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Abstract
This study aimed to analyze the articles examining five teaching sets commonly used in teaching Turkish as a foreign language from different perspectives by using meta-synthesis method and to reveal the research tendency in the field. For this purpose, 136 articles published in different journals in the ULAKBIM TR index, Dergi Park, ASOS, and Google Scholar databases were accessed by searching the identified keywords. The articles have been analyzed in terms of the publication year, subject area, index, method, name of the teaching set examined in the article, book type, level/grade, sample group, and data collection tool if exists. As a result of the analysis, three main themes were formed: articles analyzing teaching sets, articles taking opinions about teaching sets, and articles analyzing teaching sets and taking opinions about these sets. Under these themes, the subject areas of the articles, the teachings set, the levels, and the grades were analyzed in detail. It was realized that the number of articles that took opinions about the teaching sets and the number of articles that both analyzed and took opinions about the teaching sets was limited. According to the results of the research, it was detected that the document analysis method was mostly used in the articles, the textbooks included in the teaching sets were mostly included in the article samples, and the teaching sets were mostly analyzed in terms of culture transfer/cultural elements and vocabulary. It was also concluded that in articles examining a single teaching set, basic and intermediate level text and workbooks were included more in the article samples, but in articles examining more than one teaching set, there was a gradual decrease from basic level to advanced level.

Keywords: Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language, Teaching Sets, Textbooks, Meta-Synthesis

Introduction
Divan-i Lugat-i Turk, written by Kashgarli Mahmud in the 11th century for teaching Turkish to Arabs, is accepted as the first work prepared for teaching Turkish to foreigners (Barin, 2010; Kalfa, 2019; Maden, 2021). From this work to the present day, many works have been published by both foreigners and Turks for teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) (Bicer, 2012; Ozbal, 2020; Sahin & Yesilyurt, 2017). In recent years, the acceleration of institutionalization efforts in the field of TFL teaching has increased the number of textbooks written for this purpose.

The Turkish Language Teaching Centre established by Ankara University in 1985 can be regarded as the first step towards institutionalization in this field. The increasing interest in TFL education in Turkey with the Great Student Project launched in 1992 has accelerated the institutionalization efforts in this field. It can be claimed that great progress has been achieved in institutionalization efforts with the establishment of many institutions and organizations such as the Turkish Maarif Foundation, Yunus Emre Institute, and Turkish language teaching centers opened in many universities in the period from this date to the present day (Kose & Ozsoy, 2020). With the completion of the institutionalization process, it can be stated that TFL teaching has experienced its golden age.
Many institutions and organizations have started preparing their textbooks for teaching TFL. Yedi Iklim Turkish teaching set prepared by Yunus Emre Institute, Turkish for Foreigners teaching set prepared by Van Yuzuncu Yil University, and Turkish for Foreigners teaching set prepared by Gazi University are just a few of them. It is seen that these books have been transformed into a set consisting of materials such as workbooks, teacher’s guidebooks, CDs, DVDs, Teacher’s packs, and enriched e-books by making use of the developments in the field of information and communication technologies. In recent years, there has been a great increase in the number of articles on teaching sets prepared for TFL teaching. It has therefore become necessary to systematically analyze the articles examining the teaching sets.

Many studies in the literature examine the trends of research in the field of TFL teaching (Baki, 2019; Bicer, 2017; Demir & Ozdemir, 2017; Ozer & Tuna, 2020). However, when the current situation is examined in terms of TFL teaching sets, it is evident that textbooks are analyzed from different perspectives in the majority of articles. A single teaching set was included in the sample in some of these articles. For instance, Kahtali and Aslan (2021) examined Istanbul Turkish for Foreigners B1 textbook in terms of listening strategies; Can (2021) examined the texts in Journey to Turkish A1-A2 textbooks in terms of readability; Ekinci (2020) examined Yeni Hitit Turkish for Foreigners basic level textbook in terms of writing activities. In some articles, more than one textbook was included in the sample. For instance, Ilgun and Nurlu (2021) examined speaking activities in B1 and B2 level textbooks belonging to two different teaching sets in terms of intercultural communicative approach; Gocen and Okur (2016) examined A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1 textbooks belonging to three different teaching sets in terms of frequency and prevalence of words; Omeroglu (2016) examined A1 level textbooks belonging to four different teaching sets in terms of form and content features.

