



(ISSN: 2602-4047)

Özçakmak, H. (2025). A Study on Abstracts of Articles on Turkish Language Teaching, *International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture*, 10(29), 1-19.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijoecc.2860>

Article Type (Makale Türü): Research Article

A STUDY ON ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES ON TURKISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Hüseyin ÖZÇAKMAK

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Türkiye, h.ozcakmak@mku.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-8579-5567

Received: 08.11.2024

Accepted: 14.02.2025

Published: 01.03.2025

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed to review the abstracts of articles on Turkish language teaching according to content components (introduction/aim, method, findings/conclusion, and implications), formal components (word count and keywords) and relationship between content and formal components. The study used descriptive survey design, data collected using document analysis, one of the qualitative methods and techniques, and analyzed through descriptive analysis. The study materials were consisted of 200 articles, selected from 20 journals indexed in TR Dizin that publish articles on Turkish education. To analyze the article abstracts in this study, an "Article Abstract Evaluation Form" was developed by the researcher. In our study, it was found that the average score for the article abstracts published in the journals was 15.1, which corresponds to 76%. The highest success was observed in the introduction/aim (97%) and finding/conclusion (96%) sections, while the lowest success was in the recommendation section (23%), and the method section achieved 81% success. It was found that the journals with the highest scores for abstracts were Turkish Studies, Journal of Mother Tongue Education, and KEV Academy Journal. In our study, it revealed that the average word count for the article abstracts was 181 words, with a range between 132 and 242 words and the average number of keywords was 4,00. It was determined that there was a positive correlation between the average word count and the scores of the abstracts, and a positive correlation between the word count of the abstracts and the sub-components of method and suggestion. In this case, some suggestions can be put forward. First, the journal's editorial team should more carefully check abstracts for adherence to the journal's guidelines. Second, journals could raise the word count limit to a level that allows authors to fully reflect the introduction/aim, method, findings/conclusion, and implications in their abstracts.

Keywords: Turkish language education, abstracts, articles, document analysis.

Corresponded Author: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Özçakmak, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, h.ozcakmak@mku.edu.tr

Ethics Committee Approval: This study does not require ethics committee approval.

Plagiarism/Ethics: This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and has been confirmed to comply with research and publication ethics, containing no plagiarism.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the volume of academic studies produced globally has reached significant proportions. As academic studies conducted under specific disciplines have become more specialized, leading to the emergence of narrower sub-disciplines, the number of researchers in these fields has increased, resulting in a rise in the number of publications added to the literature. Researchers who previously had the opportunity to closely follow academic studies in their fields have now been relatively deprived of this capability due to the rapid growth in the number of publications. Consequently, researchers have started selecting publications—whether books, theses, articles, or proceedings—closely related to their specific research topics. At this point, "abstracts," which offer the possibility of choosing relevant works, have become indispensable for researchers who lack sufficient time to thoroughly review all academic studies in the field. Abstracts save researchers from the burden of reading entire studies that, although deemed suitable based on their titles, prove irrelevant upon examining their content.

An abstract is one of the most crucial parts of a scientific article. Successful authors invest considerable effort into preparing their abstracts, which can be considered the advertisement, trailer, or miniature version of an article (Gastel & Day, 2022, p. 59; McKee, 2024; Shah, 2019). Abstracts of scientific texts are concise and well-structured forms of writing. They refer to another text and present its content in a condensed manner (Pierson, 2004). Writing the abstract of a research article or postgraduate thesis is more than drafting a short paper or passage; it represents the creation of an original work (Shah, 2019).

In the academic context, abstracts offer numerous benefits for both readers and authors. Researchers use abstracts to determine the relevance of an article to their research interests and whether the full text is worth reading. On the other hand, writing an abstract is essential for researchers presenting at academic and professional conferences. Researchers also frequently include abstracts in project applications and research articles, and those seeking acceptance must prepare their abstracts meticulously (Rakhimova, 2023). Indeed, a study conducted by Çelik, Gedik, Karaman, Demirel & Göktaş (2014) found that an abstract failing to fully reflect the research was one of the reasons articles were rejected.

An abstract is a clear, concise, and impactful summary of a research text, designed to help readers quickly identify the article's aim (Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022). As a valuable tool for conveying the key aspects of a study's method and findings, the abstract is often overlooked and treated negligently, with minimal time dedicated to its preparation (Drury, Pape, Dowling, Miguel, Fernández-Ortega, Papadopoulo & Kotronoulas, 2023).

A review of the literature reveals several critical considerations for writing an effective article abstract. First and foremost, abstract writing should commence only after the article text is completed (Arrom, Huguet, Errando, Breda & Palou, 2018; Cook & Bordage, 2016; Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022; Shah, 2019). Having the complete text facilitates the creation of an abstract, allowing it to be derived from the findings of the article rather than preliminary plans. To prevent inconsistencies between the abstract and the main text, it is advisable to write the

abstract last (Cook & Bordage, 2016). Before beginning to draft the abstract, preparing an outline can be helpful. Creating an abstract outline provides organizing thoughts and considering the structure of the abstract as a cohesive whole (Cook & Bordage, 2016; Shah, 2019).

Given that each section of an article serves as a concise abstract (Gastel & Day, 2022, p. 59), the abstract should typically summarize the introduction, method, findings, and conclusion, with important results highlighted, though this may vary by journal (Arrom, Huguet, Errando, Breda & Palou, 2018; Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022). The final sentences should include implications based on the findings, followed by keywords that aid in indexing the article (Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022). While specific requirements vary across journals, the number of keywords generally ranges between 3 and 5.

