratio of the number of different words in their narrative text to the total number of words ($r = -.57, p < .01$). Therefore, it is possible to say that as the narrative text grew longer, the ratio of the number of different words decreased as the students ended up repeating the same words.

Table 5 illustrates the findings by gender. According to Table 5, the only significant difference between the male students and female students was in the number of different words. Therefore, the female students used more different words than the male students. When the total words and ratios were analyzed, it was found that there was no significance.

Table 5

Results of Mann Whitney U analysis of vocabulary scores by gender

Dimension of vocabulary	Group	N	Mean Rank	Total Rank	U	p
Different word	Male	14	12,4	173	68	.04*
	Female	17	19	323		
Total word	Male	14	13,7	191.5	86.5	.2
	Female	17	17,9	304.5		
Rate	Male	14	14,9	208	103	.5
	Female	17	16,9	288		

* $p < .05$

Table 6 presents the results of Mann Whitney U analysis of vocabulary variables by the level of students.

Table 6

Results of Mann Whitney U analysis of vocabulary scores according to language level

Dimension of vocabulary	Group	N	Mean Rank	Total Rank	U	p
Different word	A1	10	8.4	84	29	.001**
	A2	21	19.6	412		
Total words	A1	10	8.9	89	34	.003**
	A2	21	19.4	407		
Rate	A1	10	17	170	95	.67
	A2	21	15.5	326		

** $p < .01$

As is clearly seen in Table 6, the students at A2 level had significantly higher values in both the number of different words and the total number of words than the students at the A1 level. Nevertheless, considering the ratio, there was clearly no difference between the levels.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this study, the vocabulary in the narrative texts of Iraqi Arab students at A1-A2 level who learnt Turkish as a foreign language were investigated. While it was seen that the students used an average of 41.3 words per person, the total word variety in all narrative texts was 506. The total number of words used by all students who wrote narrative texts with an average of 57.5 words per person was 1781. While the ratio of words in narrative texts to total words was 73.8% per person, the ratio of 506 words to 1781 words was 28%.

It is clear that there have been variable findings in the studies on the vocabulary of foreign students learning Turkish as a foreign language. In the study by Erol (2014), for instance, it was stated that the students at A1-A2 level generated texts with an average of 89.9 words. The difference of about 30 words between this and present studies can be explicated by the fact that the quality of education received by the students and the fact that the exam were face-to-face. In our study, the data was collected remotely and the education of the students was carried out remotely. Therefore, it is possible to say that face-to-face education generated more effective results.

Similarly, Serin (2017) stated that A1-level students wrote 185-word texts in four different narratives and used 33 different words on average. At the A2 level, it was seen that the students produced 5 different narratives using an average of 251 words in total and 42 different words. It was found that these values were slightly more advanced at the B1 level. Göçen (2016) found that the three groups using three different textbooks at A1 level used different words between 593-637, and the three groups at A2 level used different words between 657-1050.

Based on these data, it is clear that the total number of words in general and the number of different words in the narrative texts of students learning Turkish as a foreign language differed by various variables. Even though it is difficult to offer a definite reason for what these variables might be, it is understood that the factors such as distance or face-to-face education and the textbook used (Serin, 2017) might be effective.

When we consider the data about the frequency of the words used by the participants in the narrative texts, it is possible to observe that some students repeated the same word very often. For instance, while one student used the same word eight times, two students repeated the same word 10 times (see Table 2). When we look at the word diversity of all the participants (see Table 3), it is clear that there were 277 words that were used only once.

Roughly speaking, it is possible to say that the number of words repeated six or more often was very small. While there were 11 words that were repeated six times, the more frequently repeated words ranged from one to eight. There were also 97 words in all narrative texts. It is clear that the most common 44 words in the narrative texts of the students constituted 18.7% of the total number of different words and 52.8% of the total words used. Accordingly, 941 out of 1781 words consisted of the most frequently repeated 7-97 words.

The most frequently used words in students' narrative texts were listed as "and, city, there is/are, me, one, many". It was found that among these words "and, there is/are, ben, one" were the most used words in the study of Yahşi (2020). Similar words were also repeated in other studies (Erol, 2014; Göçen, 2016; Serin, 2017). Furthermore, in our study, it was observed that only the words "and" and "city" constituted approximately 10% of all the words written in the texts. Considering that the word "city" was used very often because it was related to the given subject, it is easily understood that one of the most frequently used words by the foreign students was "and".

