



The Literature Search Methods of Academics

Sayım AKTAY¹, Sibel ÇETİN²

Abstract

Literature review allows having access to information related to the subject of interest, seeing the research previously conducted on the same subject and comparing the results. In this way, it also becomes possible to see how, where, by whom a study was conducted in the past on the subject of interest. The purpose of the current study is to define the ways of literature review employed by academicians in detail. To this end, the current study was conducted with the participation of a total of 99 academicians (45 females and 54 males) working in the Education Faculty of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University in the spring term of 2017-2018 academic year. The current study was designed in the survey model and the data were collected by using the “Ways of Literature Reviews Employed by Academicians Survey” developed by the researchers. As a result of the study, it was concluded that while the academicians see themselves highly competent in reviewing international literature, they see themselves more competent in reviewing national literature than reviewing international literature. The academicians stated that they mostly use and make reference to international resources in their studies and that they prefer the Internet first and most in their reviews. The academicians most prefer international and national articles in their reviews. Moreover, while the academicians make use of date bases the most, they prefer detailed search in search engines. In addition to these, the academicians most prefer TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM as the national data base while they prefer EBSCO as the international data base.

Key Words

Literature
Literature review
Academic review

About Article

Sending date: 19.03.2022
Acceptance Date: 14.12.2022
E-Publication Date: 31.12.2022

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Türkiye, sayimaktay@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5301-0099>

² Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Türkiye, sibelcetin1995@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0257-9947>

Introduction

It is necessary to base the research plan, objectives and methods on previous studies and to know what to do in light of the existing knowledge. Thus, it is of great importance to learn how, where and by whom a study was conducted in the past about the subject of interest. After the determination of the subject of research and preliminary objectives of the research, a literature review should be conducted in an academic manner (Özdamar, 2013). Literature review is an important process in research studies and one of the first steps to be addressed. Gash (1999) defines this process as an in-depth and systematic investigation of as many works as possible published on a particular subject (cited in Koroğlu, 2015).

Gall and Borg (1996) stated that literature review contributes to the definition of the borders of a research problem, the detection of new research subjects, the elimination of previously tried but not worked methods, the determination of what future research can be and to gain some insights about the methods to be used (cited in Koroğlu, 2015).

The process of literature review explained through the analogy of sandglass model starts with the definition of the research problem on the basis of the existing information and research results on the subject and sub-subjects of research interest. After the determination of the research problem, the existing research on the subject is reviewed. In this way, it is decided whether the problem can be researchable. By more restricting the scope of literature review, the prior research on the defined problem is examined. In order to conduct the research and to discuss the obtained results, the scope of literature review is expanded. As can be understood from the sandglass model analogy, literature review is a process that can cover all the research process (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2013).

The different purposes for literature review are explained by Bourner (1996) as follows: defining the gaps in the literature and the areas where research is needed, avoiding the re-invention of the wheel (not repeating the research previously done, not committing the same mistakes having been committed before, saving time), going further after detecting the point reached by others (building the research on a platform made up of the existing knowledge and ideas), getting to know other people working in the same field and appreciating them by including their ideas, increasing the level of knowledge on the subject of research, eliciting the works making a breakthrough and opening new horizons in the field of research, bringing an intellectual content into the research, placing the research somewhere in relation to other works, determining conflicting ideas, bringing depth into the research, demonstrating the ability of having access to previous studies, finding out the existing knowledge and ideas on the subject of research and defining the methods that can be related to the research (cited in Demirci, 2014).

While conducting a literature review, first key words are determined. Then access to data bases is gained and key words are entered into data bases and thus the list of the related research is obtained. In order to obtain a good list, resources should be reviewed well. Özdamar (2003) classified the types of literature review as review of books (books, journals, theses, encyclopedias, dictionaries etc.), review of internet sites, making use of electronic review tools, review of indices, review of almanacs, review of technical committee reports, review of summaries, review of reference materials such as bibliographies, consulting to experts, using the resources in the portfolios of experts and published research reports.