The literature highlights certain pitfalls to avoid when writing abstracts. An abstract should not include any information or findings not found within the main text (Gastel & Day, 2022, p. 60). The language of the abstract should be in the past tense (Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022), favoring expressions like "... was conducted" rather than "... will be conducted." Similarly, abstracts should not include tables, figures, or references to sources other than the measurement tools used. Avoid abbreviations, unnecessary details, and copying pasting from the main text (Gastel & Day, 2022; Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022). Abstracts are generally well-written paragraphs of about 250 words (APA, 2020; Shah, 2019). The specific word count is dictated by journal guidelines, typically ranging from 100 to 300 words. As the word count increases, the components of the article can be presented in greater detail.

The abstract is expected to encompass the key components of the article. Generally, the primary components of articles include introduction, aim, method, findings, conclusion, and implications. However, it is rare for an abstract to include all these components. The inclusion of specific components and their details in the abstract depends on the journal's writing and publishing policies. For instance, the word count limitations and the required content structure outlined in journal guidelines influence the abstract's composition. Some journals provide a standardized content template for abstracts, specifying which headings to include, which helps authors stay within the intended scope.

There are differing perspectives on which components should be included in the abstract. For example, Hyland (2004, p. 67) and Santos (1996) assert that an abstract should include the introduction, aim, method, findings, and conclusion. Fortanet (2002), however, offers a different view. Instead of a single classification, they suggest that factors such as the journal's format, the field, topic, and aim of the article may influence the author's choice of model, proposing four abstract models (as cited in Pitarch, 2016):

- Introduction + problem + conclusion
- Introduction + method + conclusion
- Introduction + method + findings + conclusion
- Introduction + aim + method + findings + conclusion.

It is evident that the abstract models proposed by Fortanet (2002) are designed to accommodate not only quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods research—such as descriptive, correlational, and experimental studies—but also review-style academic works. For instance, in certain fields within the social sciences, it is common for studies to either lack a method section or dedicate minimal space to it. This highlights the variability in abstract models based on the type of research conducted.

A review of 20 journals examined whether they provided specific guidelines for writing abstracts. Table 1 presents a list of journals that include instructions on abstract writing on their official websites.

Table 1. Distribution of Journals Providing Content Information in Abstract Writing Rules

Name of the Journal	Components Required in Abstracts
Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education	aim, method, findings, conclusion, and implications
Kastamonu Education Journal	aim, method, findings, conclusion, and implications
Turkish Studies	introduction, aim, method, findings, and conclusion
OPUS Journal of Society Research	importance, method, findings, and discussion
Journal of History School	aim, method, findings, and conclusion
Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education	aim, method, findings, and conclusion
Journal of National Education	aim, method, and conclusion
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education	aim, method, and conclusion

According to Table 1, only 40% of journals provide explicit guidelines for abstract writing. Most journals focus on aim, method, and findings in their formatting instructions.

The literature suggests a lack of standardization regarding journal writing guidelines. This situation creates numerous stylistic and content-related challenges for researchers during the manuscript preparation process. Stylistic requirements may include factors such as font type, size, weight, and style; line spacing; paragraph indentation and spacing; text alignment; margin settings; and page layout, among other combinations. Journals also vary in their content requirements, which may include specifications on the scope or subject matter of the article, as well as detailed instructions on writing the introduction, method, findings, conclusion, and implications. Other content-related components include the components of abstracts in Turkish and English or the features required in structured abstracts.

The diversity in journal-specific guidelines obliges researchers to adapt to distinct stylistic and content requirements for each publication. While content-related requirements are relatively easier to address, the process of aligning manuscripts with formatting rules can be more time-consuming. This issue not only affects researchers but also poses challenges for editors and layout professionals responsible for proofreading and typesetting. In recent years, many journals have adopted templates to expedite the process and resolve these difficulties. These templates allow researchers to paste their manuscripts directly into a predefined format, achieving compliance with stylistic requirements more efficiently.

Many journals include a separate section within their guidelines dedicated to abstracts, specifying stylistic elements such as font type and size, text alignment, line spacing, paragraph indentation, and spacing before and after paragraphs. Additionally, they provide explicit instructions on word limits. While some journals restrict

abstracts to 100 words, others allow up to 350 words. In contrast, institutional thesis writing manuals generally do not impose word limits, leading to more detailed abstracts in postgraduate theses compared to journal articles. Word limits in journal abstracts significantly influence their content. Shorter abstracts can briefly address essential components such as aim, method, findings, conclusion, and implications, whereas longer abstracts allow for more detailed explanations of these components. For instance, a 300-word abstract can provide more comprehensive information on the method section, while a 100-word abstract offers only a superficial overview of the methods.

In article abstracts, keywords are an element that requires as much attention as the abstract itself. Keywords not only provide information about the study's subject but also facilitate researchers' access to relevant studies through online searches (Cin Şeker, 2020; Erdem, Gün, Şengül & Özkan, 2015). Therefore, it is essential to ensure that the selected keywords accurately reflect the scope of the study (Furtun, 2020). Keywords unrelated to the topic may mislead researchers and result in wasted time (Sevim & İşcan, 2012).

The number of keywords required varies by journal. While some journals limit this number to three, others may request five or more keywords. Well-chosen keywords increase the likelihood of researchers finding articles due to improved searchability and indexing (Bavdekar, 2016).

