Content Analysis of Abstracts on ELT Research Available in Turkish Journal Park

Academic Platform

Kürşat CESUR[1]

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey

Muhammed KÖK

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey

Çığır AYDIN

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey

Abstract

This study investigates the tendency in research on ELT via content analysis of the abstracts of publications available in Turkish Journal Park Academic (Dergi Park Akademik) platform which is a national journal management and publication system that is home to more than 2000 journals and over 326000 articles. Qualitative research method was carried out. The input for the search query that constituted the data for this study was "English Language Teaching". The resulting 234 articles' abstracts were examined using an "Article Information Rubric". The data analysis procedure was carried out by examining each section such as availability of abstract, not stated in abstract, distribution of themes, availability of samples, distribution of sample, availability of sampling, distribution type of sampling, etc. for each abstract. The findings revealed that data analysis (*f*=125), type of sampling (*f*=110), research design (*f*=108) were mostly found to be not stated in abstracts. Moreover, ELT researchers studied mostly teacher education, curriculum and teaching materials, and language teaching. Undergraduates (*f*=130) were the most frequent sample. Purposive (*f*=79) and random (*f*=23) sampling types were found to be the most utilized types. The implications and suggestions drawn based on the findings of the study are presented in the conclusion part.

Keywords: ELT Research, Journal Articles, Content Analysis, Abstracts

[1]Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Department of English Language Teaching.
Email:kursatcesur@comu.edu.tr

Introduction

Today, the role of English is not the same as it was two decades ago. The way it is valued and taught at schools makes the role and place of English different. With the effects of globalism and multiculturalism, the role of English has come to be the language of the World. Since English has started to be perceived as a lingua franca around the world, the pedagogical aspect of English has changed as well. For this reason, English Language Teaching (ELT) industry has benefitted from this change in terms of the content of works written in the field. Several articles, MA theses, PhD dissertations, and research papers have altered and increased variety in the concepts, contents, samples, subjects, research designs and methodologies with regard to this new vision. Especially in Turkey, with the increment of the number of ELT departments in state and private universities, there is a limited number of well-conducted research studies to determine the scope of research articles lately (Yağız, Aydın & Akdemir, 2016). The departments related to ELT are various and this makes it hard to keep up with the changes and follow the general inclination of research studies. To keep in mind that gathering systematic information related to recent research studies is worth to be considered for the development of the ELT industry, many academics, researchers and practitioners will benefit from the results of this gathering by modifying their studies, research arenas or methodologies. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to determine what new trends in the field are in order to provide an overall analysis of the recent research which will hopefully enlighten the way for researchers. For this reason, 234 articles' abstracts were scrutinized with the utilization of content analysis. The importance of this study is that it will not only help us see the recent trends in the ELT arena from Journal Park Academic which lets researchers access ERIC and ULAKBIM databases, but also how well an article's abstract can be written by shedding light on the most common missing parts made by researchers.

Literature Review

Several research studies which utilize content analysis as a research design have been conducted in the field of ELT to analyse which topics, research designs, methods, tools or analysis methods have been popular among M.A. theses, PhD dissertations, books and articles. Chaiyasook and Jaroongkhongdach (2014) did a content analysis in their study regarding Thai M.A. theses' topics and methods in ELT from 2003 to 2011. For content

analysis, they collected 194 theses and dissertations from 7 universities. While analysing the data, they used a coding system which consisted of 6 categories. The results showed that student performance is the top interest among all the theses (60.82%) whereas the learning support focus has the proportion of (27.84%) in an undergraduate level. Moreover, among research design headlines, the results indicated that majority of the theses utilized human quantitative research design (61.34%). It is also noteworthy that majority of the theses utilized students as data source (80.41%). More than one instrument was employed as an instrument (73.20%). 64 out of 142 were found to be a combination of a questionnaire and a test. In their study, it is also highlighted that although a combination of analytical method was mainly used (70.10%), 82 out of 136 of those employed descriptive and inferential statistics.