It has been stated many times that the most frequently used words in written or spoken language constitute a large part of the daily use of the produced language. For instance, Thornbury (2005) stated that according to some estimates, 2500 words made up about 95% of all spoken language in English. He also stated that the 50 most frequently used words made up about half of the conversations. Nation (2013) stated that 8000-9000 words were needed in order to understand almost all of an ordinary text in English. He

also stated that the most frequently used 1000 words made up about 80% of the narrative texts. A similar finding was revealed by Stæhr as well (2008).

This particular issue has also been addressed in the context of Turkish language. Çetinkaya (2011) found that the 100 words most frequently used by 4th and 5th grade students constituted 61% of all word usage. In the context of Turkish as a foreign language, Serin (2017) revealed that the 100 most frequently used words by students at A1 level constituted 60.48% of their narrative texts and that the 100 most frequently used words by students at A2 level constituted 57.4% of their total narrative texts.

These values were slightly more advanced at the B1 level. Therefore, it is understood that the most frequently used words in a language take up a comprehensive place in daily productive language use. It is more clearly understood that inclusion of the most frequently used words in vocabulary teaching will facilitate the comprehension of the target language. In fact, it is stated that the frequencies are important in vocabulary teaching (Milton & Alexiou, 2009; Stæhr, 2008). However, in the context of Turkish, it may be misleading to start from the international studies in order to decide on how many words should be known in order to comprehend an ordinary narrative text at what rate. The reason for this is the finding that the number of words required to be known to comprehend an ordinary narrative text varies between languages (Milton & Alexiou, 2009).

When the relationship of the variables with one other is examined, while it was seen that there was a nearly perfect positive relationship between the number of different words and the total number of words ($r=.94, p<.01$), it was found that there was a high negative correlation between the total number of words and the ratio ($r=-.57, p<.01$). Such results are also available in the studies conducted with Turkish students. In the study Temur (2006) conducted with 4th and 5th graders, it was found that the correlation of different word counts in different text types with the total word count in the relevant text type varied between .964 and .974. Similarly, it was found that there were high and reverse correlations in the ratios of the total number of words in each text type to the total words of different words.

Based on this particular finding, it was seen that the number of different words increased as the text got longer, but the ratio of different words in the total text decreased, that is, the author began to use the same words over and over again. As far as this finding is concerned, it is possible to say that the students who knew more words could produce longer texts. This is simply because knowing more words can lead to a more comfortable usage of the language. People with limited vocabulary may tend to produce shorter text.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to say that the longer the text is, the more different words will be used. It is simply because, as is clearly seen in Table 4, as the total number of words increased, the ratio of the number of different words to the total number of words decreased. It is possible to combine and interpret these two particular findings as

follows: The students with more words in their productive vocabulary could produce longer texts. However, as the text grew longer, the ratio of the number of different words in the texts of the students to the length of the text decreased gradually due to the repetition of the same words. In the study done by Göçen (2016), it was seen that even though the students at C1 level wrote long texts and used more different words, they had the lowest percentage of different words in the total number of words compared to most of the students at other levels. This situation was also visible in the study of Temur (2006) with Turkish students. Therefore, care should be taken when interpreting the word diversity since the length of the text in the study is to be considered as well.

It was revealed that there was no significant relationship between age and any of the variables. It is possible to consider it normal that there is no relationship between age and any variable, simply because even though the ages of the participants were different, they started to learn the language at the same time. Furthermore, the fact that they were at the beginner level and the limited number of participants might also be a factor. There are some other studies proving that there is no significant relationship between age and vocabulary (Tüfekçioğlu, 2020).

As far as the difference between the variables by gender is concerned, it was seen that the females possessed more vocabulary diversity than men. However, it was found that there was no significant difference in terms of total words and the ratio of different words to the total words. When we look at the studies in the relevant literature, it is seen that there have been different findings in terms of vocabulary by gender. For example, Çetin (2017) found that the female students in Syrian secondary school students had more vocabulary than the male students. However, Tüfekçioğlu (2020) found that there was generally no significant difference between male and female students. Therefore, it seems to be difficult to argue that there is a consistent difference between the genders.