Another focus of research on textbooks is the analysis of theses. Maden (2021) examined the postgraduate theses on TFL teaching sets in detail under the titles of the year of publication, type, university, subject area, methods, and language levels. The most comprehensive research on textbooks was conducted by Kemiksiz (2021). In his study, Kemiksiz examined the distribution of articles and theses on textbooks according to the years, type of thesis, universities, number of authors, title of consultant, number of authors, sample selection, level of textbooks, and subject selection in detail. In most of the postgraduate theses in the field of TFL teaching, it is concluded that textbooks are at the top of the research sample (Baki, 2019; Celebi et al., 2019; Turkben, 2018).

As mentioned above, in the past decade much research has focused on examining TFL teaching sets from different perspectives. Despite such a large number of articles on teaching sets but it remains unclear which teaching sets, levels, and grades were analyzed the most and in which subject areas the textbooks were analyzed. For this reason, the purpose of this study was to gather the articles about the teaching sets of TFL under a single roof and to deal with them holistically. It is thought that in-depth analysis of the articles analyzing the teaching sets will enable researchers who want to conduct a research on this subject to use their time more effectively, to access and review the researches easily. In addition, it is thought that it will give researchers an idea about which teaching set is analyzed in terms of which subject area and it will guide future researches that will address teaching sets from different perspectives and avoid repeating the same studies in the future. To achieve these aims, the following questions were sought to be answered in the research:

- Which research methods were used in the articles analyzing TFL teaching sets?
- In which subject areas were the teaching sets analyzed?
- How were the TFL teaching sets analyzed in the articles?
- Which language level was most frequently analyzed in the articles?
- How were the articles analyzing TFL teaching sets handled concerning their purpose?
- How were the articles that took views on TFL teaching sets handled?
Methodology
In this section, information about the research model, data collection tool, and data analysis is presented.

Research Design
In this research, the meta-synthesis method, one of the qualitative research methods, was used. Meta-synthesis is defined as the systematic review, integration, and interpretation of the similarities and differences of the findings obtained from researches in a particular field (Calik & Sozbilir, 2014). Within the framework of the research, articles analyzing TFL teaching sets were examined in depth through the meta-synthesis method.

Data Collection
This research consists of analyzing the articles in which CLT teaching sets were analyzed until 2022. To ensure validity, and reliability in the meta-synthesis research, the data collection method, inclusion, and exclusion criteria of the studies should be explained in detail (Calik & Sozbilir, 2014; Polat & Ay, 2016). To ensure the validity and reliability of the study, all articles that met the criteria determined by the researcher were included in the study. The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the articles are as follows;

• Articles on five teaching sets, which are Yedi Iklim Turkish (Yedi Iklim), Istanbul Turkish for Foreigners (Istanbul), Yeni Hitit Turkish for Foreigners (Yeni Hitit), Turkish for Foreigners (Gazi), Izmir Turkish for Foreigners (Izmir), were included in the research.
• Articles comparing TLF teaching sets with textbooks prepared for teaching languages such as English, and German were excluded.
• Articles presented in scientific events such as symposiums and congresses and whose abstract or full text was published in the proceedings book were not included.
• Postgraduate studies on TFL teaching sets were not included in the sample of the research.

ULAKBIM TR index, Dergi Park, ASOS, and Google Scholar databases were used for the data collection process. The scanning process in databases was initiated on 15 February 2022 and ended on 15 April 2022. In these databases; “Turkish for foreigners”, “Turkish as a foreign language”, “teaching sets”, and “textbooks” key expressions were used for searching. The search was expanded by adding the names of the teaching sets analyzed within the scope of the research next to these key expressions. The determined articles were recorded in the data collection form using codes A1, A2, A3, ... , and 135, A136, and all articles included in the analysis are listed in Appendix 1 by year. For the reliability of the coding, the coding process was repeated by the researcher one month later, and it was found that the two codings were 98% consistent with each other. The distribution of the articles included in the study by publication year is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Article frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 1, a total of 136 articles published between 2012-2021 are included in the research. The years with the highest number of articles are 2020, 2019, and 2021 respectively (f=35, f=29, f=25). It can be stated that there has been a gradual increase in the number of articles since 2013. This finding indicates that in recent years, there has been a significant increase in the number of articles on TFL teaching sets.