A similar study was carried out in Turkey to examine articles in the field of ELT. Yağızet al. (2016) conducted a content analysis to examine articles published in Turkey in the ELT industry between 2005 and 2015. Their aim was to get the general picture of subject distributions, research methods, data collection tools, sample size group, data analysis procedures in the recently published articles in the Turkish context. They collected 274 articles from Turkish authors which were chosen from 15 different journals indexed by ULAKBIM. The results indicate that though common research topics were found as "language learning, language teaching and teacher education", researchers neglected the topics "CALL, ICT, multimedia". Also, quantitative research design was found to be predominating. Accordingly, achievement tests, questionnaires, and scales were mostly preferred as data collection tools. Furthermore, for participants, undergraduate students and teachers were the most commonly preferred sample type. Most of the articles were analysed through descriptive analysis. Drawing upon the results, they advised that there should be more focus on academics and graduates as subjects, and also mixed methods and more critical issues should be emphasized more.

Similar to this study, there is another study aim of which was to examine the articles in the field of Distance English Language Teaching. Karadeniz and Sözler (2016) did a content analysis of the articles published from 4 different journals between 2002 and 2012. They aimed to search the topics of the articles, their samplings, their methodological dimensions. They collected 30 articles; however, they used 15 of them. The results showed that teaching methods and implemented technologies were found to be the most common titles used in the articles published between 2002 and 2012. Those titles were followed by affective dimension and perception. Teachers and undergraduates were the most common

participants of the studies. Also, they highlighted that most frequently-used research model is quantitative, especially the experimental studies.

Solak (2014) conducted a research to determine the common trends of recent research papers in foreign language teaching in the Turkish context. For this reason, 189 research papers indexed by ULAKBIM and SSCI were collected between 2009 and 2013. A classification form was used as instrument. The main purpose of the study was to see the frequently used topics, distribution of language and author, data collection tools, research design, data analysis, types of samples and size of samples. The findings indicated that the highest number of research papers was published in 2013 while the least number of papers were published in 2010. Most of the papers were written in English and most of the authors were Turkish. Moreover, concept analysis, teaching and learning were the top trending topics. Quantitative research design was used more than qualitative design. Undergraduates were frequently chosen as participants. Questionnaires and documents had the highest rate as tools.

Another research conducted by Kirmizi (2012) intended to investigate the most frequently studied topics and common contents among MA theses written between 2005 and 2010 in ELT from 6 different universities. In order to find the common research topics, 209 theses from 6 universities were analysed. The theses were written at METU, Çukurova, Bilkent, Gazi, Anadolu and Hacettepe universities. The data for the study was collected under 9 common trending topics' headlines. The headlines included: materials or curriculum design and evaluation, psychology, teacher factors, teaching method, language skills, linguistics, CALL, literature and culture, learner factors. The findings indicate that among 209 collected theses, language skills is the top arena that was studied in 59 theses. Gazi University ranks first, as it has 17 theses on language skills whereas Anadolu University gave less attention to this topic having five theses. Also, teaching method is the second topic used by 32 theses. Although the topic was studied ten times in METU, it was studied three times in Gazi University. Additionally, Materials or Curriculum Design and Evaluation is the third topic studied by 24 theses. Among 24 theses, it seems that the highest number of theses on this topic is nine by Gazi University. However, Anadolu University gave the least attention to this topic with only one thesis. It was also revealed that linguistics is the fourth topic studied among 23 theses. Although there are theses written by METU (10) Çukurova (8), Gazi (5) on linguistics, Bilkent, Hacettepe and Anadolu Universities have no theses written on this topic. CALL is the least studied topic aswithjust17 theses in total.

In the light of the literature, this study tries to look for the answers to the following research questions based upon the abstracts of 234 research articles published in the field of ELT research.

1. What is the distribution of years, authors, article types, themes, samples, types of sampling, sample sizes, research methods, research designs, data collection tools, and data analysis processes of articles?