This study aims to review the abstracts of articles on Turkish language teaching by various components. The sub-goals of the study are as follows:

1. To evaluate abstracts of articles on Turkish language teaching by content components (introduction/aim, method, findings/conclusion, and implications).
2. To compare the formal components (word count and keywords) of abstracts of articles on Turkish language teaching with the abstract writing guidelines of the journals in which they were published.
3. To determine the relationship between content and formal components of abstracts of articles on Turkish language teaching.

METHOD

Research Design

The study employed descriptive survey design. Data was collected using document analysis, one of the qualitative methods and techniques, and analyzed through descriptive analysis. The purpose of descriptive analysis is to examine the collected data based on predetermined themes (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016, p. 239).

Research Material

The study population consists of journals indexed in TR Dizin that publish articles on Turkish education. The study material comprises 200 articles selected from 20 journals that publish the highest number of articles on Turkish education in TR Dizin. Ten articles were chosen from each journal. The study employed criterion sampling, a non-

random sampling method. Criterion sampling is preferred when an in-depth analysis is conducted on units meeting specific criteria (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2020, p. 92). In this study, certain criteria were determined for selecting the material. These criteria include journals indexed in TR Dizin in 2023 and 2024, published in Turkish, focused on "education-educational research," and publishing articles on Turkish language teaching.

Data Collection

The data for the study was obtained through research conducted on TR Dizin (URL, 2024). As of December 9, 2024, the database contained 1,736 journals and 628,912 works, including 606,002 articles and 22,910 projects. The numerical distribution of journals based on the criteria established from the searches on TR Dizin is as follows:

- The number of journals published in TR Dizin in 2023 or 2024 is 1,221.
- The number of journals published in the Turkish language is 908 (out of 1,221 journals).
- The number of journals whose scope is "education-educational research" is 124 (out of 908).
- 20 journals with the highest number of articles in Turkish language teaching was selected out of 124 journals.
- The number of articles on Turkish language teaching across these 20 journals is 1,549

Statistical data regarding the 20 journals with the highest number of articles on Turkish language teaching is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Descriptive Data of the Turkish Language Teaching Journals Analyzed in the Study

20 Journals	Minimum	Maximum	Median
Starting Year	1973	2019	2006
Annual Issues	2	6	4
20 Journals	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Number of Articles	279	7467	1372
Number of Citations	56	18307	4041
Citation Mean	0,09	9,45	3,09

According to Table 2, the years when the journals began publication ranged from 1973 to 2019. It is observed that the journals release between 2 to 6 issues annually, publish an average of 1,372 articles throughout their publication history, receive an average of 4,041 citations, and have an average citation-per-article ratio of 3.12. The period during which journals are excluded from TR Dizin until they are re-included can influence the number of articles and citations they receive.

In the study, 10 articles were selected from each of the 20 journals with the highest number of articles in the field of Turkish language teaching, totaling 200 articles chosen as the research material. Only research-based articles were considered in this analysis, and review articles were excluded from the evaluation. Table X presents the names of the journals, the number of articles they have published, the number of articles identified through the "Turkish" search, and the number of articles included in the study.

Table 3. Descriptive Data on Materials Selected from Turkish Language Teaching Journals

Name of the Journal	All Articles	Turkish Language Teaching Articles	Selected Articles
Turkish Studies	7467	358	10 articles
RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies	2331	230	10 articles
Journal of Mother Tongue Education	546	184	10 articles
International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education	1203	147	10 articles
Journal of National Education	1635	101	10 articles
Journal of History School	1289	52	10 articles
Korkut Ata Journal of Studies in Turcology	602	46	10 articles
Journal of Language	326	42	10 articles
Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education	1296	36	10 articles
Gazi University Journal of Educational Faculty	685	35	10 articles
Kastamonu Education Journal	374	35	10 articles
OPUS Journal of Society Research	645	35	10 articles
Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences	755	33	10 articles
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education	669	33	10 articles
Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education	648	33	10 articles
Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty	1085	32	10 articles
Electronic Journal of Social Sciences	1729	31	10 articles
EKEV Academy Journal	906	29	10 articles
Hacettepe University Journal of Education	1487	29	10 articles
Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty	279	28	10 articles
Total	25957	1549	200 articles

According to Table 3, a total of 25,957 articles have been published across 20 journals, with 1,549 of them focusing on Turkish language teaching. It is noted that the study selected 200 articles from these 20 journals, with each journal contributing 10 articles related to Turkish language teaching. These 200 articles represent approximately 13% of the articles published in Turkish language teaching within these 20 journals.

For the selection of articles for analysis, to ensure the inclusion of recent works, the articles were selected starting from 2024 and going backward. During the data collection process, an effort was made to ensure that the number of quantitative and qualitative research articles was as balanced as possible. An "Article Abstract Evaluation Form" was developed to evaluate the article abstracts in this study.

Article Abstract Evaluation Form

The development process of the Article Abstract Evaluation Form involved a literature review and expert opinions. Initially, studies addressing the essential components that should be included in abstracts were identified in both domestic and international literature (Aktaş & Yurt, 2015; Arrom, Huguet, Errando, Breda, & Palou, 2018; Fortanet, 2002; Gastel & Day, 2022; Hyland, 2004; Nundy, Kakar & Bhutta, 2022; Pho, 2008; Santos, 1996). A common list was prepared based on the components emphasized in these studies. Points were assigned to the components in the list for abstract writing. In the next stage, the list and point assignments were sent to two experts in Turkish language teaching and assessment and evaluation. The form was finalized after revisions based on feedback from the experts. The form is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Article Abstract Evaluation Form

Article Abstract Evaluation Form			
Content Components	Points	Grading Criteria	Total
Introduction/Aim	0 point	No information about introduction/aim	20 points
	2 points	Unclear information about introduction/aim	
	4 points	Clear information about introduction/aim	
Method	0 point	No information about research design No information about population/sample* No information about data collection No information about data analysis	
	1 point	Incomplete information about research design Incomplete information about population/sample Incomplete information about data collection Incomplete information about data analysis	
	2 points	Complete information about research design Complete information about population/sample Complete information about data collection Complete information about data analysis	
	0 point	No Findings/Conclusion	
	2 points	Unclear Findings/Conclusion	
	4 points	Clear Findings/Conclusion	
Implications	0 point	No implications	
	2 points	Unclear implications	
	4 points	Clear implications	

* Depending on the type of study, terms such as study group, participants, study material, and study object may be used.

