



Available online at <http://www.bedujournal.com/>

BASE FOR ELECTRONIC EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

ISSN: 2718-0107

Base for Electronic Educational Sciences, 5(1), 135-159; 2024

A Bibliometric Analysis of Postgraduate Studies on Listening (2014-2023)

Hüseyin Özçakmak^a 

^a Assoc. Prof. Dr., Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Türkiye
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8579-5567>
E-Mail: h.ozcakmak@mku.edu.tr

APA Citation:

Özçakmak, H. (2024). A Bibliometric Analysis of Postgraduate Studies on Listening (2014-2023). *Base for Electronic Educational Sciences*, 5(1), 135-159.
Submission Date: 11/01/2024
Acceptance Date: 21/03/2024

Abstract

A descriptive survey design was used in this study, which aimed to examine postgraduate studies on listening between 2014 and 2023. The data was obtained from the database provided by the Turkish Council of Higher Education Thesis Center through document review by keyword and department. In the searches, the keywords “Turkish, understand, listen, listening, hear, hearing” and the departments “Türkçe ve sosyal bilimler eğitimi, yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi, sınıf öğretmenliği, okul öncesi eğitimi, dilbilim, Türk dili ve edebiyatı eğitimi ve Türkiyat araştırmaları” were used. The data analysis was performed via the bibliometric analysis method. In the study, it was concluded that 205 postgraduate studies were written on listening, 162 of which were master’s theses and 43 of which were doctoral dissertations, and the studies on listening were written by students in 60 different universities, and most of them had been written by the students at Gazi University. It was found that most of the studies were completed in institutes of educational sciences (f=115), the studies were written in 23 different departments, and mostly for secondary school students (f=68) and non-native speakers (f=53). In terms of subject, it was revealed that most of the studies were about teaching methods and techniques (f=70), teaching Turkish to foreigners (f=53), textbooks (f=47), reading education (f=32), and types of listening (f=27), and the studies were listed as quantitative (f=115), qualitative (f=64) and mixed design (f=26) by their designs. It was also found that 174 studies were conducted with samples, and 31 studies were conducted with materials, and the sample size in most of the studies (f=123) was in the range of 0-100, and 510 measurement tools were used in 205 studies. In addition, the most preferred measurement tools were forms (f=148), tests (f=129), and scales (f=105), and the least preferred ones were checklists (f=3), programs (f=4), and rubrics (f=3).

Keywords: Turkish language education, listening, postgraduate studies, bibliometric analysis.



Introduction

Postgraduate studies are academic works that enable us to keep up with current developments in the field. Completed under the guidance of experienced academic staff, these works aim to develop solutions tailored to the needs by addressing any problems or difficulties arising in the discipline. Depending on the subjects' scope, intensity, or workload, they are addressed at the master's or doctoral level, contributing to addressing the deficiencies in the field.

Following recent academic studies in the field helps researchers stay up to date. Researchers always need to read what has been written and to make a note of studies that catch their attention to avoid keeping behind on developments in their field. Otherwise, they may present results that are merely repetitions or ordinary works instead of original ones. Postgraduate studies hold a significant place in the academy. An unfiltered search conducted on February 15, 2024, on the YÖK Thesis Center for the year 2023 yielded 53,645 theses results (YÖK, 2024a). Considering the increasing number of completed studies each year, we can predict that postgraduate studies will occupy even more space in academic studies in the coming years. When the number of books, articles, and proceedings is taken into consideration, the volume of studies reaches a very high level. This situation is evident in every discipline. At this point, the difficulty arises in following and thoroughly reviewing the large number of academic studies conducted in the field. While senior researchers have a chance to follow academic studies written in their fields over the years, young researchers may face challenges in this regard. On the one hand, they need to get familiar with studies that were conducted in previous years, and on the other hand, they should be informed about current research to keep up with the field. The division of each discipline into sub-disciplines and the emergence of dozens of new topics within these sub-disciplines prolong the process of researchers exploring their fields. Analysis studies that examine studies conducted in the field collectively can help young academics shorten the adaptation process and solve this problem more easily. According to the Turkish Higher Education Council, the presence of 434,485 master's students and 114,508 doctoral students registered during the 2022-2023 academic year in Türkiye (YÖK, 2024b) makes the importance of analysis studies more tangible.

In recent years, an increase has been observed in the number of academic studies comprehensively analyzing books, theses, articles, and proceedings in the field of Turkish language teaching through different analysis methods such as meta-analysis, meta-synthesis, content analysis, or bibliometric analysis. While some of these studies analyze Turkish language teaching in general, others examine reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills separately.

A vast number of analysis studies providing a general overview of publications in the field of Turkish language teaching have been carried out (Sevim & İşcan, 2012; Coşkun, Özçakmak, & Balcı, 2012; Varışoğlu, Şahin, & Göktaş, 2013; Yağmur Şahin, Kana, & Varışoğlu, 2013; Aktaş & Yurt, 2015; Özçakmak, 2017; Boyacı & Demirkol, 2018; Önal & Maden, 2021; Karagöz & Şeref, 2021; Demir, 2021; Demir & Çalışkan, 2021). Upon examining these studies, it becomes evident that many of them have focused on analyzing postgraduate studies, while several studies have

examined master's theses and doctoral dissertations together or separately. In addition, some studies have addressed merely articles.

The relevant literature shows that some analysis studies have extensively addressed specific topics in Turkish language teaching. Research has been conducted to comprehensively examine academic studies on topics such as textbooks in Turkish language teaching (Aydeniz & Haydaroğlu, 2021; Maden, 2021; Sur, 2021; Temizkan, 2021), technology in Turkish language teaching (Genç Ersoy & Ersoy, 2021; Şahin, Başbayrak, & Çiftçi, 2020; Topçu, 2021), anxiety in Turkish language teaching (Kemiksiz, 2022; Sarıkaya & Yamaç, 2023), values education in Turkish language teaching (Batur & Akdeniz, 2020; Dincel, 2023), assessment in Turkish language teaching (Ungan & Dinçel, 2022), self-efficacy in Turkish language teaching (Maden & Özgen, 2023), drama in Turkish language teaching (Maden, Durmaz, & Sayal, 2022), academic achievement in Turkish language teaching (Maden, Banaz, & Gülen, 2022), attitude in Turkish language teaching (Kemiksiz, 2023), reflective thinking in Turkish language teaching (Ustabulut, 2021), and Turkish language teaching curriculum (Altunkaynak, 2023; Kaplan & Özgen, 2023).

In some analysis studies conducted in the field of Turkish language teaching, certain study groups have been addressed. For instance, Oğuz (2021), and Dolunay and Saluk (2023) focused on gifted children, Günaydın (2020), Kırımlı and Kayhan (2022), and Can and Kardeş (2023) on bilingual individuals, Biçer and Alan (2019), and Emek (2020) on Turkish aristocrats, Eyüp (2020) on Turkish language teachers, Arı, Yaşar, and İstanbullu (2020) on prospective Turkish language teachers, Erdem & Gökçe (2020) on elementary school students, and Demir and Şeref (2021) on dissertation committees as their study groups. Some analysis studies in the field of Turkish language teaching have focused on specific journals and scientific conferences. For instance, Mutlu (2018), Karagöz (2019), and Cin Şeker (2020) conducted a bibliometric study analyzing the articles published in *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi* (The Journal of Mother Tongue Education). In another study, Batur, Özdil, and Özcan (2022) analyzed the articles published in *Millî Eğitim Dergisi* (The Journal of National Education). Similarly, Yıldız (2016) examined international language journals, while Bozkurt & Uzun (2015) focused on international scientific conferences and their presented papers. There are also a few studies limited to a university or a department. In a study conducted by Kadan (2021), the postgraduate studies on language education done at Hatay Mustafa Kemal University were examined. In another study, Yağmur Şahin, Kana, and Varışoğlu (2013) evaluated the studies done in the department of Turkish language education.