Data Collection Tool
The articles that met the criteria given above were recorded in the data collection form. The data collection form consists of the title of the article, year of publication, subject, index, method, name of the
The data collection form was evaluated by two field experts to ensure its validity. The Kappa test was applied to analyze the opinions of the field experts regarding the data collection form. Kilic (2015) defines this test as a statistical reliability test for the agreement between two or more observers, and interprets the Kappa value in this test as “+1” which means that the results of the observers are completely compatible with each other, “0” means that the agreement of the observers depends on chance, and “-1” means that the evaluations of the observers are opposite to each other. The Kappa value of the data collection form employed in the study was calculated as 0.71. This value can be interpreted as a high level of agreement between the opinions of the field experts.

**Data Analysis**

In the research, descriptive statistics, and meta-synthesis (thematic content analysis) were used to evaluate the data. Frequency and percentage analyses of the articles included in the research were performed for the year of publication, models, and index information. The subject area, book type, level/grade, sample group, and data collection tools of the teaching set examined in the article were analyzed by the meta-synthesis method. As a result of this analysis, three main themes were formed: articles analyzing teaching sets, articles taking opinions about teaching sets, and articles analyzing teaching sets and taking opinions. Under each theme, detailed information was given about the sample of the articles (names, levels, and grades of teaching sets), subject areas, sample group, and data collection tools if exists.

**Findings**

In the findings section of the research, the analyses of the articles examining TFL teaching sets in terms of different variables, and the findings obtained are presented. In this context, firstly, the distribution of the articles included in the research according to the indexes in the journal classification determined by the Presidency of the Inter university Council of Turkey according to the criteria for being an associate professorship in the field of educational sciences is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2 Distribution of Articles by Indexes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULAKBIM TR</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both national and ULAKBIM TR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 2, 7 of the articles on TFL teaching sets were published in journals indexed in international indexes. The majority of the articles were published in journals indexed in ULAKBIM (f=57) and national indexes (f=67). The number of articles published in both international and ULAKBIM indexed journals (f=5) is quite limited. The fact that most of the articles were published in journals indexed in ULAKBIM and national indexes can be explained by the fact that most of the journals published in international indexes do not publish articles analyzing textbooks. In the article analyzing TFL teaching sets, 13 different research models were used. The distribution of these models used in the articles is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3 Research Models of Articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Models</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative research</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic qualitative research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical analytical research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus-based approach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text content analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 3, it is found that the document analysis method (f=70) is mostly used in the articles on TFL teaching sets. This method is followed by the survey method (f=13). In some articles, the research method was not mentioned (f=12) or detailed information about the research method was not provided (f=11). The case (f=12), and descriptive (f=7) models are among the frequently employed models in analyzing teaching sets.

Three main themes were determined for the articles analyzing TFL teaching sets. These themes consist of articles analyzing TFL teaching sets, articles taking opinions about TFL teaching sets, and articles analyzing TFL teaching sets and taking opinions. The number of articles according to the three main themes is presented in Table 4.

### Table 4 Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing TFL teaching sets</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>92.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles taking opinions about TFL teaching sets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles analyzing TFL teaching sets and taking opinions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4, the majority of the articles analyzing TFL teaching sets (f=126) consist of articles analyzing teaching sets. It is also seen that the number of articles that take opinions about the teaching sets (f=5) and the number of articles that analyze the teaching sets and take opinions (f=5) is quite limited. In this part of the study, meta-syntheses of the detected articles under these three main headings are presented. Under each heading; the subject area, book type, level/grade, if any, sample group, and data collection tools of the articles were analyzed in detail by the meta-synthesis method.