2. Which components of a well written abstract are not stated in the abstracts?

Methodology

Research Design

The analysis of documents is hard to interpret and evaluate. Therefore, a rubric is needed to get a precise and reliable data. In this respect, the present study attempts to utilize content analysis as a research design since it aims to describe the trends in the ELT field based on the 234 abstracts. In other words, in order to get systematic and objective data, descriptive content analysis was applied in this study. Regarding the importance of systematic analysis in written document analysis, Yağız et al. (2016) state that "such a systematic analysis converts qualitative data into quantitative data."

Sample

The main criterion for the selection of the ELT related articles was whether they were scanned in Journal Park Academic or not. For this reason, the articles published until 2018were scanned through Journal Park Academic. In the end, 234 published articles related to ELT field were selected for this study.

Data collection instrument

"Article Information Rubric" (See Appendix) was applied as an instrument in order to analyse and evaluate the data systematically. Initially, this rubric was used by Sözbilir, Kutu and Yaşar (2012). Then, Yağız et al. (2016) modified the rubric into the ELT field based upon their aims in their study. The researchers of this study modified the sections of rubric belonging Yağız et al. in line with their research questions. All the abstracts of the articles were analysed with the help of this rubric. The data entry was done through Microsoft Excel 2010 program.

Data collection procedures

Firstly, the articles available at Turkish Journal Park Academic were searched. 234 articles published in the ELT field were found by researchers after typing the search query "English Language Teaching". Secondly, Yağız et al.'s (2016) rubric was modified. Researchers readapted their rubric in line with their research questions. After sharing 234 articles equally, researchers analysed articles by using the rubric. The data entry was done through the Microsoft Excel program. The researchers double-checked their entries for the validation of the data.

Data analysis

After the data entry, analysis and the results were provided in Microsoft Excel 2010 (Meyer & Avery, 2009). With the help of a rubric used by all researchers, each article was analysed regarding the headlines shown in the rubric and data were coded in the Microsoft Excel program. The findings shown in the tables descriptively were provided through content analysis which helps the researchers see similar topics, concepts, and themes together clearly (Berg & Lune, 2017; Mayring, 2000).

Results

Regarding the first research question, the analysis of its results is depicted below.

Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of years.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of years

Years	f	$\%$
2017	35	15
2012	33	14
2013	28	12
2016	26	11
2015	24	10.15
2014	21	9
2011	17	7.27

Year	Frequency	Percentage
2010	10	4.27
2009	10	4.27
2007	8	3.41
2008	5	2.13
2018	4	2
2006	2	0.85
2005	2	0.85
2004	2	0.85
2000	2	0.85
2003	1	0.42
2002	1	0.42
2001	1	0.42
1996	1	0.42
1995	1	0.42
Total	234	100

Table 1 indicates that there is a non-linear increment of articles regarding years. However, the amount of articles increases in the late 2000s whereas it declines in the late 90s and at the beginning of 2000s. Also, with further analysis of the chart, it is clearly seen that except 2018 which is the year this study is conducted, late 2010s particularly 2015, 2016 and 2017 are the years with the largest frequency distribution. Academic Incentive Allowance to the Turkish researchers which was put into practice in 2015 could have had considerable impact on this increase. Moreover, Terms of Application for Associate Professorship was changed in December 2016. This may have also provoked the increase in the number of the articles in those years.

Table 2. Frequency distribution of Number of Authors

Number of Authors	f	%
1	122	52.10
2	87	37.20
3	20	8.55
4	5	2.15
Total	234	100

It is inferred from Table 2 that authors mostly prefer to write articles by themselves rather than with one or more authors. Accordingly, Table 2 shows us that the frequency of articles written by single author is 122 while the lowest frequency, which is 5, belongs to the ones which have four authors. To get more points both for 'Academic Incentive Allowance' and the 'Terms of Application for Associate Professorship', they may have wished to carry out the study either themselves (f=122) or with a colleague (f=87).

Table 3. Frequency distribution of Article Types

Article Type	f	%
Original Research	181	77
Commentary Opinion	25	11
Editorial	15	6.5
Review Article	7	3
Book Reviews	3	1
Others	2	1
Empty	1	0.50
Total	234	100

Table 3 shows that among 234 articles, the frequency distribution of original research is 181. In addition, commentary opinion articles' frequency is 25. The least applied article type is book reviews with the frequency of 3.