Data Analysis

The data collected in the study were analyzed using descriptive analysis. For this purpose, the 200 articles selected as the sample were evaluated based on the Article Abstract Evaluation Form developed by the researcher. The analyses were conducted based on Turkish abstracts and keywords. The abstracts were processed into the Article Abstract Evaluation Form created in Excel.

➤ The abstracts were analyzed for whether they included an introduction or aim sentences, and the ones with a clear introduction or aim were given 4 points.

➤ The method sections of the abstracts were evaluated in terms of the sub-components: research design, population/sample, data collection, and data analysis. It was checked whether these sub-components were included; scoring was based on whether the research design, population/sample, data collection, and data analysis components were complete or incomplete. Article abstracts with complete sub-components received 8 points. Concepts that can take different names, such as study group, participants, study materials, and study object, depending on the type of study, were coded under the heading of “population and sample”.

➤ The abstracts were evaluated based on whether they included findings or the conclusion section. Article abstracts that had a clear section of findings or conclusion were awarded 4 points.

➤ Similarly, the article abstracts were examined in terms of the implications section. Abstracts where the implications were presented clearly were evaluated and awarded 4 points.

In the study, the quantitative evaluation of the abstracts published in journals was carried out according to the “Journal Abstract Writing Rules Checklist” prepared by the researcher. The article abstracts were checked for the word count of the abstracts and the number of keywords and then recorded in the checklist created in Excel. The

article abstracts transferred to the checklist were compared for compliance with the abstract writing rules of the respective journal.

Validity - Reliability

To ensure validity in the study, attention was paid to adhering to the criteria that the analyzed journals are indexed in TR Dizin, published in Turkish, focus on education and educational research, and include studies related to Turkish language teaching. To maximize content validity, the 20 journals with the highest number of articles in Turkish language teaching were identified, and 10 articles from each journal were selected, starting from the most recent issues and moving backward. Efforts were made to achieve a balanced distribution in terms of research types (quantitative-qualitative) across the selected journals. To ensure reliability, particular care was taken during the coding of data, and the data were re-coded by the researcher after a two-week interval. Following the second round of coding, the data entered the Excel file was reviewed to confirm there were no omissions or discrepancies, ensuring that the data were processed consistently and made ready for analysis.

Scope and Limitations

During the selection of the 20 journals forming the study sample, searches using the keyword “Turkish” were utilized. It was assumed that the keyword “Turkish” encompasses many studies conducted in the field of Turkish language teaching. However, some of the works identified through this search may not be directly related to Turkish language teaching. This study is limited to article abstracts published in journals indexed in TR Dizin in 2024 and written in Turkish in the field of education. The analyses conducted in the study pertain only to the year 2024. Changes in abstract writing requirements of the journals may have occurred after this period.

FINDINGS

The findings section of the study presents the results of analyses related to the content and formal components of abstracts of articles on Turkish language teaching. Initially, findings concerning the content components of the abstracts, namely "introduction/aim," "method," "findings/conclusion," and "implications," are discussed.

Table 5. Distribution of Journal Abstracts by Content Scores

Name of the Journal	Introd.		Find./		Total	%
	/Aim	Method	Concl.	Implic.		
Grading	4 p.	8 p.	4 p.	4 p.	20 p.	
Turkish Studies	3,8	7,2	4,0	2,0	17,0	85
Journal of Mother Tongue Education	4,0	7,4	4,0	1,2	16,6	83
EKEV Academy Journal	4,0	7,1	4,0	1,2	16,3	82
Kastamonu Education Journal	4,0	7,0	4,0	1,2	16,2	81
Hacettepe University Journal of Education	4,0	7,2	4,0	0,8	16,0	80
Gazi University Journal of Educational Faculty	4,0	6,5	3,8	1,6	15,9	80
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education	4,0	6,5	3,8	1,4	15,7	79
Korkut Ata Journal of Studies in Turcology	4,0	7,0	4,0	0,4	15,4	77
RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies	3,8	6,4	4,0	1,2	15,4	77
International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education	3,6	7,2	4,0	0,4	15,2	76
Journal of National Education	4,0	6,4	4,0	0,8	15,2	76
Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education	4,0	6,3	3,4	1,4	15,1	76
Electronic Journal of Social Sciences	4,0	6,1	4,0	0,8	14,9	75

Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education	4,0	5,9	3,8	1,0	14,7	74
Journal of Language	4,0	6,2	4,0	0,4	14,6	73
Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty	4,0	6,2	4,0	0,0	14,2	71
Journal of History School	3,7	6,4	3,6	0,2	13,9	70
Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty	3,8	5,4	3,6	0,8	13,6	68
OPUS Journal of Society Research	3,3	5,2	3,2	1,6	13,3	67
Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences	3,4	5,2	3,4	0,0	12,0	60
X	3,87	6,44	3,82	0,92	15,1	76
%	97	81	96	23	76	

Table 5 indicates that the journals achieved an average score of 15.1, corresponding to 76%. The greatest success in article abstracts was observed in the "introduction/aim" (97%) and "findings/conclusion" (96%) sections. Conversely, the lowest success was in the "implications" section, with a rate of 23%. When the journals are compared in terms of article abstract scores, the most successful journal was found to be Turkish Studies, with a score of 17.0 (85%), followed by Journal of Mother Tongue Education (83%) and EKEV Academy Journal (82%). The journal with the lowest success in abstract writing was identified as the Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences (60%).