### Meta-Synthesis of Articles Analyzing Teaching Sets

In the articles analyzing the TFL teaching sets (f=126), 14 subject areas were determined. The findings related to the distribution of the articles analyzing the TFL teaching sets according to the subject areas are presented in Table 5.

### Table 5 Subject Areas of Articles Analyzing Teaching Sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject areas</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading (texts, readability, types)</td>
<td>A8, A16, A21, A24, A25, A26, A30, A49, A53, A64, A71, A82, A85, A102, A116, A136</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening (texts, activities, strategies)</td>
<td>A23, A29, A50, A51, A54, A56, A65, A72, A79, A84, A95, A112, A114, A120, A132</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>A22, A40, A61, A69, A70, A80, A89, A97, A98, A99, A100, A103, A118, A121, A126</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (activities)</td>
<td>A5, A10, A13, A18, A33, A37, A96, A113, A122, A128</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching principles, methods, and approaches</td>
<td>A17, A52, A63, A73, A105, A131, A135</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary teaching</td>
<td>A14, A42, A83, A109</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking (activities)</td>
<td>A9, A57, A120</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values education</td>
<td>A58, A123</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 5 reveal that TFL teaching sets were mostly analyzed in terms of vocabulary (f=25) and cultural transfer/cultural elements (f=23). These two subject areas were followed by reading, listening (f=15), and grammar (f=15). It is also revealed that the teaching sets were analyzed in terms of teaching principles, methods, and approaches (f=7) and vocabulary teaching (f=4). Teaching sets were analyzed in one or two articles in terms of values education, text-visual harmony/progressivity, well-known people, gender preference, pronunciation, exercise instructions, unit evaluation, text adaptation, and Turk-Turkey image.

The distribution of the articles examining a single teaching set according to the subject areas, and the teaching sets is as follows. Yedi Iklim teaching set was analyzed under the subject areas of cultural transfer/cultural elements (A36, A41, A106, A110, A124, A127), vocabulary (A44, A55, A59, A66, A68, A91, A101), reading (A8, A53, A136), teaching principles, methods and approaches (A17, A22, A63, A135), listening (A54, A79), writing (A33, A113), text-image harmony/progressivity (A35), values education (A58, A123), vocabulary teaching (A109), grammar (A126), and gender preference (A130). Istanbul teaching set was analyzed under the subject areas of cultural transfer/cultural elements (A4, A13, A20, A77, A92), reading (A25, A30, A71, A116), vocabulary (A67, A107, A125), writing (A10, A128), listening (A29, A132), speaking (A9), unit evaluation (A87), teaching approach (A105), and grammar (A122). Gazi teaching set was analyzed in the subject areas of cultural transfer/cultural elements (A7, A28, A45, A48, A108), listening (A23, A84, A114), reading (A16, A64), and vocabulary (A114). Yeni Hitit teaching set was analyzed in the subject areas of cultural transfer/cultural elements (A1, A2, A11), writing (A5, A96), vocabulary (A6, A117), grammar (A89), and text adaption (A90). Izmir teaching set was analyzed in the subject area of teaching approach (A73).

Teaching sets were compared in the subject areas of grammar (A40, A61, A69, A70, A80, A88, A97, A98, A99, A100, A103, A100, A118, A121), vocabulary (A15, A27, A32, A52, A65, A81, A86, A94, A104), reading (A21, A24, A26, A49, A82, A85, A95, A102), cultural transfer/cultural elements (A12, A31, A34, A38, A78) and writing (A18, A37, A122). Teaching sets were also compared in the subject areas of listening (A50, A56, A72), speaking (A51, A57, A120), well-known people (A62, A93), vocabulary teaching (A14, A42), text-image harmony (A129), teaching principles (A131), Turk-Turkey image (A115), vocabulary teaching (A83), gender preference (A74), exercise instructions (A60), and pronunciation (A39).