Table 4. Frequency distribution of Theme of the Articles

Themes	*f*	*%*
Teacher Education	49	20.94
Curriculum and Teaching Materials	36	15.38
Language Teaching	34	14.52
Research Studies	20	8.54
Multimedia & ICT in Eng. Ed.	19	8.11
Learning and Acquisition	17	7.26
Other	14	5.98
Cult & Literature in Language Teaching	12	5.12
Testing and Evaluation	10	4.27
CALL	8	3.41
Higher Education	6	2.56
Applied Linguistics	5	2.13
Language itself	4	1.70
Total	234	100

Table 4 displays that the most commonly investigated topics are teacher education (f=49), curriculum and teaching materials (f=36), language teaching (f=34). The least focused topics are language itself (f=4), applied linguistics (f=5), higher education (f=6), and CALL (f=8).

Table 5. Frequency distribution of Sample

Sample	f	%
Undergraduate	130	62
Teachers	31	14.9
Others	15	7.2
Secondary	6	2.88
High School	5	2.40
Graduate	3	1.44
Pre-schoolers	2	0.96
Primary School Students	2	0.96
Administrators	2	0.96
Parents	2	0.96
Total (Overlapping within 192)	208	100

As seen in Table 5, undergraduates are the most frequent sample (f=130). Teachers (f=31) and others (f=15) follow in order. On the other hand, pre-schoolers, primary school students, administrators and parents (f=2) are the least used ones as a sample. As the most frequent type of sampling is purposive (see Table 6 below), the researchers in the field have a tendency to carry out their studies with the ones to whom they can reach and access easily.

Table 6. Frequency distribution of availability of Type of Sampling

Sample Type	f	%
Purposive	79	71
Random	23	20
Stratified	4	3.6
Convenience	2	1.81
Others	2	1.81
Quota	0	0
Snowball	0	0
Total	110	100

Most of the studies have applied purposive sampling (f=79) and random sampling (f=23) while quota and snowball have never been used (f=0). This type of sampling is very

useful in situations when you need to reach a targeted sample quickly. Therefore, it is the most commonly used one.

Table 7. Frequency distribution of availability of Sample Size

Sample Size	f	%
Bt 31-100	58	37
Bt 101-300	40	25
Bt 11-30	23	14.7
Bt 1-10	21	13.4
Bt 301-1000	12	7.6
Over 1000	2	1.28
Total (Overlapping within 154)	156	100

Table 7 displays that studies have generally been conducted with a small sample size. For instance, 58 studies were carried out with participants numbered between 31 and 100, and 40 of them were carried out with participants numbered between 101 and 300 is. The larger number of sample size have not been preferred (bt 301-1000, f=12; over 1000, f=2) since their frequencies seem to be low. It could have been difficult to reach to a wider number of participants.

Table 8. Frequency distribution of Research Method

Research method	f	%
Qualitative	97	52.7
Quantitative	45	24.5
Mixed	42	22.8
Total	184	100

It is clear that qualitative research method is the most applied one with the frequency of 97 whereas the frequency of the quantitative research method is 45. Meanwhile, the mixed method shows almost the same frequency (42) with quantitative research method.

Table 9. Frequency distribution of Research Design

Research design	f	%
Survey	32	22.7
Descriptive	24	17
Case study	15	10.6
Comparative	11	7.8
Correlational	11	7.8
Triangulation	8	5.7
Exploratory Qual-Quan	7	5
Explanatory Quan-Qual	6	4.3
Review	5	3.5
Other (Qualitative – Non-Interactive)	5	3.5
True experimental	4	2.8
Quasi-experimental	3	2.1
Concept analysis	3	2.1
Pre-experimental	2	1.4
Ex-post facto.	2	1.4
Grounded theory	1	0.7
Other (Qualitative – Interactive)	1	0.7
Historical analysis	1	0.7
Total (Overlapping within 125)	141	100

Table 9 indicates that the most applied research designs are survey (*f*=32), descriptive (*f*=24), case (*f*=15), comparative and correlational (*f*=11). On the other hand, the least preferred ones are historical analysis, other and grounded theory (*f*=1).