Table 6 presents the scores for the "method" section of article abstracts, specifically examining the sub-components of "design, population/sample, data collection, and data analysis."

Table 6. Distribution of Article Abstracts by Method Scores

Name of the Journal	Pop./				Total	%
	Design	Samp.	D. Coll.	D. Ana.		
<i>Grading</i>	<i>2 p.</i>	<i>2 p.</i>	<i>2 p.</i>	<i>2 p.</i>	<i>8 p.</i>	
Journal of Mother Tongue Education	1,8	2,0	2,0	1,6	7,4	93
Hacettepe University Journal of Education	2,0	2,0	1,8	1,4	7,2	90
Turkish Studies	1,8	2,0	1,6	1,8	7,2	90
International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education	1,7	1,9	1,6	2,0	7,2	90
EKEV Academy Journal	2,0	1,9	1,8	1,4	7,1	89
Kastamonu Education Journal	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,6	7,0	88
Korkut Ata Journal of Studies in Turcology	2,0	1,8	1,6	1,6	7,0	88
Gazi University Journal of Educational Faculty	1,8	1,6	1,4	1,7	6,5	81
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education	1,4	1,5	1,8	1,8	6,5	81
Journal of National Education	1,4	1,8	1,6	1,6	6,4	80
RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies	1,5	1,7	1,6	1,6	6,4	80
Journal of History School	1,7	1,5	1,8	1,4	6,4	80
Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education	1,4	1,9	1,3	1,7	6,3	79
Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty	1,6	2,0	1,2	1,4	6,2	78
Journal of Language	1,4	2,0	1,2	1,6	6,2	78
Electronic Journal of Social Sciences	1,4	1,9	1,2	1,6	6,1	76
Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education	1,0	1,8	1,4	1,7	5,9	74
Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty	1,4	1,8	0,8	1,4	5,4	68
Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences	1,2	1,5	1,1	1,4	5,2	65
OPUS Journal of Society Research	1,1	1,7	1,0	1,4	5,2	65
X	1,57	1,81	1,48	1,59	6,44	81
%	79	90	74	79	81	

An examination of Table 6 reveals that the success rate of journals in the "method" section of abstracts is 81%. Among the sub-components of method, journals demonstrated the highest success in the "population/sample" component (90%) and the lowest in the "data collection" component (74%). Considering all sub-components of method, the most successful journals were identified as Journal of Mother Tongue Education, followed by

Hacettepe University Journal of Education, Turkish Studies, and International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education. In contrast, the journals with the lowest success in writing the method section of abstracts were Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences and OPUS Journal of Society Research, both scoring 65%. This section of the study examines the article abstracts in the field of Turkish language teaching in terms of the formal components of abstracts, specifically the number of words and keywords. Table 7 presents findings related to the word count of abstracts.

Table 7. Distribution of Article Abstracts by Word Counts

Name of the Journal	Journal Rule	Abstract Word Mean	Compatible Article	Rate
	f	X	f	%
Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty	100-200	132	10	100
Journal of Language	0-300	171	10	100
EKEV Academy Journal	0-300	201	10	100
Kastamonu Education Journal	150-350	199	10	100
Journal of National Education	0-250	175	10	100
Turkish Studies	200 +	242	10	100
Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences	100-200	141	9	90
Ahi Evran University Journal of Kirsehir Education	150-200	176	9	90
Electronic Journal of Social Sciences	0-200	165	9	90
Gazi University Journal of Educational Faculty	0-200	159	9	90
Hacettepe University Journal of Education	0-300	229	9	90
Korkut Ata Journal of Studies in Turcology	150 +	192	9	90
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education	150-200	170	9	90
Journal of History School	150-300	193	9	90
OPUS Journal of Society Research	150-200	161	8	80
Journal of Mother Tongue Education	0-150	167	6	60
International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education	100-150	163	6	60
Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education	150-200	207	5	50
Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education	150-200	173	5	50
RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies	200-250	196	5	50
Mean		181	8,4	84

An analysis of Table 7 indicates that most journals define abstract length with a lower limit of 150 words and an upper limit of 200 words. The table also reveals that some journals do not specify a lower limit (f=7), while others do not impose an upper limit (f=2). The average word count of the reviewed abstracts is 181. In terms of word count compliance, many journals (f=17) adhere to their specified abstract length guidelines. However, it has been observed that the journals Journal of Mother Tongue Education, International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education, and Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education exceed their respective word limits. The overall compliance rate of abstracts with the word count rules of their respective journals is 84%. Journals such as Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty, Journal of Language, EKEV Academy Journal, Kastamonu Education Journal, Journal of National Education, and Turkish Studies demonstrate full compliance (100%) with their abstract word count guidelines. In contrast, the journals with the lowest compliance rates are Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, and RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies.