In the research, 71 articles analyzing a single teaching set were identified. In these articles, Yedi Iklim (f=30), Istanbul (f=20), Gazi (f=11), Yeni Hitit (f=9) and Izmir (f=1) teaching sets were analyzed. The samples of the articles mostly comprise text and workbooks. The sample of two articles consisted only of videos prepared for the teaching set. Video activities prepared for Yedi Iklim A1 textbooks (A136) and Istanbul teaching set (A112) were analyzed in two articles. The meta-analysis of other articles according to the teaching sets and levels/grades is shown in Table 4.

As can be seen from the table above, the sample of most of the articles on TFL teaching sets consists of textbooks. The number of articles (A33, A59, A63, A73, A77, A105, A107, A116, A117) in which workbooks are included in the article sample is quite limited. The teacher’s guidebook was included in the sample in only one article (A63). In the articles analyzing a single teaching set, Yedi Iklim (f=29) teaching set was analyzed the most. Yedi Iklim set
is followed by Istanbul (f=19), Gazi (f=11), and Yeni Hitit (f=9) teaching sets. Izmir teaching set constitutes the sample in only one article. Considering the analysis of teaching sets according to levels and grades, it is found that Yedi Iklim basic-level (A1-A2) text and workbooks were analyzed 42 times, intermediate level (B1-B2) text- and workbooks (40) and advanced level (C1-C2) text and workbooks were analyzed 25 times. Istanbul teaching set basic level books were analyzed 20 times, intermediate level books 30 times, and advanced level books 24 times. Gazi teaching set basic level books were analyzed 13 times, intermediate level books 12 times, and advanced level books 5 times. Yeni Hitit teaching set basic level books were analyzed 12 times, intermediate level books 8, and advanced level books 4 times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook/Workbook</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Meta-Synthesis of Articles Examining a Single Teaching Set

A detailed look at the articles analyzing a single teaching set in Table 6 reveals three trends in sample selection. In the articles in the first group, all textbooks of a teaching set (A1, A2, A6, A9, A10, A16, A20, A22, A23, A33, A41, A48, A53, A63, A66, A77, A92, A106, A108, A109, A125, A126) were included in the sample of the article. In the articles in the second group, it is seen that the sample is preferred from basic level A1-A2 (A11, A17, A44, A45, A59, A67, A68, A96, A101, A110, A119), intermediate level B1-B2 (A7, A29, A36, A90, A91, A105, A130), or advanced level C1-C2 (A13, A25, A116) textbooks. In the articles in the third group, the sample teaching set consists of a single grade of textbooks such as A1 grade (A30, A54, A73, A117, A124, A135), A2 grade (A114), B1 grade (A5, A8, A28, A35, A79, A107, A112, A132), B2 grade (A84, A87, A136) and C1 grade books (A58, A64, A89, A127). However, there are also articles (A71, A123, A128) that do not comply with these three trends.

In the research, 55 articles analyzing more than one TFL teaching set were determined. The inclusion status of the teaching sets in the article sample is as follows: Yedi Iklim (f=42), Istanbul (f=44), Gazi (f=27), Yeni Hitit (f=33), and Izmir (f=5) sets were included in the article sample. The meta-synthesis of these articles is shown in Table 7.

It can be seen from the data in Table 7 that two (f=25), three (f=17), or four (f=13) teaching sets were compared in the articles. The number of articles (A14, A27, A52, A60, A86, A98, A115) in which the workbook was included in the article sample is limited. Teacher’s guidebooks (A52, A86) and CDs with listening texts (A72, A86) were included in the sample in only two articles. Considering the examination status of the teaching sets according to levels and grades, it is seen that Yedi Iklim basic level (A1-A2) text and workbooks were examined 76 times, intermediate level (B1-B2) text and workbooks (49) and advanced level (C1-C2) text and workbooks 35 times. Istanbul teaching set basic level books were analyzed 75 times, intermediate level books 45 times, and advanced level books 24 times. Yeni Hitit teaching set basic level books were analyzed 38 times, intermediate level books 26 times, and advanced level books 14 times. Yeni Hitit teaching set basic level books were analyzed 56 times, intermediate level books 28 times, and advanced
level books 14 times. Izmir teaching set basic level books were analyzed 13 times, intermediate level books 6 times, and advanced level textbooks 3 times. In the articles in which more than one teaching set is included in the article sample, it is concluded that most of the basic level (A1-A2) text and workbooks of all teaching sets are analyzed.