Table 10. Frequency distribution of Data Collection Tools

Data Collection Tool	f	%
Questionnaire	90	37.97
Interview	49	20.68
Documents	21	8.86
Other	20	8.44
Achievement Test	17	7.17
Perception, Attitude, Skill etc Test	15	6.33
Alternative tools (Conceptual Maps, Portfolios etc.)	13	5.49
Observation	12	5.06
Total (Overlapping within 193)	237	100

The most frequently used data collection tool is a questionnaire (f=90). Interviews (f=49) and documents (f=21) are also preferred by the ELT researchers. On the other hand, observation and alternative tools are the least applied tool types as shown in Table 10.

Table 11. Frequency distribution of Data Analysis

Data Analysis	f	%
Content Analysis	29	20.00
Frequency, Percentage Tables	26	17.93
T-test	20	13.79
Other (Qualitative)	15	10.34
ANOVA / ANCOVA	14	9.66
Correlation	10	6.90
Qualitative Descriptive Analysis	9	6.20

Factor Analysis	6	4.14
Mean / Standard Deviation	5	3.45
Other (Quantitative Descriptive)	4	2.76
Graphic Display	2	1.38
Non-parametric tests	2	1.38
Other (Quantitative Inferential)	2	1.38
Chi-square	1	0.69
MANOVA / MANCOVA	0	0.00
Regression	0	0.00
Total (Overlapping within 134)	145	100

It is inferred from Table 11 that while researchers analyse data, they frequently use content analysis (f=29), percentage tables (f=26), and t-test (f=20). The least applied data analysis techniques are regression and MANOVA (f=0), Chi-square (f=1), quantitative (inferential), non-parametric tests and graphic display (f=2).

In line with the second research question, the results are shown below.

Table 12. Frequency distribution of Not Stated Items in the Abstract

Item	*f*
Type of Sampling	124
Data Analysis	100
Research Design	109
Sample size	80
Research Method	50
Data Collection Tool	41
Sample	42

Topic	0
Total (Overlapping within 224)	546 Items

A well-written abstract has some components which are crucial to create its unity (Andrade, 2011). Therefore, in order to understand the quality of the abstracts, the common distribution of unmentioned elements in the abstract is investigated. Results show that the common unmentioned elements in 224 abstracts are as follows: type of sampling (f=124), data analysis (f=101), research design (f=109), and sample size (f=80). On the other hand, all abstracts have mentioned their topics in the abstracts.

Conclusion, Discussion and Implications

Much attention has been given to ELT arena all over the world ever increasingly since the concept of English as Lingua France emerged. The needs and priorities of people have led English to become an interlanguage among countries. Naturally, this inclination towards English has brought a new understanding on the teaching methodology of it. Therefore, the study shed light on ELT field in terms of the most commonly used topics, methodology, data collection tools, type of sampling, sample size, etc. The findings obtained through this study are generally in line with the relevant literature. The number of studies has increased recently. It can probably be because of the popularity of English or the attached importance to it by the researchers. Although the frequency of studies is between 1 and ten from 1995 to 2010, the frequency goes up to 20s after 2011. This means that researchers tend to investigate ELT arena or publish articles more often after 2011. The number of journals also increased after the changes in the 'Academic Incentive Allowance' and the 'Terms of Application for Associate Professorship'. Furthermore, the number of articles written by 3 or 4 authors are much less than the ones written by 1 or 2 authors. Therefore, it might be suggested that more collaborative works are needed to be done in the ELT field. Research sometimes necessitates working in teams. Also, the quality of the increasing number of the research studies can also be questioned in further research studies.

As for the article types, the number of "the book review" and "review article" is very low. Book reviews are a source of information to scholars, teachers, teacher educators, and researchers; therefore there is an ever-increasing need for them. More specifically, the number of articles focusing on topics such as CALL, higher education, applied linguistics and

language itself is not in favour. Therefore, these topics might be advised to be investigated in a similar quantity.