There are many studies examining research conducted on the four fundamental skills of Turkish which are reading, writing, speaking, and listening. There have been 9 analysis studies on reading (Akaydın & Çeçen, 2015; Özdemir, 2018; Ceran, Aydın, & Onarıcıoğlu, 2018; Karagöz & Şeref, 2019; Çifci & Ünlü, 2020; Topal, Ongun, & Arıcı, 2022; Akkuş, 2022; Bahadır, 2023; Keray Dinçel & Sanlav, 2023), 6 on writing (Tok & Potur, 2015; Bolat & Tekin, 2018; Karagöz & Şeref, 2020; Kemiksiz, 2021; Şimşek, Akbulut, & Koparan, 2023; Demirel, 2023), and 6 on speaking (Potur & Yıldız, 2016; Sarıkaya & Söylemez, 2016; Topçuoğlu Ünal & Özer, 2016; Alver & Taştemir, 2017; Kesici, 2023; Karabulut, 2023).

Our study aimed to perform a bibliometric analysis for the master's and doctoral studies on listening from 2014 to 2023. Therefore, it would be beneficial to summarize the analysis studies on listening in the literature. For instance, Topçuoğlu Ünal and Özer (2014) analyzed 17 books, 7 papers, 59 articles, and 87 postgraduate studies written between 1995 and 2013; Doğan and Özçakmak (2014) examined 49 master's theses written between 1998 and 2013; Kemiksiz (2017) reviewed 150 articles written between 2007 and 2016; Kardeş, Çetinkaya, and Kaya (2018) investigated 103 articles and 65 master's theses written between 2005 and 2017; Doğan Kahtalı, Oğuz, Cayhan, and Taşkın (2020) analyzed 42 articles written between 2017 and 2019; Cin Şeker (2020) scrutinized 44 master's theses written between 2000 and 2020; Kavum (2021) reviewed 55 master's theses written between 2005 and 2019; Kayadibi (2022) examined 7,664 academic studies written between 1973 and 2021 and searched in the WoS database; Soyuçok (2022) analyzed 93 master's theses written between 2000 and 2020; Göçer and Bıyık (2022) reviewed 170 articles and 93 master's theses written between 2005 and 2022; Yangil (2022) scrutinized 91 articles written between 2008 and 2020; Potur (2023) examined 175 master's theses written between 2011 and 2020; and Karbuz (2023) reviewed 55 articles, 38 master's theses, and 2 papers written between 2009 and 2021.

The mentioned 13 analysis studies ensure that theses and articles have frequently been analyzed in the studies on listening. The number of studies has increased in recent years, with 9 studies conducted in 2020 and beyond. The most recent studies in terms of the searched year range were conducted by Kayadibi (2022), and Göçer and Bıyık (2022). In Kayadibi's (2022) study, no theses were included. Göçer and Bıyık's (2022) study, on the other hand, covered 170 articles and 93 master's theses on listening conducted between 2005 and 2022. The relatively smaller number of listening theses included necessitates reviewing the criteria used in the search process for the relevant study.

Aim of the Study

This research aimed to evaluate postgraduate studies on listening between 2014 and 2023 by year, type, university, institute, main discipline, target audience, topic, research design, sample/study group/material, and measurement tool, and to compare the findings obtained with other analysis studies on listening.

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive survey design. Data were collected through one of the qualitative methods and techniques, document analysis. Document analysis refers to examining all types of documents, whether official or private (Sönmez & Alacapınar, 2016, p. 186). Bibliometric analysis, which is an effective method for analyzing research trends in a specific field, was performed. In bibliometric analysis, publications are classified based on various attributes such as the name of an institution/journal/author, article type, research area, citation metrics, country or region, and so on (Lee, 2015: 17; Chen, Ye, Chen, & Liang, 2019).

Research Materials

The study materials included 205 postgraduate studies on listening, 162 of which were master's theses and 43 of which were doctoral dissertations, between 2014 and 2023.

Data Collection

The data were collected through document analysis. In the study, the database of the Turkish Higher Education Council National Thesis Center (YÖK, 2024a) was searched to access the names of the studies on listening between 2014 and 2023, using certain keywords and main discipline criteria. The keywords "Turkish", "understand", "listen", "listening", "hear" and "hearing" were used. The studies were queried with these keywords, and those determined to be related to the topic of listening were saved to an Excel file named "Keywords". In the final phase, all saved names of studies were sorted alphabetically, duplicates were removed, and each study was listed once.

In the searches based on the departments, those expressing the same scope with multiple names were merged under the current department. In this context, the departments of "Türkçe (Turkish)", "Türkçe eğitimi (Turkish language education)", "Türkçe öğretimi (Turkish language teaching)", "Türkçenin eğitimi öğretimi (Teaching Turkish language)", "Türkçe öğretmenliği (Turkish language teaching)", "Türkçe ve sosyal bilgiler (Turkish language and social studies)", "Türkçe ve sosyal bilimler (Turkish language and social sciences)", "sosyal bilgiler ve Türkçe eğitimi (Social studies and Turkish language education)", "sosyal bilimler ve Türkçe eğitimi (Social sciences and Turkish language education)" were merged under the department of "Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi (Turkish Language and Social Sciences Education), and the departments of "yabancı dil olarak Türkçe (Turkish as a foreign language)", "yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi (Teaching Turkish as a foreign language)" were merged under the department of "Yabancılarla Türkçe Öğretimi (Teaching Turkish to Foreigners)". The departments of "ilköğretim (primary school)", "ilköğretim eğitimi (primary school education)", "ilköğretim sınıf öğretmenliği (primary school classroom teaching)", "ilköğretim sınıf öğretmenliği eğitimi (primary school classroom teaching education) were merged under the department of "Sınıf Öğretmenliği (Primary School Teaching)". The department of "okul öncesi öğretmenliği (preschool teaching)" was merged under the department of "Okul Öncesi Eğitimi (Preschool Education)". The departments of "genel dilbilim (general linguistics)", "dil bilimi araştırmaları (linguistic studies)", "dil bilimleri ve kültür araştırmaları (linguistic and cultural studies)" were merged under the department of "Dilbilim (Linguistics)". The departments of "Türk dili ve edebiyatı (Turkish language and literature)", "Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretmenliği (Turkish language and literature teaching)" were merged under the department of "Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Eğitimi (Turkish Language and Literature Education)". The studies conducted in the department of basic education were included either in "Okul Öncesi Eğitimi (Preschool Education)" or "Sınıf Öğretmenliği (Primary School Teaching)" based on their target audience. Turcology Studies; however, consisted of a single department.

As a result, a total of 7 departments were identified for the postgraduate studies on listening: Turkish Language and Social Sciences Education,

Teaching Turkish to Foreigners, Primary School Teaching, Preschool Education, Linguistics, Turkish Language and Literature Education, and Turcology Studies. The studies on the topic of listening were identified through the searches conducted in terms of these departments. The identified studies were saved in an Excel file named "Departments", sorted alphabetically, and duplicates were removed to ensure that each study appeared only once. Finally, the Excel files containing the keywords and departments obtained from the searches were merged into a single Excel file named "All Listening Studies", resulting in a dataset consisting of 205 studies ready for analysis. The final search covering both the keyword and department was conducted on February 15, 2024.

Data Analysis

The data collection process, completed through searches performed by keyword and department, was followed by the data analysis. In that vein, 205 studies on listening conducted between 2014 and 2023 were classified and subjected to a bibliometric analysis. The listening studies were analyzed under 10 categories, including years, types, universities, institutes, departments, target audiences, topics, research designs, samples/study materials, and measurement tools of the studies. For analyzing the listening studies, the "Listening Studies Classification Form" developed by the researcher was employed. Each study was searched in the database of the Turkish Higher Education Council (YÖK) National Thesis Center, and the retrieved data were transferred into this form. Information regarding the years when the studies were completed, their types, universities, institutes, and departments was obtained from the thesis metadata, while information about target audiences, topics, designs, and measurement tools was coded based on the abstracts and full texts of the theses. In the study, the data obtained for these categories were analyzed along with different variables, and basic statistics such as frequency, total, percentage, and mean were calculated.