Looking at the difference between the language proficiency classes, it was clear that the participants at the A2 level were significantly better than those at the A1 level, both in the number of different words and in the total number of words. Nevertheless, there was no significant difference between the proficiency classes according to the ratio of different words to the total number of words.

Considering the previous studies, even though the results differed, it is possible to say that the use of different words increased as the proficiency class increased. Gündoğdu (2020) found that there was no regular increase in word diversity in the narrative texts of A1-B2 level students. However, he concluded that the students who used different words the most were at the B2 level. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that different words were used with the increase in the proficiency class. It is possible to say that the words used by the students were closely related to their textbooks. Serin (2017) found that the students used words similar to the words in the books that they used in their productive vocabulary. Therefore, it is possible to say that it is necessary to include as many different words as possible in the textbooks. Göçen (2016), who investigated the textbooks, found that the textbooks he examined generally made an irregular progress

in terms of vocabulary between the proficiency classes, and only one book demonstrated a consistent progress from A1 to C1. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that serious analyzes and examinations should be performed about the word diversity in the textbooks.

5. SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following suggestions can be offered:

- In the studies on vocabulary, the impact of mother tongue should be investigated. In future studies, it is recommended to investigate the differences among the students whose mother tongues are different.
- As far as the studies in the relevant literature, are concerned it is possible to say that the textbook has a huge impact on vocabulary of the learners who use the textbook. Therefore, it is recommended that attention be paid to the diversity of words in the textbooks to be used and prefer the textbooks with a large variety of words.
- The small number of participants in the present study may have limited the patterns that the data could reveal. Therefore, studies with more participants may generate more specific results.
- In this study, only beginner level participants were included. It is possible to obtain different results in studies involving participants between A1 and C1 proficiency levels.

References

- Akyol, H. (2015). *Türkçe ilk okuma yazma öğretimi [Primary teaching of reading and writing in Turkish]*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Baş, B. (2011). Söz varlığı ile ilgili çalışmalarda kullanılacak ölçütler [Criteria to be used in studies on vocabulary]. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları*, 29, 27–61.
- Beck, I. L., Perfetti, C. A., & McKeown, M. G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(4), 506–521. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.74.4.506>
- Bilge, H., & Kalenderoğlu, İ. (2022). The relationship between reading fluency, writing fluency, speaking fluency, reading comprehension, and vocabulary. *Education and Science*, 47(209), 156–171. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2022.9609>
- Çal, P., & Erdoğan, E. (2018). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin etkinliklerle kelime öğretimi hakkındaki görüşleri [Opinions of students learning Turkish as a

- foreign language about teaching vocabulary through activities]. *Uludađ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31, 153–164.
- Çetin, S. A. (2017). *Suriye uyruklu ortaokul öğrencilerinin Türkçe yazılı anlatımlarında kelime hazinesi [Vocabulary in Turkish written expressions of Syrian secondary school students]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya.
- Çetinkaya, Ç. (2011). *İlköğretim 4 ve 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin kelime kullanım sıklıkları üzerine bir araştırma [A research on the frequency of word usage of primary school 4th and 5th grade students.]*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation) Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Çiftçi, M. (1991). *Bir grup yükseköğretim öğrencisi üzerinde kelime serveti araştırması [Vocabulary research on a group of higher education students]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Duin, A. H. (1986). *The effects of intensive vocabulary instruction on expository writing*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minnesota.
- Erol, H. F. (2014). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde temel seviye kelime edinimi [Basic level vocabulary acquisition in teaching Turkish as a foreign language]*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Göçen, G. (2016). *Yabancılar için hazırlanan Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki söz varlığı ile Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin yazılı anlatımlarındaki söz varlığı*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Gündođdu, M. (2020). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin kelime hazinesi üzerine bir durum tespiti: A1- B2 örneđi [A case study on the vocabulary of students learning Turkish as a foreign language: A1- B2 example]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Güvendik, T. (2019). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde dil-kültür ilişkisi bağlamında yazınsal metinlerin temel söz varlığı açısından incelenmesi [Examination of literary texts in terms of basic vocabulary in the context of language-culture relationship in teaching Turkish as a foreign language]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Nevşehir.
- Hestad, L. C. (2014). *The impact of vocabulary instruction on writing fluency*. Walden University, Minnesota.
- Karadađ, Ö. (2013). *Kelime öğretimi [Vocabulary teaching]*. İstanbul, Kriter.