It is found that students -especially undergraduate ones - are the most chosen data source (*f*=130). Chaiyasook and Jaroongkhongdach (2014) also found that undergraduates were the most frequent source with 80%. Moreover, there are many studies that found out undergraduates as a predominant data source (Ciltas, Guler & Sozbilir, 2012; Solak, 2014; Yağız et al., 2016). That can be because academics and researchers have easier access to undergraduates than they do to other data source types. They have a tendency in carrying out their studies with the ones to whom they can access and work with easily. In line with these results, academics might be advised to target different samples by taking the diversity of samples into consideration.Also, there is very few research conducted with a sample size of 1000 and over. Most of the research has low sample sizes probably because of the problems with accessing a large number of participants and working with such magnitude of data. In this aspect, larger sample sizes can be better to carry out the research studies with, since these studies can also be more reliable when compared to the ones which have rather a limited number of participants.

This study shows that qualitative studies are more common (*f*= 97) than quantitative ones (*f*=45). However, relevant literature found quantitative studies to be predominant in number (Chaiyasook & Jaroongkhongdach, 2014; Solak, 2014; Yağız et al., 2016). This can be because of the number of searched articles as the study is limited to 234 articles in Turkish Journal Park Academic platform. As for data collection tools, questionnaires were found to be the most used data collection tool type. Chaiyasook and Jaroongkhongdach (2014) and Yağız et al. (2016) similarly found questionnaires to be more frequently preferred. The reason for this is likely to be the easy application and analysis of questionnaires. Furthermore, as there is a disposition on the same topics with the same size participants by using the common statistical designs, there is no variety of range on the type of sampling, research design and data analysis methods. In terms of the type of sampling; snowball, quota, convenience and stratified; in terms of research design; historical analysis, grounded theory, ex-post facto and pre-experimental; in terms of data analysis; regression, MANOVA/MANCOVA, chi-square and non-parametric tests can be recommended to be utilized more often. The researchers might be using these tools less than the others just because they are less knowledgeable on these tools or they do not need to use them. Further

study can be carried out to find out the reasons why they use a particular type of sampling, research design, and data analysis tools.

This study has also examined the abstracts in terms of the frequently unmentioned headlines. By showing the unmentioned headlines in the abstracts, it was aimed to display to what extent the published articles had accomplished writing effective and clear abstracts. Many components such as type of sampling ($f=124$), data analysis ($f=101$), research design ($f=109$), sample size ($f=80$) are not stated in the abstracts. This means that most of the articles do not include all the components that are normally supposed to be included in a well-written abstract. Abstracts that formed the base for this study generally contain information regarding the topic, sample and tools; however, type of sampling, data analysis and research designs are very rarely expressed. Therefore, another suggestion of this study is that academics and researchers should strongly consider paying more attention to the content, features and the quality of their abstracts.

References

Andrade, C. (2011). How to write a good abstract for a scientific paper or conference presentation. *Indian J Psychiatry*,*53*(2), 172-175.

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2017). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Chaiyasook, W., & Jaroongkhongdach, W.(2014).A content analysis of Thai master's theses in ELT from 2003 to 2011. *Proceedings of the International Conference: DRAL 2 / ILA,* 64-74.

Ciltas, A., Guler, G., & Sozbilir, M. (2012). Mathematics education research in Turkey: A content analysis study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice (ESTP)*, *12*(1), 565-580.

Karadeniz, A., & Sözler, S. (2016). Open and distance foreign language teaching: A content analysis study. *Journal of Educational& Instructional Studies in the World*, *6*(S1), 1–8.

Kırmızı, Ö. (2012). Research trends in M.A. ELT programs in Turkey. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 4687–4691. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.319

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis [28 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozial forschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-line Journal], *1*(2), Art. 20. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-1.2.1089

Meyer, D. Z., & Avery, L. M. (2009). Excel as a Qualitative Data Analysis Tool. *Field Methods*, *21*(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X08323985

Solak, E. (2014). The content analysis of the research papers on foreign language education inTurkey. *International Journal of English and Education*, *3*(3), 167–178.