Validity and Reliability

Several procedures were performed to establish validity and reliability. To ensure scope validity, the Turkish Higher Education Council (YÖK) National Thesis Center was searched by the keywords and departments related to studies on listening during the data collection process. Among the results obtained using keywords and main disciplines, the studies about listening were selected and saved in separate Excel files. These Excel files were merged, and duplicate studies were removed, ensuring that each listening study appeared only once. Additionally, the processes conducted in the study were systematically and clearly explained in the method for ensuring validity. An expert in Turkish language education was consulted during the development of the "Listening Studies Classification Form", and data coding process. To establish reliability, inter-rater reliability was utilized. Inter-rater reliability is used to examine the reliability of scores given by two or more independent observers regarding the extent to which numerous objects possess a particular characteristic (Büyükoztürk et al., 2020: 118). For this purpose, Miles and Huberman's (1994/2015, p. 64) formula "Reliability = [Agreement / (Disagreement + Agreement)] x 100" was used, resulting in a calculated value of 0.83. The literature review indicated that this value demonstrates the reliability of the research.

Scope and Limitation

This research is limited to 205 postgraduate studies (162 master's theses, and 43 doctoral dissertations) about listening education, found using specific keywords. The studies covering the years 2014-2023 were examined, while those focusing on listening in foreign language education were excluded from the scope of the study.

Ethical Statement

In this study, adherence to the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive published by the Higher Education Council (YÖK, 2016) was ensured. None of the situations specified under the title "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics" in Article 4, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the relevant Directive occurred. Since the study falls outside the "Ethical Authorization Required Situations" specified in "TR Dizin (TR Indexing)", it is not subject to ethical committee approval (ULAKBİM, 2020).

Findings

In this section, tables and explanations obtained upon performing a bibliometric analysis based on the years, types, universities, institutes, departments, target audiences, topics, research designs, samples/study materials, and measurement tools of the studies are provided.

Table 1

Distribution of the listening studies by type

Types of Studies	2014-2018		2019-2023		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Master's thesis	48	75,0	114	80,9	162	79
Doctoral dissertation	16	25,0	27	19,1	43	21
Total	64	31,2	141	68,8	205	100

Table 1 shows that the number of master's theses is approximately four times higher than the number of doctoral dissertations. It can be seen that the studies written between 2019 and 2023 show an increase of more than double compared to the period from 2014 to 2018.

Table 2

Distribution of the listening studies by university

Universities	M	DR	Σ	%	Universities	M	DR	Σ	%
1 Gazi	8	14	22	10,8	19. A. Adnan Menderes	3	1	4	2,0
2 N. Hacı Bektaş Veli	11	0	11	5,4	20. Sakarya	3	1	4	2,0
3 K. Dumlupınar	10	0	10	4,9	21. T. Gaziosmanpaşa	4	0	4	2,0
4 Yıldız Teknik	7	2	9	4,4	22. S. Cumhuriyet	4	0	4	2,0
5 Dokuz Eylül	6	2	8	3,9	23. V. Yüzüncü Yıl	4	0	4	2,0
6 Anadolu	4	4	8	3,9	24. İnönü	1	2	3	1,4
7 Ankara	4	3	7	3,4	25. Akdeniz	3	0	3	1,4
8 Atatürk	6	1	7	3,4	26. Bartın	3	0	3	1,4
9 B. Abant İzzet Baysal	5	1	6	2,9	27. Düzce	2	0	2	1,0
1 Erciyes	4	2	6	2,9	28. İstanbul Medipol	2	0	2	1,0
1 Ç. Onsekiz Mart	5	1	6	2,9	29. İstanbul	2	0	2	1,0
1 Uşak	4	2	6	2,9	30. Fırat	2	0	2	1,0
1 Hacettepe	4	1	5	2,4	31. B. Mehmet Akif Ersoy	2	0	2	1,0
1 Necmettin Erbakan	4	1	5	2,4	32. Mersin	2	0	2	1,0
1 Kırıkkale	5	0	5	2,4	33. H. Mustafa Kemal	2	0	2	1,0
1 E. Osmangazi	3	1	4	2,0	34. Başkent	2	0	2	1,0
1 Marmara	2	2	4	2,0	35. Çağ	2	0	2	1,0
1 K. Ahi Evran	4	0	4	2,0	Other (25 Univ.)	23	2	25	12,2
					Total (60 Univ.)	162	43	205	100

According to Table 2, there are a total of 60 universities that conducted studies on listening between 2014 and 2023. While master's theses were written in all of these universities, doctoral dissertations were conducted in only 19 of them. Gazi University had the highest number of studies, followed by Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University and Kütahya Dumlupınar University. The universities where most doctoral theses were written are Gazi University, Anadolu University, and Ankara University.

Table 3

Distribution of the listening studies by institutes

Institutes	2014-2018		2019-2023		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Educational Sciences	50	78,1	65	46,1	115	56,1
Social Sciences	12	18,8	44	31,2	56	27,3
Postgraduate Education	-	-	19	13,5	19	9,3
Health Sciences	1	1,6	10	7,1	11	5,4
Turcology Studies	1	1,6	1	0,7	2	1,0
Winter Sports and Sport Sciences	-	-	2	1,4	2	1,0
Total	64	31,2	141	68,8	205	100

The distribution of the studies on listening by institutes can be seen in Table 3. Accordingly, the highest number of listening studies (f=115) were conducted in institutes of educational sciences, followed by institutes of social sciences (f=56). While 78% of the studies were written in institutes of educational sciences from 2014 to 2018, this ratio decreased to around 56% from 2019 to 2023.

Table 4

Distribution of the listening studies by department

Departments	2014-2018		2019-2023		Total	
	f		f		f	%
Turkish Language and Social Sciences	41		74		115	56,1
Education	7		20		27	13,2
Primary School Teaching	6		8		14	6,8
Special Education	2		7		9	4,4
Educational Sciences	-		6		6	2,9
Preschool Education	1		5		6	2,9
Teaching Turkish to Foreigners	-		4		4	2,0
Audiology	-		3		3	1,5
Nursing	1		2		3	1,5
Physical Education and Sports Teaching	-		2		2	1,0
Biophysics	-		2		2	1,0
Child Development and Education	1		1		2	1,0
Turkish Language and Literature	1		1		2	1,0
Turcology Studies	-		1		1	0,5
Speech and Language Therapy	-		1		1	0,5
Linguistics	-		1		1	0,5
Fine Arts Education	-		1		1	0,5
Public Relations and Publicity	-		1		1	0,5
Business Management	-		1		1	0,5
Music	1		-		1	0,5
Secondary School Social Sciences	1		-		1	0,5
Psychology	1		-		1	0,5
Distance Education	1		-		1	0,5
Otorhinolaryngology	1		-		1	0,5
Total Number of Studies	64		141		205	100
Total Number of Departments	12		19		23	

According to Table 4, 205 listening studies were written across 23 different departments. From 2014 to 2018, 64 studies were completed in 12 departments, while 141 studies were conducted in 19 departments from 2019 to 2023. The highest number of studies were conducted in the department of Turkish Language and Social Sciences Education (f=115). Following that, Primary School Teaching (f=27) and Special Education (f=14) were the departments respectively.

Table 5

Distribution of the listening studies by target audiences

Target Audiences	2014-2018		2019-2023		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Secondary School	23	35,9	45	31,9	68	33,2
Non-native Speakers	17	26,6	36	25,5	53	25,9
Primary School	7	10,9	26	18,4	33	16,1
Preschool	2	3,1	11	7,8	13	6,3
University	4	6,3	4	2,8	8	3,9
Informal Education	1	1,6	7	5,0	8	3,9
Teachers	2	3,1	3	2,1	5	2,4
Preschool + Primary School	4	6,3	-	-	4	2,0
Undefined	2	3,1	2	1,4	4	2,0
Primary School + Secondary School + High School	1	1,6	2	1,4	3	1,5
High School	-	-	2	1,4	2	1,0
Bilinguals	-	-	2	1,4	2	1,0
Turkish Aristocrats	-	-	1	0,7	1	0,5
Primary School + Secondary School + Teachers	1	1,6	-	-	1	0,5
Total	64	31,2	141	68,8	205	100

Table 5 reveals that the majority of the target audiences for 205 studies on listening was mostly comprised of secondary school students (f=68). Following secondary school students, listening studies were conducted mostly with non-native speakers (f=53) and primary school students (f=33). Among the studies, some were focusing on special education. The distribution of the studies focusing on special education by target audiences is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Distribution of the listening studies in special education

Target Audiences	f	%
Primary School	7	25,9
Preschool	5	18,6
Secondary School	5	18,6
Preschool + Primary School	4	14,8
Informal Education	3	11,1
Primary School + Secondary School + High School	3	11,1
Total	27	100

According to Table 6, there were 27 studies on listening conducted with special education students, with the highest number of studies carried out with primary school students (f=7).