| Table 7 Meta-Synthesis of Articles Examining more than one Teaching Set |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Level            | Basic            | Intermediate     | Advanced         | Basic            | Intermediate     | Advanced         |
| Textbooks        | Workbooks        | Textbooks        | Workbooks        | Textbooks        | Workbooks        | Textbooks        |
| Basic            | Workbooks        | Textbooks        | Workbooks        | Textbooks        | Workbooks        | Textbooks        |
| Yedi Iklim       | A1              | A2               | A3               | A10             | A11             | A12              |
| Izmir            | A10             | A11             | A12              | A13             | A14             | A15              |
| Subtotal          | A10             | A11             | A12              | A13             | A14             | A15              |
| Yedi Iklim       | A1              | A2               | A3               | A10             | A11             | A12              |
| Istanbul         | A10             | A11             | A12              | A13             | A14             | A15              |
| Subtotal          | A10             | A11             | A12              | A13             | A14             | A15              |
| Total            | A10             | A11             | A12              | A13             | A14             | A15              |

A detailed analysis of the articles analyzing more than one teaching set in Table 7 reveals that there are three different trends in sample selection. In the articles in the first group, it is seen that all textbooks belonging to the compared teaching sets were included in the article sample (A15, A34, A37, A38, A56, A57, A65, A69, A70, A72, A81, A82, A83, A85, A86, A93, A103, A115, A118). In the articles in the second group, basic level (A1-A2) textbooks (A14, A26, A27, A32, A40, A50, A60, A61, A62, A80, A99, 100, 121, 129, 131), intermediate level textbooks (A102) and advanced level textbooks (A102) were compared. In the third group, textbooks at the same grade belonging to different teaching sets such as A1 (A39, A74), A2 (A12, A21, A31, A51, A97, A98), B1 (A18, A42, A52) B2 (A88, A104, A123) and C1 (A78) were included in the article sample. Nevertheless, there are also articles (A24, A34, A55, A57) that do not comply with the three trends mentioned above.

Meta-Synthesis of Articles Taking Opinions about TFL Teaching Sets

The second main theme of the research consists of articles that take opinions about TFL teaching sets. Five articles were identified under this theme. In three of these articles, the sample consists of one teaching set, and in two of them more than one teaching set. In these articles, opinions were collected on the subject areas of general evaluation on Istanbul teaching set (A134), Istanbul basic level books listening texts (A133), and Yeni Hitt teaching set culture transfer (A3). Yedi Iklim, Istanbul, Gazi, and Yeni Hitt teaching sets (A75), Yedi Iklim, Istanbul and Gazi teaching sets (A47) were evaluated in general by taking opinions. The majority of the articles that take opinions about the teaching sets are about the general evaluation of the teaching sets (f=4). In these articles, unlike the studies analyzing the teaching sets, it was found that different data collection tools were used and the sample group to which these tools were applied differed. For this reason, the data collection tools used and the sample group to which the data collection tools were applied were analyzed in the articles on TFL teaching sets. It was detected that questionnaire (A3), interview form (A47, A134), and semi-structured interview (A75, A133) were used as data collection tools in the articles. In these articles, students (A47, A134), and teachers (A3, A47, A75, A133) were preferred as the sample group. In only one article (A47), the sample group consists of both students and teachers.
Meta-Synthesis of Articles Analyzing TFL Teaching Sets and Taking Opinions