Sözbilir, M., Kutu, H., & Yaşar, M. D. (2013). The status of chemistry education researches and trends in Turkey. M. Sözbilir (Ed.). *Chemistery Education in Turkey*. (pp.175-204). İstanbul: Türkiye Kimya Derneği Yayınları.

Yağız, O., Aydın, B., & Akdemir, A. S. (2016). ELT research in Turkey: A content analysis of selected features of published articles. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *12*(2), 117-134.

Appendix

ARTICLE INFORMATION RUBRIC								
CODE		**Name of The Article**						
Availability of abstract	1. Yes	2. No	**Year**		**Number of Authors**		**Journal Type**	1. International 2. National
Article Type	1. Original Research	2.Review Article	3. Commentary Opinion		4. Book Reviews		5. Editorial	6. Others
Name of the Journal			**Source**	1. SSCI	2. ERIC- BEI- EI-AEI	3. ULAKBIM	4. Institute - Faculty Journal	5. Others
Not Stated in the abstract	1.Topic	2. Sample	3. Type of Sampling	4. Sample Size	5. Method	6. Research Design	7. Data Collection Tool	8. Data Analysis

Theme – Subject – Topic of the Article						
1. Learning and Acquisition	2.Language Teaching	3. Teacher Education	4. Higher Education	5. Applied Linguistics	6. Cult. & Literature in Language Teaching	13. Other …………………
7. CALL	8. Curriculum and Teaching Materials		9. Testing and Evaluation	10. Multimedia & ICT in Eng. Ed.	11. Research Studies	12. Language Itself	………………… ………………… ………………… ……

Sub-Topic	Write what the article, review, or the paper is about specifically like "Vocabulary Teaching", "Use of Stories in ELT", "Use of Computer Games", etc.				
Sample	1. Pre-schoolers	2. Primary School Students	3. Secondary	4. High School	5. Undergraduate	6. Graduate
	7. Academics	8. Teachers	9. Administrators	10. Parents	11. Others ……………………………………………………… ……………………	

Type of Sampling	1. Random	2. Stratified	3. Quota	4. Purposive (Purposeful)	5. Convenience	6. Snowball	7. Others
Sample Size	1. bt 1-10	2. bt 11-30	3. bt 31-100	4. bt 101-300	5. 301-1000	6. Over 1000	

Research Method	1. Quantitative		2. Qualitative		3. Mixed
	Experimental	Non-Exp.	Interactive	Non-Interactive	
Research Design	11 True Exp. 12 Quasi Exp. 13 Pre-experim. 14 Single Subject 15 Other …………….	21 Descriptive 22 Comparative 23 Correlational 24 Survey 25 Ex-post Facto 26 Secondary Data Analysis 27 Other …………….	31 Ethnography 32 Phenomenology 33 Case Study 34 Grounded Theory 35 Critical Studies 36 Other …………………	41 Historical Analysis 42 Concept Analysis 43 Review 44 Meta-Analysis 45 Other………………	51 Explanatory Quan-Qual 52 Exploratory Qual-Quan 53 Triangulation

Data Collection Tools	1 Questionnaire	2 Achievement Test		3 Perception, Attitude, Skill etc Test	4 Interview
	5 Observation	6 Alternative tools (Diagnostic Test, Conceptual Maps, Portfolios etc)		7 Documents	8 Other ………………………………… ……………..

Data Analysis	Quantitative		Qualitative
	Descriptive	Inferential	Qualitative Analysis
	11 Frequency, Percentage Tables 12 Mean / Standard Deviation 13 Graphic Display 14 Other …………………………………	21 t-test 22 Correlation 23 ANOVA / ANCOVA 24 MANOVA / MANCOVA 25 Factor Analysis 26 Regression 27 Chi-square 28 Non-parametric tests 29 Other ………………………………… ..	31 Content Analysis 32 Qualitative Descriptive Analysis 33 Other ………………………………… ……..

Reference List	Write reference of the article in APA Style here