Table 7

Distribution of the Listening Studies by Topics

Topics	f	%	Topics	f	%
1.Instructional strategies...	70	16,7	16.Listening challenges/barriers	7	1,7
2.Teaching Turkish to foreigners	53	12,6	17.Measurement and evaluation	7	1,7
3.Coursebooks	47	11,2	18.Listening self-efficacy	6	1,4
4.Reading education	32	7,6	19.Instructional program	5	1,2
5.Types of listening	27	6,4	20.Multimedia	5	1,2
6.Language development	23	5,5	21.Children's literature	3	0,7
7.Listening activities	22	5,2	22.Vocabulary	3	0,7
8.Speaking education	22	5,2	23.Listening awareness	3	0,7
9.Writing education	15	3,6	24.Creative thinking	3	0,7
10.Listening attitude	13	3,1	25.Listening analysis studies	3	0,7
11.Literature education	12	2,9	26.Teaching Turkish to bilinguals	2	0,5
12.Metacognition	10	2,4	27.Creative drama	2	0,5
13.Listening anxiety	8	1,9	28.Grammar instruction	1	0,2
14.Digital stories	8	1,9	29.Teaching Turkish to Turkish societies	1	0,2
15.Opinions	7	1,7			
			Total		100
			420		

It is understood from Table 7 that 420 frequencies were generated for 29 topics related to listening studies. It is observed that the highest number of studies were conducted on the topic of "instructional methods and techniques" (f=70), followed by the studies on "teaching Turkish to foreigners" (f=53), "coursebooks" (f=47), "reading education" (f=32), and "types of listening" (f=27).

Table 8

Distribution of most studied topics by years

Years	Order	Topics	f	%
2014-2018 (f= 133)	1.	Instructional strategies, methods...	24	18,0
	2.	Teaching Turkish to foreigners	17	12,8
	3.	Reading education	11	8,3
	4.	Coursebooks	11	8,3
	5.	Types of listening	8	6,0
	6.	Listening attitude	7	5,3
	7.	Writing education	6	4,5
	8.	Listening activities	6	4,5
	9.	Language development	6	4,5
	10.	Speaking education	5	3,8
Total			71	53,4
2019-2023 (f= 287)	1.	Instructional strategies, methods...	46	16,0
	2.	Teaching Turkish to foreigners	36	12,5
	3.	Coursebooks	36	12,5
	4.	Reading education	21	7,3
	5.	Types of listening	19	6,6
	6.	Speaking education	17	5,9
	7.	Language development	17	5,9
	8.	Listening activities	16	5,6
	9.	Writing education	9	3,1
	10.	Metacognition	7	2,4
Total			158	55,1

In Table 8, the most studied 10 listening topics for the years 2014-2018 and 2019-2023 are presented. Accordingly, the most common topics for listening studies during both the periods of 2014-2018 and 2019-2023

were “instructional strategies, methods, and techniques” and “teaching Turkish to foreigners”.

Table 9

Distribution of the listening studies (2014-2018) by research designs

Years	Type	f	Designs	f	%
2014-2018 ($\Sigma= 64$)	Quantitative	35	Experimental	16	54,7
			Survey	11	
			Correlational Survey	5	
			Scale Development	2	
			Causal-Comparative	1	
	Qualitative	19	Case	11	29,7
			Qualitative	5	
			Action Research	3	
	Mixed	10	Mixed	10	15,6

According to Table 9, most of the listening studies conducted between 2014 and 2018 were quantitative (54.7%). Within the quantitative studies, the most used designs were experimental (f=16) and survey (f=11). Qualitative studies were mostly designed in the form of case research (f=11).

Table 10

Distribution of the listening studies (2019-2023) by research designs

Years	Type	f	Designs	f	%
2019-2023 ($\Sigma= 141$)	Quantitative	80	Experimental	33	56,7
			Survey	25	
			Correlational Survey	17	
			Scale Development	3	
			Causal-Comparative	1	
	Qualitative	45	Design	1	31,9
			Qualitative	15	
			Case	14	
			Action Research	8	
			Phenomenology	5	
	Mixed	16	Meta-synthesis	2	11,3
			Grounded Theory	1	
			Mixed	16	

As shown in Table 10, most of the listening studies conducted between 2019 and 2023 were quantitative (56.7%). Within the quantitative studies, the most used designs were experimental (f=33) and survey (f=25). Among qualitative studies, the studies were mostly designed in “qualitative” (f=15) and “case” (f=14) designs. In addition, no information about sub-designs was included in all of the mixed-method studies (f=16).

Table 11

Distribution of the listening studies by sample size

Sample	f	%	Sample	f	%
0-100	123	70,7	0-20	27	15,5
101-200	12	6,9	21-40	40	23,0
201-300	7	4,0	41-60	29	16,6
301-400	12	6,9	61-80	15	8,6
401-500	5	2,9	81-100	12	6,9
501-1000	10	5,74			
1001+	5	2,9			
Total	174	100	Total	123	70,7

It is reported in Table 11 that among the 174 studies on listening, the sample size was commonly between “0-100” (f=123). Within the “0-100” sample range, the sample size of “21-40” (f=40) was the most preferred. 31 listening studies conducted with study materials are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Distribution of the listening studies by study materials

Type of Material	f	%	Number of Materials	f	%
Text	12	38,7	0-50	12	38,7
Activity	11	35,4	50-100	7	22,6
Coursebook	2	6,5	101-200	3	9,7
Thesis	2	6,5	201-300	2	6,5
Mixed Material	1	3,2	301-400	2	6,5
Dialogue	1	3,2	401-500	2	6,5
Learning Outcome	1	3,2	501-1000	3	9,7
Video	1	3,2			
Total	31	100	Total	31	100

It is noticeable that among 31 studies conducted with listening materials, the most frequently used types of materials were “text” (f=12) and “activity” (f=11). As for the number of materials, it is clear that the most popular range was between “0-50” (f=12).

Table 13

Distribution of the listening studies by measurement tools

Measurement Tools	f	%
Forms	148	29,0
Tests	129	25,3
Scales	105	20,6
Documents	61	12,0
Diaries	24	4,7
Surveys	19	3,7
Inventories	11	2,2
Rubrics	6	1,2
Programs	4	0,8
Checklists	3	0,6
Total	510	100

Table 13 shows that 510 measurement tools were used in 205 studies on listening. The most commonly used measurement tools were “forms” (f=148), “tests” (f=129), and “scales” (f=105). It can be seen that the least preferred measurement tools were “checklists” (f=3), “programs” (f=4), and “rubrics” (f=3).

Table 14

Distribution of the listening studies by the number of measurement tools

Number of Measurement Tools	Number of Studies	%
1	77	37,6
2	44	21,2
3	34	17,6
4	25	13,7
5	13	4,4
6	6	2,9
7	6	2,0
Total	205	100,0

The number of measurement tools used in the studies written on listening are presented in Table 14. Accordingly, the majority of the studies were carried out using a single measurement tool ($f=77$). Following that, the studies employing two measurement tools ($f=44$) are ranked.

Table 15

Distribution of the Measurement Tools by Research Designs

Research Design	N	Measurement Tool	
		f	X
Mixed	26	103	3,96
Quantitative	115	276	2,40
Qualitative	64	131	2,05
Total	205	510	2,49

Table 15 explains the distribution and average number of measurement tools by research designs. Accordingly, data were collected using 510 tools in 205 studies, with an average of 2.49 measurement tools per study. It is understood that the number of measurement tools is highest in quantitative studies ($f=276$), and the number of tools per study is highest in mixed-method studies ($X=3.96$).

Conclusion and Discussion

In this section, the findings are discussed by comparing them with the findings and results of studies available in the literature under the headings of years, types, universities, institutes, departments, target audiences, topics, research designs, samples/study materials, and measurement tools of the studies.