Table 8. Distribution of Article Abstracts by Keyword Counts

Name of the Journal	Journal Rule	Keyword Mean	Compatible Article	Rate
	f	X	f	%
Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education	3-5	3,7	10	100
Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences	3-5	3,4	10	100
Ahi Evran University Journal of Kirsehir Education Journal of Mother Tongue Education	3 +	3,8	10	100
EKEV Academy Journal	3-5	4,7	10	100
Electronic Journal of Social Sciences	3 +	4,0	10	100
Hacettepe University Journal of Education	2-5	3,6	10	100
Kastamonu Education Journal	- 5	3,8	10	100
Journal of National Education	3-8	4,6	10	100
RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies	3-5	3,8	10	100
International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education	3-5	4,1	10	100
Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty	3-5	3,4	9	90
Journal of Language	4-8	4,3	9	90
Gazi University Journal of Educational Faculty	3-5	3,9	9	90
Korkut Ata Journal of Studies in Turcology	3-5	3,7	9	90
Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education	3-5	4,0	9	90
OPUS Journal of Society Research	3-5	4,1	9	90
Journal of History School	4-6	4,6	9	90
Turkish Studies	5 +	4,9	9	90
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education	4-6	4,0	8	80
Mean		4,0	9,5	95

An examination of Table 8 reveals that many journals (f=10) adopt a range of 3–5 keywords for abstracts. The average number of keywords in the reviewed articles is 4. It is evident that most articles (f=19) adhere to the keyword count specified by their respective journals. However, the average number of keywords in Turkish Studies falls below the journal's stipulated limit. More than half of the journals (f=11) demonstrate full compliance (100%) with their keyword requirements, while the lowest compliance rate is observed in the Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education (80%).

Table 9 provides descriptive information regarding the word counts of journal abstracts and the components that constitute these abstracts.

Table 9. The Distribution of Descriptive Data for the Abstract Word Counts and the Components of the Abstract

Variables	n	X	Ss
The word counts of the article abstracts	200	180,48	47,714
All components of the abstracts	200	15,06	3,015

According to Table 9, the abstracts of the selected articles from the reviewed journals were written with an average of 180.48 words, and their abstract scores averaged 15.06. To determine the relationship between the word counts of the abstracts and their scores, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted, and the findings are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. The Relationship Between Abstract Word Counts and the Components of the Abstract

Variable	Holistic Abstract Scores	
The word counts of the article abstracts	r	,257**
	p	,000
	n	200

** p<.01

According to Table 10, there is a positive correlation between the word count of the abstracts and the scores obtained across all components of the article abstracts ($r = .257$; $p < .01$).

Information regarding the Pearson correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the word count of the abstracts and the sub-components of the abstracts—namely, "introduction/aim, method, findings/conclusion, and implications"—is presented in Table 11.

Table 11. The Distribution of Descriptive Data of The Abstracts and Their Sub-Components

Variables	n	X	Ss
The word counts of the article abstracts	200	180,48	47,714
Introduction/Aim	200	3,87	,596
Method	200	6,44	1,979
Findings/Conclusion	200	3,82	,755
Implications	200	0,92	1,639

According to Table 11, the sub-components of the article abstracts received the following average scores: the introduction/aim section scored 3.87 out of 4, the method section scored 6.44 out of 8, the findings/conclusion section scored 3.82 out of 4, and the implications section scored 0.92 out of 4.

Table 12. The Relationship Between the Abstract Word Counts and the Sub-Components of the Abstracts

Variable		Introd./Aim	Method	Find./Concl.	Implic.
The word counts of the article abstracts	r	,044	,216**	,056	,168*
	p	,537	,002	,432	,017
	n	200	200	200	200

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

According to Table 12, a positive correlation is observed between the word counts of the abstracts and the sub-components of the abstract, specifically the method ($r = .216$; $p < .01$) and recommendation ($r = .168$; $p < .05$) sections.

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

In our study, it was found that the average score for the article abstracts published in the journals was 15.1, which corresponds to 76%. The highest success in the abstracts was observed in the introduction/aim (97%) and finding/conclusion (96%) sections, while the lowest success was in the recommendation section (23%), and the method section achieved 81% success. Indeed, the results of Aktaş's (2015) study support our findings. In that study, 724 research article abstracts related to Turkish language teaching published in SSCI and Ulakbim social sciences databases between 2004 and 2013 were analyzed. The study concluded that a large portion of the article abstracts contained no information other than aim and findings. Additionally, it was found that the method information in the abstracts was insufficient, and findings, conclusion, and implications were mostly omitted. In a study by Coşmuş (2011), 100 research article abstracts written in English and Turkish were examined. The study concluded that the introduction, method, and findings sections were most frequently included in both languages. Similar results were found in Demir's (2022) study, where it was concluded that all article abstracts contained aim, method, and findings sections. Similarly, in the study conducted by Çakır & Fidan (2015), it was determined

that more than 70% of the article abstracts contained information about the aim, method and findings, with less emphasis on the conclusion section.

In our study, the journals with the highest scores for article abstracts were Turkish Studies, Journal of Mother Tongue Education, and EKEV Academy Journal, while the journals with the lowest scores were Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences, OPUS Journal of Society Research, and Ahi Evran University Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty.

Regarding the sub-components of the method in the journal abstracts, it was found that the highest success was in the component of population/sample, and the lowest success was in the component of data collection. In the study by Turan, Sevim & Tunagür (2018), while sufficient information was provided about the sample in the abstracts, it was found that the information about data collection and data analysis techniques was inadequate. In our study, the journals with the highest success in all aspects of the method were Journal of Mother Tongue Education, Hacettepe University Journal of Education, Turkish Studies, and International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education, while the least successful journals were Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences and OPUS Journal of Society Research.