One of the types of academic literature, the library is a basic and indispensable element in planning and conducting the research. Researchers using the library in their research should well know the ways of making use of a modern library equipped according to the documentation technique to be able to conduct the bibliographic study needed (Üstdal and Gülbahar, 1997). In university libraries, the basic reference books, encyclopedias, indices, special books and almanac are found. Moreover, depending on their size, libraries may include journals and periodicals as well (Özdamar, 2003).

Books that are another type of literature review are the sources of information that make it possible to reach previously conducted research. There are a lot of books available in university libraries. Yet, some books include old information. Therefore, we need to examine books carefully (Sönmez, 2006). Journals include findings related to the development and testing of a theory and the interpretations of these findings. In order to determine in which journals studies have been published, bibliographic indices are examined (Arseven, 2001).

Today, literature reviews are mostly conducted in the Internet. In the Internet, there are many centers offering free or paid internet review services. University libraries serve researchers in cooperation with the centers providing full text or abstract text services in a periodical or continuous manner. When reviewing the literature through the internet, the keyword that best expresses the subject should be used. Keywords should be selected from among the words to be included in the headings or contents of the publications. There are national and international data bases in the Internet. These data bases present information to users (Özdamar, 2003).

Literature review is used in each stage of a study. A detailed literature review makes important contributions to the researcher. While conducting the literature review, the researcher needs to be aware of what he/she is looking for and focus his/her research on what he/she is looking for. While conducting a literature review, researchers should know what to do and when and what to look for to avoid possible problems and then conduct it as required (Demirci, 2014).

Although conducting a literature review can be seen to be boring for novice researchers, it is known that it will make important contributions to the end product. The information obtained as a result of the literature review enables to define the pre-requisites and research conditions in the field of research, to see the boundaries of the subject and to understand the theories in the field (Arseven, 2001).

In addition, literature review makes it possible to have access to the existing information about the subject to be researched, to see the previous studies on this subject and to compare the results. If literature review is not performed, then the product to be elicited will not have a qualified contribution to the field and us (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2013). Thus, the purpose of the current study is to determine the types of literature review employed by researchers. In this regard, the sub-purposes of the current study are to investigate the types of literature review employed by academicians in relation to

- Gender,
- Title,
- Department,
- Seniority (length of service),
- Whether they have taken any course about literature review,
- Whether they see themselves competent in reviewing the national literature,
- Whether they see themselves competent in reviewing the international literature.

Method

Research Model

In the current study, the survey model; one of the quantitative research methods, was employed to investigate the types of literature review employed by academicians in terms of different variables. The survey model aims to collect data to determine certain characteristics of a group (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2013).

Data Sample

The universe of the current study consists of the academicians working in Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University in 2017-2018 academic year. The sampling is comprised of a total of 99 academicians (45 females and 54 males) working in the Education Faculty of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University in 2017-2018 academic year. The distribution of the academicians' demographic features is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of the Academicians according to their Demographic Features

Demographic Features	f	%	
Gender	Female	45	45.5
	Male	54	54.5
Title	Research assistant	24	24.2
	Instructor	10	10.1
	Assistant Professor	37	37.4
	Associate Professor	20	20.2
	Professor	8	8.1
Department	Primary Education	14	14.1
	Foreign Languages Education	8	8.1
	Maths and Science Education	18	19.1
	Fine Arts Education	11	11.7
	Turkish and Social Studies Education	15	16.0
	Educational Sciences	26	27.7
Seniority (length of service)	Special Education	2	2.1
	10 Years or less	37	37.4
	11-20 Years	36	36.4
Whether having taken a course	21 Years or more	26	26.3
	Yes	67	67.7
Competence in reviewing the national literature	No	32	32.3
	Yes	95	96.0
Competence in reviewing the international literature	No	4	4.0
	Yes	79	79.8
Total	No	20	20.2
		99	100.0