Years

Our study revealed that 205 postgraduate studies were written on listening between 2014 and 2023. Considering the study conducted by Doğan and Özçakmak (2014), which examined listening theses from 1998 to 2013, where 49 postgraduate theses were written in the relevant years, it was observed that the number of studies on listening between 2014 and 2023 increased fourfold. Furthermore, it was concluded in our study that the number of postgraduate studies written between 2019 and 2023 ($f=141$) increased more than twice compared to the years 2014-2018 ($f=64$). When these results are considered together, it can be suggested that there is an increasing trend in the number of postgraduate studies on listening in the field. Indeed, there are a great number of studies in the literature that support this view (Kemiksiz, 2017; Kardaş, Çetinkaya, and Kaya, 2018; Kavum, 2021; Soyuçuk, 2022; and Göçer and Bıyık, 2022). However, it is also necessary to compare this result with studies on other language skills to make it more tangible. For instance, in a study conducted by Aydeniz and Haydaroğlu (2021), it was found that the majority of postgraduate theses were about writing, and reading skills, while the least number of studies were about listening.

Types of Postgraduate Studies

In our study, it was found that 162 of the 205 postgraduate studies identified were master's theses, while 43 of them were doctoral dissertations. It was concluded that the number of doctoral dissertations between 2019 and 2023 decreased compared to the period between 2014 and 2018, while the proportion of master's theses increased. Additionally,

it was determined that the proportion of master's theses was 79%, whereas the proportion of doctoral dissertations was 21%. Some studies in the literature show similarity with this result (Doğan and Özçakmak, 2014; Kavum, 2021; Potur, 2023).

Universities

Our study determined that there were 60 universities where postgraduate studies on listening were completed between 2014 and 2023. Moreover, master's theses were included in all these universities, while doctoral dissertations were only conducted in 19 universities. Potur's (2023) study, which analyzed the postgraduate studies written on listening between 2011 and 2020, found that the studies were conducted in 49 different universities, and doctoral dissertations were written only in 19 universities. This result significantly supports our study. However, the lower number of universities where postgraduate studies were conducted in the study above may be attributed to the fact that the search was conducted merely with some keywords. Some studies reported that postgraduate studies were conducted in a much smaller number of universities (Doğan and Özçakmak, 2014; Kavum, 2021). It can be claimed that the search for postgraduate studies conducted in Turkish language departments using only the keyword "listening" in Kavum's (2021) analysis study might be the main reason for this discrepancy. The difference between the results of our study and the analysis study conducted by Doğan and Özçakmak (2014) can be explained by the increase in the number of postgraduate studies on listening over the past 10 years. In our study, it was found that the majority of the studies were completed at Gazi University, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, and Kütahya Dumlupınar University. Similarly, in the majority of studies in the literature, it was concluded that the highest number of postgraduate studies on listening were conducted at Gazi University (Doğan and Özçakmak, 2014; Boyacı and Demirkol, 2018; Kavum, 2021; Soyucok, 2022; Potur, 2023).

Institutes

When evaluated by institutes, it was understood that the postgraduate studies on listening between 2014 and 2023 were mostly completed in institutes of educational sciences (f=115), followed by institutes of social sciences (f=56). Similarly, in the analysis study conducted by Kavum (2021), 41 of 55 postgraduate studies identified were conducted in institutes of educational sciences (75%), and 14 (25%) of them were carried out in institutes of social sciences. In the study conducted by Doğan and Özçakmak (2014), it was found that the distribution of the postgraduate studies was as follows: 53% of them were in institutes of social sciences, 45% of them were in institutes of educational sciences, and 2% of them were in institutes of health sciences. Compared to the results of our study, this situation can be explained by the increasing number of institutes of educational sciences over the past 10 years. In our study, it was revealed that the studies on listening between 2019 and 2023 were completed in institutes of health sciences, postgraduate education, winter sports and sport sciences. This finding is important as it indicates that the postgraduate studies on listening spread across different types of institutes.

Departments

In our study, it was found that the studies on listening were written in 23 different departments. The number of departments became 19 between 2019 and 2023 whereas the number was 12 between 2014 and 2018. The majority of the studies were carried out in the department of Turkish and social sciences education (f=115), followed by primary school teaching (f=27), and special education (f=14), respectively. The finding that the majority of the studies were conducted in the department of Turkish and social sciences education, as reported in the studies by Potur (2023) and Kavum (2021), supports our study. Furthermore, in our study, it was revealed that some studies on listening were carried out in fields of science such as audiology, nursing, biophysics, otolaryngology, and speech and language therapy. Potur's (2023) study also supports this result. This is remarkable as the departments in listening studies have become more widespread, gaining an interdisciplinary feature.

Target Audiences

It was observed in our study that the studies on listening were mostly carried out with secondary school students (f=68), followed by non-native speakers (f=53), and primary school students (f=33). The literature indicates that secondary school students are the preferred target audience in most of the postgraduate studies on listening (Doğan and Özçakmak, 2014; Kemiksiz, 2017; Kardaş, Çetinkaya, and Kaya, 2018; Doğan Kahtalı, Oğuz, Cayhan, and Taşkın, 2020; Kavum, 2021; Göçer and Bıyık, 2022; Potur, 2023). Generally, findings in the literature suggest that studies on listening focusing on preschool, primary school, and high school levels are not at the desired level (Doğan and Özçakmak, 2014; Kardaş, Çetinkaya, and Kaya, 2018; Doğan Kahtalı, Oğuz, Cayhan, and Taşkın, 2020; Göçer and Bıyık, 2022). In our study, although not sufficient, it was found that compared to the period of 2014-2018, there was a proportional increase in the number of postgraduate studies targeting preschool and primary schools from 2019 to 2023. In addition, it was concluded in our study that there are a considerable number of postgraduate studies targeting special education (f=27).

Topics

It was revealed that among 205 postgraduate studies on listening, 420 frequencies were created under 29 different topics. This result indicates that each study covers approximately 2 topics. It was also found that the majority of the studies were conducted on instructional methods and techniques (f=70), followed by the studies on teaching Turkish to foreigners (f=53), coursebooks (f=47), reading education (f=32), and types of listening (f=27). Upon scrutinizing the studies in the literature, it was concluded that the majority of the studies on listening were about listening methods and techniques, with topics such as "listening attitude, listening comprehension, listening instruction, listening activities, and views on listening" (Kemiksiz, 2017; Kardaş, Çetinkaya, and Kaya, 2018; Soyuçok, 2022; Göçer and Bıyık, 2022; Potur, 2023). On the other hand, it was observed in our study that the popularity of postgraduate studies on reading education and writing education declined, while studies on textbooks, speaking education, listening activities, and types of listening gained popularity.

Research Designs

In our study, it was found that the majority of the postgraduate studies on listening conducted between 2014 and 2023 employed quantitative designs (f=115), followed by qualitative designs (f=64), and mixed methods (f=26). In the literature, studies on listening often employed quantitative, qualitative, and mixed designs, respectively (Eyüp, 2020; Doğan Kahtalı, Oğuz, Cayhan, and Taşkın, 2020; Kavum, 2021; Soyuçok, 2022; Göçer and Bıyık, 2022). In our study, it was noted that experimental design (f=49) was the most preferred in quantitative studies, while case study design (f=25) was the most preferred within qualitative studies. Kavum (2021) and Potur's (2023) studies emphasized experimental design and document analysis the most, while Kemiksiz's (2017) study preferred survey and document analysis. In our study, it was revealed that in all mixed methods studies (f=26) and many qualitative studies (f=20), only "qualitative" and "mixed" designs were used, without specifying any particular design.

Samples/Study Materials

In our study, it was determined that out of the 174 postgraduate listening studies conducted with sampling, 123 opted for a sample size within the range of "0-100", with the most common range being "21-40" (f=40). This finding conforms with Yangil's (2022) study, which reported a preference for sample sizes ranging from 31 to 100, and Kavum's (2021) research, which noted a preference for sample sizes between 51 and 100. On the contrary, Eyüp's (2020) study identified a predominance of sample sizes ranging from 101 to 200. The variance in findings might be attributed to some factors such as the exclusive focus on Turkish language teachers and the analysis of only articles in the respective study. Additionally, in our study, among the 31 listening studies employing study materials, the most commonly used types of materials were texts (f=12) and activities (f=11).