- Kılınç, A. (2011). *Yabancılar Türkçe öğretiminde sözlü Türkçenin kelime sıklığı ve yaygınlığını belirleme çalışması [The study of determining the word frequency and prevalence of oral Turkish in teaching Turkish to foreigners.]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı (M.E.B.). (2021). *Diller İçin Avrupa Ortak Başvuru Metni: Öğrenme, Öğretme ve Değerlendirme (Tamamlayıcı Cilt) [Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment (Supplementary Volume)]* Erişim: [chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_01/04144518_CEFR_TR.pdf](http://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_01/04144518_CEFR_TR.pdf)
- Memiş, M. R. (2018). *Impact of derivational morpheme teaching on vocabulary, lexicalization skill and reading comprehension competence of the students learning Turkish as foreign language*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Gazi University, Ankara.
- Milton, J., & Alexiou, T. (2009). Vocabulary size and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. In B. Richards, M. H. Daller, D. D. Malvern, P. Meara, J. Milton, & J. Treffers-Daller (Eds.), *Vocabulary studies in first and second language acquisition: The interface between theory and application* (pp. 194–211). Londra, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. National Institute of Child Health Human Development, Washington.
- Serin, N. (2017). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi için hazırlanmış ders kitapları ile bu kitapları kullanan öğrencilerin söz varlığının karşılaştırılması [Comparison of the textbooks prepared for teaching Turkish as a foreign language and the vocabulary of the students who use these books]*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Atatürk University, Erzurum.
- Seyhan, L. (2018). *Yabancılar Türkçe öğretimi için Avrupa ortak öneriler çerçevesindeki bağlamlardan hareketle Türkçenin temel söz varlığının belirlenmesi [Determining the basic vocabulary of Turkish based on the contexts within the framework of European common recommendations for teaching Turkish to foreigners]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis), Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya.
- Stæhr, L. S. (2008). Vocabulary size and the skills of listening, reading and writing. *Language Learning Journal*, 36(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730802389975>
- Temur, T. (2006). *İlköğretim 4 ve 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin yazı dilindeki kelime hazinelerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Examination of primary school 4th and 5th grade*

students' vocabulary in written language in terms of some variables]. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Londra, Longman.

Tıraşođlu, C. (2019). *Yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde söz varlığını geliştirmeye yönelik WEB 2.0 araçları: Kahoot! örneđi [WEB 2.0 tools to improve vocabulary in teaching Turkish to foreigners: Kahoot! sample]*. (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Akdeniz University, Ankara.

Tüfekçiođlu, B. (2018). *Yabancı dil olarak akademik Türkçe: sosyal bilimlerde akademik ve teknik söz varlığı [Academic Turkish as a foreign language: academic and technical vocabulary in social sciences]*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Tüfekçiođlu, B. (2020). An analysis on the vocabulary of learners of turkish as a foreign language. *Hacettepe Egitim Dergisi*, 35(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2019051661>

Yahşi, Ö. (2020). *Yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde temel düzey söz varlığını belirleme: Yabancılar için hazırlanan Türkçe ders kitapları ile Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin yazılı ve sözlü anlatım uygulamalarına dayalı söz varlığı [Determining the basic level vocabulary in teaching Turkish to foreigners: Turkish textbooks prepared for foreigners and the vocabulary based on written and oral expression practices of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language.]*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Kafkas University with the decision dated 07.12.2022 and numbered 25.

Statement of Contribution of Researchers to the Article:

İbrahim Dođukan Demirel collected the data. Huzeyfe Bilge did the other parts of the research.

Conflict of Interest Statement

There is no conflict of interest

Statement of Financial Support or Acknowledgment:

No financial support was received from any institution for this study. No Acknowledgment.