In our study, it was found that the rules regarding the number of words in an abstract vary from journal to journal. Most journals prefer a word range of 150 for the lower limit and 200 for the upper limit. The study determined that the average word count for the article abstracts was 181 words, with a range between 132 and 242 words. In a study by Demir (2022), it was found that the abstracts had an average of 162 words, with a range from 102 to 256 words.

Regarding the average word count of the abstracts, it was determined that most journals (f=17) adhered to their word limits, while the "Journal of Mother Tongue Education, International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education, and Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education" exceeded the word limits. In our study, it was found that all the articles published in the Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty, Journal of Language, EKEV Academy Journal, Kastamonu Education Journal, Journal of National Education, and Turkish Studies journals fully complied with the journal rules (100% compliance). On the other hand, the journals with the least compliance were Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, and RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies, where the compliance rate was 50%.

In our study, the average number of keywords used in the analyzed article abstracts was found to be 4, and it was determined that most journals adopted a range of "3-5 keywords." Studies by Aktaş & Uzuner Yurt (2015) and Turan, Sevim & Tunagür (2018) concluded that most studies used 4-5 keywords. A study by Deniz & Karagöl (2017) found that author guidelines adopted keyword ranges of 3-5, 3-6, 3-8, and 4-6.

In our study, it was found that in many of the analyzed articles (f=19), the average number of keywords aligned with the keyword count specified by the journals. However, the average number of keywords in the journal

Turkish Studies was found to be below its specified limit. Our study also found that all the article abstracts from 11 journals fully complied with the keyword count specified by the journal (100% compliance). The journal with the lowest compliance rate was determined to be Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Educational Faculty Journal, with a compliance rate of 80%.

The study found a positive correlation ($r=,257$; $p<.01$) between the average word count of the article abstracts and the scores obtained from all aspects of the abstracts. This indicates a linear relationship between writing abstracts with more words and the total scores of the abstracts. Additionally, a positive correlation was identified between the word count of the abstracts and the sub-components of method ($r=,216$; $p<.01$) and suggestion ($r=,168$; $p<.05$). This suggests that using more words in the abstracts could increase the scores in the method and suggestion sections.

In our study, it was observed that only 40% of the journals included information about which sections should be present in the article abstracts. In contrast, a study by Deniz & Karagöl found that approximately 87% of thesis writing guidelines included explanations about the sub-components of thesis abstracts.

SUGGESTIONS

In the study, it was determined that the abstracts were most successful in the introduction/aim and findings/conclusion sections, and least successful in the implications section, while the method section was found to be adequately written. The findings of this study are generally supported by existing literature. Given that implications, which are the outcomes of the research findings reached after going through challenging phases, are of great importance for researchers, teachers, practitioners, and administrators, the omission of sufficient attention to this section in the abstracts should be avoided. The importance of including implications in the abstracts should be emphasized.

In fact, our study found a positive correlation between the word count of the abstracts and the implications section, meaning that abstracts written with more words were more successful in terms of providing implications. The method section plays a crucial role both in the article and in the abstract. Articles that lack or have incomplete methods can negatively affect researchers' understanding of the work. In our study, it was found that while the journals' abstracts were generally successful in the method section, some articles lacked sufficient information regarding the sub-components of data collection and analysis. The positive correlation between the abstracts' word counts and the method section indicates that articles with longer abstracts tend to receive higher scores in the method component. Therefore, it is believed that providing detailed information about the method in article abstracts would help researchers better understand the research process.

In our study, it was found that there were differences in the word count requirements for abstracts across the journals. Some journals did not have a minimum or maximum word limit, while the majority preferred a lower limit of 150 words and an upper limit of 200 words. A positive correlation was found between the word count of the article abstracts and the scores from all the abstract components. This suggests that abstracts written with

more words tend to receive higher scores. In other words, abstracts with fewer words might achieve lower success. Although a small number of journals were found to have article abstracts that exceeded the word limits set by the journals, two implications can be made: First, the journal's editorial team should more carefully check abstracts for adherence to the journal's guidelines. Second, journals could raise the word count limit to a level that allows authors to fully reflect the introduction/aim, method, findings/conclusion, and implications in their abstracts.

In our study, it was found that journals generally preferred "3-5 keywords" in abstracts, with the average number of keywords being 4 in the analyzed articles. A review of the literature shows that a 4-5 keyword range is widely accepted. It was observed that many article abstracts complied with the journal's specified number of keywords, but in some cases, the number of keywords exceeded the limit set by the journal.

Finally, our study revealed that only 40% of the journals included information on the components that should be included in the abstracts. Journals should provide detailed guidance in the instructions to authors, specifying how the different components of the abstract (such as introduction/aim, method, findings/conclusion, and implications) should be presented.