Measurement Tools

In our study, it was understood that a total of 510 measurement tools were utilized in 205 postgraduate studies on listening. The most commonly used measurement tools were forms (f=148), tests (f=129), and scales (f=105), while the least preferred ones were checklists (f=3), programs (f=4), and rubrics (f=3). Similarly, in the study conducted by Kavum (2021), it was found that tests, scales, personal information forms, and interview forms were the most commonly used measurement tools. Eyüp's (2020) study highlighted scales as the predominant tools, while documents were emphasized in Yangil's (2022) research, and documents along with interview forms were reported in Karbuz's (2023) study. Moreover, our analysis revealed that the majority of the studies employed a single measurement tool (f=77), followed by those utilizing two tools (f=44). It was further observed that quantitative studies utilized the highest number of measurement tools overall (f=276), whereas mixed-method studies exhibited the highest average number of tools per study ($X=3.96$).

General Evaluation

Our study, which performed a bibliometric analysis of postgraduate studies on listening from 2014 to 2023, was discussed in comparison with other studies evaluating academic works such as postgraduate studies, articles, books, and conference papers about listening. Following these

comparisons under 10 headings, some conclusions have been summarized in this section. Firstly, in terms of years of publication, our study covering the years 2014-2023 found 205 postgraduate studies on listening, indicating a significant increase compared to previous years. However, the finding of relatively fewer postgraduate studies on listening in some recent studies on listening raises the need for more stringent criteria in the selection process.

Regarding types of postgraduate studies, it was found that there was not a significant change in the distribution between master's theses and doctoral dissertations, with doctoral dissertations being many fewer in number. Our study determined 60 universities where postgraduate studies on listening were written, indicating an increase in the prevalence of listening studies at the university level compared to previous analysis studies. When compared with the literature, the results obtained by institutes showed that postgraduate listening studies were predominantly conducted in institutes of educational sciences, and there was also diversity in terms of types of institutes. The fact that the studies on listening were submitted to 23 different departments indicates that listening skill is being studied by other disciplines as well, suggesting an interdisciplinary trend.

In terms of target audiences, it was understood that the postgraduate listening studies primarily focused on secondary schools, but foreign students also gained popularity as samples. On the other hand, both old and new studies prioritized the topic of listening methods and techniques. However, it was found in our study that postgraduate studies about reading education and writing education were less preferred, while studies on coursebooks, speech education, listening activities, and types of listening were more prevalent. Regarding methodology, it was concluded that quantitative methods were predominantly used, a finding supported by the literature. Within quantitative research, experimental designs were prevalently preferred, while case study designs were more prevalent within qualitative research. As for samples/materials, it was concluded that the majority of research on listening involved samples or study groups, with fewer studies using materials. Most of the studies preferred sample sizes ranging from 0 to 100. In terms of measurement tools, it was determined that scales, documents, interview forms, and tests were the most commonly used measurement tools in analysis studies.

Implications

Analysis studies focusing on the fundamental skills in Turkish language teaching should be reconducted in five-year periods. In that vein, young researchers can familiarize themselves with the field, while senior academics are provided with a comprehensive evaluation opportunity. In our study, postgraduate studies on listening skills over 10 years were scrutinized. Researchers can conduct analysis studies evaluating other academic works written on reading, writing, and speaking skills in recent years. These studies can be based on postgraduate studies or sources such as articles, books, and conference papers.

In our study, postgraduate studies on listening skills in the context of native language were examined. Researchers can focus on studies about teaching Turkish to foreigners in terms of listening skills. Additionally, academic studies about listening written in other languages such as

English, French, German, Arabic, and so on can be subject to investigation.

The number of students taking master's and doctoral degrees in Turkish language teaching has increased, leading to hundreds of academic studies being conducted each year, particularly theses and articles. This situation has resulted in a concentration on certain topics within Turkish language studies. Researchers can utilize academic studies focusing solely on these topics in analysis studies.

In our study, it was found that postgraduate studies on listening skills are most commonly conducted with secondary school students and foreign learners, yet studies involving other groups are not at a sufficient level. Thus, researchers working on listening skills can carry out studies targeting high school and university students, teachers and academics, or bilingual individuals of Turkish aristocrats.

References

- Akaydın, Ş. & Çeçen, M. A. (2015). Okuma becerisiyle ilgili makaleler üzerine bir içerik analizi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 40(178). <http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2015.4139>
- Akkuş, Z. (2022). *Akıcı okuma becerisi üzerine yapılan çalışmalardaki genel eğilimler: bir tematik içerik analizi çalışması* (Master's thesis, Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- Aktaş, E., & Yurt, S. U. (2015). Türkçe eğitimi alanındaki makale özetlerine yönelik bir içerik analizi. *Turkish Studies (Elektronik)*, 10(7), 73-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8121>
- Altunkaynak, M. (2023). Türkçe dersi öğretim programı ile ilgili yapılan araştırmalarda eğilim: İçerik analizi. *Balikesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 26(50), 469-482. <https://doi.org/10.31795/baunsobed.1295270>
- Alver, M., & Taştımır, L. (2017). Konuşma becerisi üzerine yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(3), 451-462. <https://ijlet.com/DergiTamDetay.aspx?ID=2041>
- Arı, G., Yaşar, M. S., & İstanbullu, E. (2020). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarıyla ilgili yayımlanan makalelerin incelenmesi (2014-2018). *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(2), 487-508. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.689343>
- Aydeniz, S. ve Haydaroğlu, M. (2021). Dört temel dil becerisi alanında yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin bibliyometrik analizi. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(1), 200-216. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/turkegitimdergisi/issue/62994/929408>
- Bahadır, H. İ. (2023). Okuma motivasyonu ile ilgili araştırmalara yönelik bir içerik analizi. *Korkut Ata Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (11), 931-952. <https://doi.org/10.51531/korkutataturkiyat.1311634>
- Batur, Z., & Akdeniz, T. (2020). Değerler eğitimiyle ilgili yapılan tezler üzerine bir inceleme: Türkçe eğitimi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(1), 1-11.

<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/usaksosbil/issue/55286/705495>

- Batur, Z., Özdil, Ş., & Özcan, H. Z. (2022). Millî Eğitim dergisinde yayımlanan makalelerin Türkçe eğitimi açısından bibliyometrik analizi. *Millî Eğitim Dergisi*, 51(234), 1591-1612. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.860666>
- Biçer, N., & Alan, Y. (2019). Türk soylulara Türkçe öğretimi ile ilgili çalışmalara genel bir bakış. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 29(1), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.18069/firatsbed.538665>
- Bolat, Y., & Tekin, M. T. (2018). Türkiye’de yazma eğitimi üzerine yapılan ölçek geliştirme çalışmalarının analizi: Bir meta-sentez çalışması. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(2), 26-40. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mkuefder/issue/41727/496671>
- Boyacı, S., & Demirkol, S. (2018). Türkçe Eğitimi Alanında Yapılan Doktora Tezlerinin İncelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(2), 512-531. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.363599>
- Bozkurt, B., & Uzun, N. (2015). Türkçenin eğitimi-öğretimine ilişkin bir alanyazını değerlendirmesi: Uluslararası bilimsel toplantılarda eğilimler/yönelimler. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 1(2). <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jlere/issue/18968/200358?publisher=jlere>
- Büyüköztürk, S., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, S., & Demirel, F. (2020). *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (29. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Can, F., & Kardaş, M. N. (2023). Türkiye’de ikidillilik üzerine yapılmış akademik çalışmaların eğilimleri. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(38), 555-577. <https://doi.org/10.35675/befdergi.1206969>
- Ceran, D., Aydın, M., & Onarıcıoğlu, A. S. (2018). Okuma eğitimi üzerine yapılan tezlerde eğilimler: Bir içerik analizi çalışması. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(3), 2377-2392. <https://doi.org/10.29299/kefad.2018.19.03.016>
- Chen, J., Ye, X., Chen, M. and Liang, Y. (2019). Bibliometric analysis of the papers on urban education. *Library Hi Tech*, 37(4), 894-905. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-01-2019-0009>
- Cin Şeker, Z. (2020). Ana dili eğitimi dergisi’nde yayımlanan makalelerin anahtar kelimeleri üzerine betimsel bir analiz. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(3), 797-811. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.718596>
- Cin Şeker, Z. (2020). Dinleme ve konuşma becerilerine yönelik lisansüstü tezlerin anahtar kelimeleri üzerine bir inceleme: betimsel analiz. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (19), 128-140. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.752206>
- Coşkun, E., Özçakmak, H. ve Balcı, A. (2012). Türkçe eğitiminde eğilimler: 1981-2010 yılları arasında yapılan tezler üzerine bir meta-analiz çalışması. E. Yılmaz, M. Gedizli, E, Özcan ve Y. Koçmar (Ed.). *Türkçenin eğitimi öğretimi üzerine çalışmalar içinde* (s. 204-212). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