The third main theme of the research consists of articles that analyze TFL textbook sets and take opinions about these sets. There are at least two data set sources in the articles analyzed under this theme. The first one is the data obtained from the teaching sets and the other one is the data obtained from the sample group about the teaching set in general or about a subject included in the teaching set. Five articles were identified under this theme. In three of these articles, the sample consists of a single teaching set. The effect of the themes in Yedi Iklim B1 and C1 textbooks on speaking skills (A76), Istanbul teaching set culture transfer (A111), and Istanbul B1 and C1 textbooks vocabulary (A46) were analyzed under the subject areas and opinions were taken on these subject areas. In the other two articles identified under this theme, Yedi Iklim, Istanbul, Gazi, Yeni Hitit, and Izmir teaching sets were compared and analyzed under the subject areas of grammar (A19), and Yedi Iklim, Gazi, and Yeni Hitit teaching sets were compared and analyzed under the subject areas of emphasis (A43) and opinions were taken on this subject area. In these articles, questionnaire (A19, A76), interview form (A43), semi-structured focus group interview (A111), and achievement test (A46) were employed as data collection tools. In these articles, students (A19, A46, A76, A111) and teachers (A19, A43, A111) were preferred as the sample group. In two articles (A19, A111), both students and teachers were preferred as the sample group.

Discussions, Conclusions, and Implications

In this research, in which the articles on five different teaching sets, which are most commonly used in teaching Turkish as a foreign language, were analyzed by meta-synthesis method, the following results were obtained: It is concluded that the number of articles on TFL teaching sets has been increasing every year. The findings presented in many studies conducted in the field of TFL teaching that both the number of articles and the number of postgraduate theses have increased in recent years support the results of this research (Baki, 2019; Kemiksiz, 2021; Maden and Onal, 2021). This situation can be explained by the increase in the number of international students in Turkey, the increase in the interest in learning Turkish all over the world, the increase in the number of institutions and organizations providing Turkish education, and the increase in the number of teaching sets published. Regarding the methods of the articles examining TFL teaching sets, it is concluded that document review (f=70) and survey (f=13) are the two most commonly used methods. In some articles (f=11), it is seen that the method section is passed over as qualitative research and not clearly stated, and in some other articles (f=12), this section is not included in the method section at all. The use of document analysis, survey, case, and descriptive methods in the analyzed articles can be explained by the aim of examining and describing a situation existing in TFL teaching sets from different aspects. For this reason, it can be concluded that qualitative research methods are used in articles analyzing teaching sets, while quantitative and mixed studies are limited in number. In the studies examining the articles published in the field of TFL teaching, it was concluded that qualitative studies were used more (Bicer, 2017; Cevirme and Kocak, 2018; Maden and Onal, 2021). Taken together, these results suggest that it would be appropriate to conduct more quantitative and mixed articles in articles analyzing TFL teaching sets.

The majority of the articles analyzed consisted of articles analyzing teaching sets (f=126). It is seen that the number of articles that take opinions about the teaching sets (f=5), analyze the teaching sets, and take opinions about the sets (f=5) is limited. By increasing the number of articles that take opinions from teachers about the teaching sets, more comprehensive information on many issues such as the usefulness of the teaching sets, functionality, problems encountered during implementation, weaknesses, and strengths of the teaching sets can be revealed. Similarly, the opinions of the students about the teaching sets are important in terms of providing feedback about the teaching sets.

In terms of the subject areas analyzed in TFL teaching sets, it is concluded that they are mostly analyzed in terms of vocabulary (f=25) and cultural transfer/cultural elements (f=23). Similarly, Maden (2021), in his article in which he analyzed the
master’s theses on textbooks, concluded that the most analyzed subject areas were vocabulary (f=24) and cultural transfer/cultural elements (f=20). Kemiksiz (2021) analyzed articles and postgraduate theses on SFL teaching textbooks and found that vocabulary/vocabulary teaching (f=55) and cultural elements/cultural transfer (f=51) took the first two places in subject preferences. It is seen that in the studies that take opinions about the teaching sets, it is mostly made in the form of a general evaluation of the subject area of the sets (f=3), but in the articles that analyze the teaching sets and take opinions, it is seen that a specific subject area is focused on. In the articles examining a single teaching set, Yedi Iklim, Istanbul, Gazi, and Yeni Hitit teaching sets were mostly examined in the subject area of cultural transfer/cultural elements. However, it was found that this situation differed in the articles comparing the teaching sets. In the articles comparing the teaching sets, grammar (f=14), vocabulary (f=9), and analyzing reading texts (f=8) were the most common subject areas.