REFERENCES

- Aktaş, E., & Uzuner Yurt, S. (2015). Türkçe eğitimi alanındaki makale özetlerine yönelik bir içerik analizi. *Turkish Studies*, 10(7), 73-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8121>.
- APA (American Psychological Association). (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). <https://apastyle.apa.org/instructional-aids/abstract-keywords-guide.pdf>.
- Arrom, L. M., Huguet, J., Errando, C., Breda, A., & Palou, J. (2018). How to write an original article. *Actas Urológicas Españolas (English Edition)*, 42(9), 545-550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acuroe.2018.02.012>.
- Bavdekar, S. B. (2016). Formulating the right title for a research. *Journal of the Association of Physicians of India*, 64(2), 53-56. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27730781>.
- Büyüköztürk, S., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, S., & Demirel, F. (2020). *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (29. Ed.). Pegem Akademi.
- Çelik, E., Gedik, N., Karaman, G., Demirel, T., & Göktaş, Y. (2014). Mistakes encountered in manuscripts on education and their effects on journal rejections. *Scientometrics*, 98, 1837-1853. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11192-013-1137-y>.
- Cin Şeker, Z. (2020). A descriptive analysis on the keywords of articles published in the Journal of Mother Tongue Education. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 8(3), 797-811. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.718596>.
- Cook, D. A. & Bordage, G. (2016). Twelve tips on writing abstracts and titles: How to get people to use and cite your work, *Medical Teacher*, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181732>.
- Coşmuş, C. (2011). Structural organisation of abstracts in English and Turkish research article [Unpublished master thesis]. Uludağ University.

- Çakır, H., & Fidan, Ö. (2015). A contrastive study of the rhetorical structure of Turkish and English research article abstracts. In D. Zeyrek, Ç. Sağın Şimşek, U. Ataç, & J. Rehbein (Eds.), *Ankara papers in Turkish and Turkic linguistics* (pp. 367-378). Harrassowitz Verlag. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvc770nr?turn_away=true.
- Demir, D. (2022). Rhetorical structure, tense and voice features of article abstracts in educational sciences. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(1), 183-202. <https://doi.org/10.19160/e-ijer.1037078>.
- Deniz, K. & Karagöl, E. (2017). Thesis writing guides for academic writing. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 5(2), 287-312. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.298783>.
- Drury, A., Pape, E., Dowling, M., Miguel, S., Fernández-Ortega, P., Papadopoulou, C., & Kotronoulas, G. (2023). How to write a comprehensive and informative research abstract. In *Seminars in oncology nursing* (pp. 1-5). WB Saunders. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soncn.2023.151395>.
- Erdem, M. D., Gün, M., Şengül, M., & Özkan, E. (2015). A content analysis about keywords including in scientific articles in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34(1), 213-237. <https://doi.org/10.7822/omuefd.215246>.
- Furtun, S., (2020). A review of Turkish education abstracts submitted to international primary teacher education symposium in terms of academic writing technique/style: The sample of 2016-19). *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 28(6), 2424-2436. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.741275>.
- Gastel, B., & Day, R. A. (2022). *How to write and publish a scientific paper (9th Edition)*. Bloomsbury.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Mckee, K. (2024, 14 February). How to write a scientific abstract. https://merc.laurentian.ca/sites/default/files/5b_mckee_2018_how_to_write_a_scientific_abstract.pdf.
- Nundy, S., Kakar, A., Bhutta, Z.A. (2022). How to write an abstract? In Nundy, S., Kakar, A., Bhutta, Z.A. (Eds.). *How to practice academic medicine and publish from developing countries?* (pp. 179-184). Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5248-6_15.
- Pho, P. Z. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, 10(2), 231-250. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24049410>.
- Pierson, D. J. (2004). How to write an abstract that will be accepted for presentation at a national meeting. *Respiratory Care*, 49(10), 1206-1212. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15447804>.
- Pitarch, R. C. (2016). Case study: How to write an abstract for empirical research papers in ESP journals. *Revista Académica Liletrad* (2), 373-390. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5993205>.
- Rakhimova, I. (2023). Raising students' awareness of how to write an abstract for a research paper. In International scientific and current research conferences International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research & Practice: International Scientific and Current Research Conferences, USA, (pp. 63-67). <https://orientalpublication.com/index.php/isrcr/article/view/1118>.

Santos, M. B. D. (1996). The textual organization of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*, 16, 481-499. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1996.16.4.481>.

Sevim, O., & İřcan, A. (2012). A content analysis of keyword of theses in the field of Turkish education and teaching. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 7(1), 1863-1873. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.3101>.

Shah, I. P. (2019). How to write a research abstract. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biological Science Archive*, 7(2), 1-3. <https://www.ijpba.in/index.php/ijpba/article/view/109/103>.

Turan, L., Sevim, O., & Tunagür, M. (2018). A content analysis for the summary sections of doctoral theses in the field of Turkish education. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, (11), 29-44. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/554688>.

URL (2024). TÜBİTAK Ulakbim TR DİZİN. <https://trdizin.gov.tr/>

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2021). *Sosyal bilimlerde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (12. Baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Ethics Statement: In this article, the journal's writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics rules, and journal ethical rules have been complied with. The responsibility for any violations that may arise regarding the article belongs to the author(s). This study does not require ethics committee approval.

Declaration of Author(s)' Contribution Rate: In this study, the contribution rate of the author is 100%.

CONTRIBUTION RATE	CONTRIBUTORS
Idea or Notion	Hüseyin Özçakmak
Literature Review	Hüseyin Özçakmak
Method	Hüseyin Özçakmak
Data Collecting	Hüseyin Özçakmak
Data Analysis	Hüseyin Özçakmak
Findings	Hüseyin Özçakmak
Discussion and Commentary	Hüseyin Özçakmak

Funding: No contribution and/or support was received during the writing process of this study.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent forms were not obtained from the participants in the study.

Data Availability Statement:

- The data sets created and/or analyzed during the study will be provided by the relevant author upon request of the editor or referees.
- For questions regarding datasets, etc., the corresponding author should be contacted.
- All data related to the article is included in the article.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest between the author and other individuals, institutions or organizations related to the research.



This study is licensed under CC BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>).

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of IJOEEC and/or the editor(s). IJOEEC and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.