- Çifci, M. ve Ünlü, S. (2020). Türkiye’de çevrimiçi okuma üzerine yapılan çalışmaların analizi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(4), 1368-1385. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.755846>
- Demir, M. İ., & Şeref, İ. (2021). Türkçe eğitimi lisansüstü tezlerine yönelik bir araştırma: Tez jürileri. *Türkiye Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(2), 273-296. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tubad/issue/67618/1018840>
- Demir, T. T. (2021). Türkçe eğitimi alanında nicel araştırma yöntemleri kullanılarak yapılan doktora tezlerindeki eğilimler. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 9(2), 543-560. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.873899>
- Demir, T. T. ve Çalışkan, G. (2021). Türkçe eğitimi alanında nitel araştırma yöntemleri kullanılarak yapılan doktora tezlerindeki eğilimler. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 10(4), 1412-1429. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/2162075>
- Demirel, A. (2023). Türkçe eğitimi alanındaki yazma eğitimiyle ilgili lisansüstü tezler üzerine bir inceleme. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 25(3), 849-863. <https://doi.org/10.32709/akusosbil.1074129>
- Dincel, Ö. (2023). Türkçe öğretiminde değerler eğitimi temalı araştırma makaleleri: bir içerik analizi çalışması. *Asya Studies*, 7(24), 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.31455/asya.1278960>
- Doğan Kahtalı, B., Oğuz, B., Cayhan, C., Taşkın, N. (2020). Türkiye’de dinleme eğitiminin geldiği nokta (2017-2019 yılları). *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Akademi Dergisi*, (4), 645-663. <https://doi.org/10.47994/usbad.775002>
- Doğan, Y. ve Özçakmak, H. (2014). Dinleme becerisinin eğitimi üzerine yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin değerlendirilmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 2(2), 90-99. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.46766>
- Dolunay, S. K., & Saluk, N. (2023). Özel/üstün yetenekli öğrencilere yönelik yapılmış Türkçe eğitimi ile ilgili çalışmalar üzerine bir inceleme. *RumeliDE Dil Ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (35), 65-95. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1342087>
- Emek, M. (2020). 2010-2020 yılları arasında Türk soylulara Türkiye Türkçesi öğretimi alanında Türkiye’de yapılan tez ve makale türü akademik çalışmaların çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. A. Okur, İ. Güleç ve B. İnce. (Ed.). *Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretiminde Yeni Yönelimler 2* içinde (s.147-165). Sakarya: Beşiz Yayınları.
- Erdem, S., & Gökçe, B., (2020). Türkiye’de 2005-2019 yılları arasında ilkokulda Türkçe öğretimine yönelik yapılan araştırmalar üzerine bir değerlendirme. E. Yağmur Şahin (Ed.). *Türkçe Eğitimi ve Türk Edebiyatı Araştırmaları* içinde (s.287-319), Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi.
- Eyüp, B. (2020). Türkçe öğretmenleri ile ilgili yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin eğilimleri: bir içerik analizi (2000-2019). *RumeliDE Dil Ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (21), 536-558. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.843489>

- Genç Ersoy, B., & Ersoy, M. (2021). Teknoloji destekli Türkçe öğretimi üzerine yayınlanan makalelerin içerik analizi: Ulakbim-TR Dizin Örneği. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(3), 810-829. <https://doi.org/10.31592/aeusbed.977274>
- Göçer, A., & Bıyık, T. (2022). Dinleme becerisi ile ilgili yapılan çalışmaların genel görünümü üzerine bir inceleme. *Avrasya Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(1), 98-123. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/adea/issue/71036/1122181>
- Günaydın, Y. (2020). İki dillilik ile ilgili yayımlanan makalelerin incelenmesi (2010-2020). *International Journal of Language Academy*, 8(5). <https://doi.org/10.29228/ijla.48083>
- Kadan, Ö. F. (2021). Hatay'da dil eğitimi alanında yapılmış lisansüstü tezlerin bibliyometrik analizi. A. Gündüz, H. Çoruh, S. Hatipoğlu ve Y. Yılmaz (Ed.). *Hatay Araştırmaları VI* içinde (pp. 295-312).
- Kaplan, K., & Özgen, A. (2023). 2016-2022 yılları arasında Türkçe öğretim programları konulu yayımlanan makale ve tezlerin analizi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Türkoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(1), 435-456. <https://doi.org/10.32321/cutad.1255782>
- Karabulut, C. (2023). Ana dil ve yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde konuşma becerisine ilişkin ölçek çalışmalarının incelenmesi. *Bezgek Yabancılar Türkçe Öğretimi Dergisi*, 2(4), 249-260. <https://doi.org/10.56987/bezgek.1389740>
- Karagöz, B., & Koç Ardıç, İ. (2019). Ana dili eğitimi dergisinde yayımlanan makalelerin bibliyometrik analizi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 7(2), 419-435. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.482628>
- Karagöz, B., & Şeref, İ. (2019). Okuma alanındaki araştırmaların bibliyometrik özellikler açısından incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 7(3), 781-799. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.581630>
- Karagöz, B., & Şeref, İ. (2020). Yazma becerisiyle ilgili makaleler üzerine bir inceleme: web of science veri tabanında eğilimler. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(1), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.619090>
- Karagöz, B., & Şeref, İ. (2021). Türkçe eğitimi doktora tezlerine bütünsel bir yaklaşım (1995-2020). *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* (46), 43-68. <https://doi.org/10.21497/sefad.1031689>
- Karakaya, İ. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. A. Tanrıoğen (Ed.) Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri için. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Karbuç, A. (2023). *Dinleme eğitimi araştırmalarına genel bakış: Bir meta-sentez çalışması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, Tokat.
- Kardaş, M. N., Çetinkaya, V., & Kaya, M. (2018). 2005-2017 yılları arasında dinleme eğitimi üzerine yapılmış akademik çalışmaların eğilimleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), 21-32. <http://kusobdergi.com.tr/en/pub/issue/36472/411426>
- Kavum, K. (2021). *Dinleme/izleme becerisi alanında yapılan lisansüstü araştırmalar üzerine bir meta sentez çalışması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

- Kayadibi, N. (2022). Dinleme konusunda yapılan eğitim arařtırmalarının bibliyometrik analizi. *Türkiye Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, 26(2), 507-522.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tsadergisi/issue/71638/1071064>
- Kemiksiz, Ö. (2017). Dinleme becerisi üzerine yazılan makalelerin deęerlendirilmesi. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(1), 511-531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18298/ijlet.1710>
- Kemiksiz, Ö. (2021). Yazma becerilerinin geliřtirilmesi üzerine hazırlanan tezlere yönelik bir inceleme: yarı deneysel çalıřmalar. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 18(41), 3172-3203.
<https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.887374>
- Kemiksiz, Ö. (2022). Türkçe öğretiminde kaygı üzerine yapılan çalıřmaların eğilimleri. *Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 31-48.
<https://doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.688865>
- Kemiksiz, Ö. (2023). Türkçe öğretiminde tutum: Lisansüstü tezlerin arařtırma eğilimleri. *Korkut Ata Türkiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi* (11), 752-774. <https://doi.org/10.51531/korkutataturkiyat.1276184>
- Keray Dinçel, B., & Sanlav, G. (2023). Okuma stratejilerine yönelik yazılan lisansüstü tezlerin farklı deęişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 12(3), 1254-1285. <https://doi.org/10.7884/teke.1314293>
- Kesici, S. (2023). Konuşma becerisini geliřtirmede kullanılan tür, yöntem ve teknikler: bir alanyazın taraması. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 8(1), 88-105. <https://doi.org/10.54979/turkegitimdergisi.1265865>
- Kırımlı, B., & Kayhan, S. (2022). İki dillilik ile ilgili yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin incelenmesi (2001-2021). *International Journal of Language Academy*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.29228/ijla.58109>
- Lee, S. H. (2015). *A bibliometric analysis of the field of records management: A case study of records management journal, 1989-2013*. Doctoral Dissertation, Canada: University of Toronto.
- Maden, A., Banaz, E., & Gülen, D. (2022). Türkçe öğretiminde akademik başarı üzerine yapılmıř lisansüstü tezlerin eğilimleri. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(2), 577-589.
<https://doi.org/10.54979/turkegitimdergisi.1214163>
- Maden, S. (2021). Türkçe ders kitapları ile ilgili lisansüstü tezlerin eğilimleri: Bir içerik analizi. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(1), 30-45.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1548973>
- Maden, S., & Özgen, A. (2023). Türkçe eğitimi alanında hazırlanmıř öz yeterlik ile ilgili arařtırmaların eğilimleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(3), 822-839.
<https://doi.org/10.31592/aeusbed.1312815>
- Maden, S., Durmaz, N., & Sayal, A. (2022). Türkçe öğretiminde drama yönteminin kullanımıyla ilgili arařtırmaların eğilimleri. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(1), 146-170.
<https://doi.org/10.54979/turkegitimdergisi.1072744>