In the articles analyzing teaching sets, the majority of the sample group consists of only textbooks. The number of articles in which workbooks (f=16), teacher’s guidebooks (f=3), videos (f=2), and CDs (f=2) are included in the sample group is limited. The fact that there is no article with only workbooks, or teacher’s guidebooks as the sample in the articles analyzed can be considered as one of the striking results of this research. Teacher’s guidebooks fulfill many functions such as teachers’ preparation before the lesson, planning, using the textbook efficiently in classroom work, the order of the activities in the lesson, how to do them (Kilic, 2009), directing and shaping the activities or measuring student achievements (Gocer, 2008). For this reason, the adequacy of teacher’s guidebooks should be examined in many aspects such as explaining the strategies, methods, and techniques recommended to teachers and including additional activities/examples. In addition to their physical and visual features, workbooks should be evaluated in many aspects such as their compatibility with textbooks, their effectiveness in gaining skills, including the sufficient and varied number of exercises in terms of language skills, and determining their in-class and extra-curricular use. The fact that there is no article analyzing enriched e-book applications prepared for teaching sets can be seen as another striking result of the research. Further research could usefully explore the effectiveness of enriched e-book applications from different perspectives according to teacher and student experiences.

Regarding the presence of the teaching sets in the article sample, Yedi Iklim set was analyzed alone in 31 articles, while it was evaluated by comparing with other teaching sets in 47 articles. Istanbul teaching set was analyzed in 24 articles alone and in 47 articles it was analyzed by comparing with other teaching sets. Yeni Hitit teaching set was analyzed in 11 articles alone and in 31 articles by comparing with other teaching sets. Gazi teaching set was analyzed in 11 articles alone and in 31 articles by comparing with other teaching sets. Izmir teaching set was analyzed in one article alone, and in 6 articles it was analyzed by comparing with other teaching sets. Based on these data, it is concluded that Yedi Iklim, Istanbul, Gazi, Yeni Hitit, and Izmir teaching sets are analyzed the most in the articles respectively. This result of the research can be explained by the fact that Yedi Iklim, Istanbul, Gazi, Yeni Hitit, and Izmir teaching sets are used more in teaching TFL (Erdil, 2018; Omeroglu, 2016).

Two different sample selection trends have emerged considering the analyses of teaching sets according to levels and grades. In the articles analyzing a single teaching set, sample selection differs depending on the teaching sets. The number of basic and intermediate level text and workbooks analyzed in Yedi Iklim, Gazi, and Yeni Hitit teaching sets was very close to each other, while in Istanbul teaching set, it was concluded that mostly intermediate level text and workbooks were analyzed. In the articles in which more than one teaching set was analyzed, it is evident that in five teaching sets, most of the basic level text and workbooks and then intermediate level text and workbooks were included in the article sample. It was determined that advanced level text and workbooks were analyzed the least in the teaching sets. This can be explained by the absence of C2 level text and workbooks in Yeni Hitit, Gazi, and Izmir teaching sets. Evaluating both sample selection trends together, it is concluded that the basic, intermediate, and advanced level books are
preferred respectively. This result of the study is in parallel with the finding of Kemiksiz (2021) in his article. In his article, Kemiksiz concluded that there was a gradual decrease in sample selection from the basic level to the advanced level.

It was determined that there were three different trends in the selection of the sample from the teaching sets. In the articles analyzing a single teaching set (f=71), three different approaches were identified in the sample selection. In the articles in the first group (f=22), books belonging to all levels of the teaching set, in the articles in the second group (f=21), basic, intermediate, or advanced level books, and in the articles in the third group (f=22), a single grade book belonging to any grade of the teaching set was selected. A similar sample selection tendency is observed in the studies comparing teaching sets. In the articles in the first group (f=19), all textbooks in the teaching sets were compared, while in the second group (f=17), basic, intermediate, or advanced-level books were compared. The studies in this group focused especially on basic level textbooks (f=15). In the third group of articles (f=15), a book belonging to any level of the teaching sets was compared. It is thought that it would be appropriate to examine all the books that make up the sets or the books at the same level together in the sample selection in the studies analyzing the teaching sets as it may provide set or level integrity.
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