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2015). *Nitel veri analizi*. (Çev. S. Akbaba Altun ve A. Ersoy). Pegem Akademi. (Orijinal yayın tarihi 1994).
- Mutlu, H. H. (2018). Ana dili eğitimi dergisinde yayınlanan araştırmaların eğilimleri: içerik analizi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(4), 1196-1209. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.450275>
- Oğuz, B. (2021). Özel yetenekli öğrencilere ana dili öğretimi konulu çalışmaların (2017-2020) eğilimleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 10(1), 330-348. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1660552>
- Önal, A. ve Maden, S. (2021). Türkçe eğitimi ile ilgili 2015-2019 yılları arası lisansüstü tezlerin araştırma eğilimleri. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 23(3), 929-941. <https://doi.org/10.32709/akusosbil.879623>
- Özçakmak, H. (2017). Türkçe eğitimi lisansüstü araştırmalarında yeni yönelimler (2011-2015). *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 6(3), 1607-1618. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/teke/issue/31471/344462>
- Özdemir, S. (2018). Okumaya ilişkin lisansüstü araştırmaların eğilimleri. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(4), 1161-1178. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.455560>
- Potur, Ö. (2023). Dinleme becerisi üzerine yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin incelenmesi. *RumeliDE Dil Ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (33), 126-150. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1283685>
- Potur, Ö., & Yıldız, N. (2016). Konuşma becerisi alanında yapılan akademik çalışmaların eğilimleri. *Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi*, (18). <https://www.idealonline.com.tr/IdealOnline/lookAtPublications/paperDetail.xhtml?uId=35111>
- Sarıkaya, B. & Söylemez, Y. (2016). *Türkçe eğitimi alanındaki konuşma becerisiyle ilgili yapılan lisansüstü çalışmaların değerlendirilmesi*. II. Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi (12-14 Ekim 2016), Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi.
- Sarıkaya, B., & Yamaç, A. E. (2023). Temel dil becerilerinde kaygı: lisansüstü tezler üzerine bir araştırma. *Elektronik Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(23), 15-32. <https://doi.org/10.55605/ejedus.1253153>
- Sevim, O. ve İşcan, A. (2012). Türkçenin eğitimi ve öğretimi alanında yapılan yüksek lisans tezlerinde geçen anahtar kelimelere dönük bir içerik analizi. *Turkish Studies*, 7(1), 1863-1873. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.3101>
- Soyuçok, M. (2022). Dinleme becerisi üzerine hazırlanan lisansüstü tez çalışmalarının bibliyometrik analizi. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi*, 8(1), 66-80. <https://doi.org/10.47714/uebt.1079623>
- Sönmez, V. ve Alacapınar, F. G. (2016) *Sosyal bilimlerde ölçme aracı hazırlama*. Ankara: Anı Yayınları.

- Sur, E. (2023). Türkçe ders kitaplarına yönelik hazırlanan çalışmalardaki eğilimler. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 12(1), 194-220. <https://doi.org/10.7884/teke.5615>
- Şahin, A., Başbayrak, M., & Çiftçi, B. (2020). Teknoloji destekli Türkçe eğitimi tezlerinin eğilimleri. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi*, 6(2), 98-114. <https://doi.org/10.47714/uebt.737997>
- Şentürk, C., & Yazar, İ. (2021). Türkçe öğretimi üzerine yapılan lisansüstü çalışmaların analizi. *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education (IJTASE)*, 10(4), 258-276. <https://www.ijtase.net/index.php/ijtase/article/view/4/6>
- Şimşek, B., Akbulut, S., & Koparan, B. (2023). Yazma Becerisini Geliştirmeye Yönelik Yazılan Makalelerin İncelenmesi. *Turkish Academic Research Review*, 8(3), 1217-1235. <https://doi.org/10.30622/tarr.1336308>
- Temizkan, M. (2021). Türkçe Ders Kitaplarına Yönelik Lisansüstü Çalışmalar Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *Okuma Yazma Eğitimi Araştırmaları*, 9(2), 147-162. <https://doi.org/10.35233/oyea.1011359>
- Tok, M., & Potur, Ö. (2015). Yazma Eğitimi Alanında Yapılan Akademik Çalışmaların Eğilimleri (2010-2014 Yılları). *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(4), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.30614>
- Topal, Y., Ongun, A., & Arıcı, B. (2022). Okuma Eğitimi ile İlgili Lisansüstü Tezlerin Eğilimleri: Bir İçerik Analizi. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(2), 459-471. <https://doi.org/10.54979/turkegitimdergisi.1193156>
- Topçu, F. K. (2021). Türkçe Eğitimi Alanında Yapılmış Dijital Öğrenme Tezlerinin İncelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 9(4), 1338-1359. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.982783>
- Topçuoğlu Ünal, F. & Özer, F. (2014). Türkçe öğretiminde dinleme becerisi ile ilgili kaynakça çalışması. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 202-3-218. http://jret.org/FileUpload/ks281142/File/23.topcuoglu_unal.pdf
- Topçuoğlu Ünal, F. ve Özer, D. (2016). Konuşma becerisi ile ilgili kaynakça çalışması. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(47), 671-686. <https://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/articles/bibliography-study-related-with-speaking-skill.pdf>
- ULAKBİM. (2020). TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM Ulusal Akademik Ağ ve Bilgi Merkezi Cahit Arf Bilgi Merkezi. <https://trdizin.gov.tr/ufaq/etik-kurul-izinleri-her-makale-icin-mi-istenmektedir/>
- Ungan, S., & Dincel, Ö. (2022). Ana Dili Olarak Türkçe Öğretiminde Ölçme Değerlendirme Temalı Bilimsel Araştırmalar: Bir İçerik Analizi Çalışması. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(2), 562-576. <https://doi.org/10.54979/turkegitimdergisi.1191204>
- Ustabulut, M. Y. (2021). Türkçe öğretiminde yansıtıcı düşünme uygulamalarına ilişkin araştırmaların eğilimleri. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 10(3), 1089-1104. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/teke/issue/65009/1000816>

- Varişoğlu, B., Şahin, A., & Göktaş, Y. (2013). Türkçe eğitimi araştırmalarında eğilimler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 13(3), 1767-1781. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2013.3.1609>
- Yağmur Şahin, E., Kana, F., & Varişoğlu, B. (2013). Türkçe eğitimi bölümlerinde yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin araştırma eğilimleri. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(2), 356-378. <https://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/2671/1189>
- Yangil, M. K. (2022). A Content Analysis of Articles Published in the Listening Skill Area Between 2008 and 2020, *International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture*, 7(18), 1809-1846. <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijoecc.599>
- Yıldız, D. (2016). Uluslararası Dil Dergilerinde Yayımlanan Makalelerin İncelenmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36(2). <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/gefad/issue/29793/320355>
- YÖK. (2016). Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesi. <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Sayfalar/Kurumsal/mevzuat/bilimsel-arastirma-ve-etik-yonetmeligi.aspx>
- YÖK. (2024a). Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- YÖK. (2024b). Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi. <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>