As can be seen in Table 1, 45.5% of the participants are females and 54.5% are males. From the distribution of the participating academicians, it is seen that the highest percentage of them hold the title of assistant professor with 37.4 and the smallest percentage of them hold the title of professor with 8.1. Their distribution across the departments shows that the highest percentage of them are in the department of “Maths and Science Education” with 19.1 and the smallest percentage of them are in the department of “special education” with 2.1. The distribution of the academicians according to their seniority shows that the highest percentage of them is in “10 years or less” with 37.4 and the smallest percentage of them is in “21 years or more” with 26.3. In relation to whether they have taken any course about literature review, 67.7% of them said “yes” and 32.3% said “no”. In terms of reviewing the national literature, while 96% of them see themselves competent, 4% do not see. In terms of reviewing the international literature, while 79.8% of the academicians see themselves competent, 20.2% do not.

Data Collection Tool

The data in the current study were collected by using the Ways of Literature Reviews Employed by Academicians Survey” developed by Aktay and Çetin (2018). The questionnaire consists of personal information and open-ended questions.

Data analysis

The questionnaire was administered to a total of 99 academicians, 45 females and 54 males. In the analysis of the collected data, SPSS program package was used. In this program, frequencies and percentages were calculated for the collected data.

Findings

Table 2. The way first preferred by the academicians for conducting a literature review

Variable	f	%
Library	14	14.1
Internet	85	85.9
Total	99	100.0

As can be seen in Table 2, the academicians mostly prefer the Internet to conduct a literature review. When their preferences are examined in relation to gender, it is seen that both females (88.9%) and males (83.3%) prefer the Internet to the greatest extent. When their preferences are examined in relation to title, it is seen that 95.8% of the research assistants, 50% of the instructors, 89.2% of the assistant professors, 90% of the associate professors and 75% of the professors prefer the Internet. When their preferences are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 85.7% of the academicians in the department of primary education, 87.5% of the academicians in the department of foreign languages education, 89.5% of the academicians in the department of maths and science education, 72.7% of the academicians in the department of fine arts education, 80% of the academicians in the department of Turkish and social sciences education, 89.7% of the academicians in the department of educational sciences and 100% of the academicians in the department of special education prefer the Internet. When their preferences are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 91.9% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less”, 97.2% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” and 61.5% of the academicians in the group “21 years or more” prefer the Internet. When their preferences are examined in relation to whether they have taken any course, it is seen that 82.1% of the academicians having had a course and 93.8% of the academicians not having had any course prefer the Internet. While 85.3% of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature prefer the Internet, 100% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature prefer the Internet. While 87.3% of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the international literature prefer the Internet, 80% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing the international literature prefer the Internet.

Table 3. The way most preferred by the academicians for conducting a literature review

Variable	f	%
Library	21	21.2
Internet	78	78.8
Total	99	100.0

As can be seen in Table 3, the academicians prefer the Internet more. When their preferences are examined in relation to gender, it is seen that both females (82.2%) and males (75.9%) prefer the Internet to the greatest extent. When their preferences are examined in relation to title, it is seen that 79.2% of the research assistants, 60% of the instructors, 81.1% of the assistant professors, 75% of the associate professors and 100% of the professors prefer the Internet. When their preferences are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 78.6% of the academicians in the department of primary education, 87.5% of the academicians in the department of foreign languages education, 78.9% of the academicians in the department of maths and science education, 54.5% of the academicians in the department of fine arts education, 60% of the academicians in the department of Turkish and social sciences education, 89.7% of the academicians in the department of educational sciences and 100% of the academicians in the department of special education prefer the Internet. When their preferences are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 81.1% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less”, 83.3% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” and 69.2% of the academicians in the group “21 years or more” prefer the Internet. When their preferences are examined in relation to whether they have taken any course, it is seen that 79.1% of the academicians having had a course and 78.1% of the academicians not having had any course prefer the Internet. While 77.9% of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature prefer the Internet, 100% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature prefer the Internet. While 83.5% of

the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the international literature prefer the Internet, 60% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing the international literature prefer the Internet.

Table 4. Resources first capitalized on by the academicians to have information about their subject of research interest

Variable	f	%
Article	63	67
Presentation	0	0
Book	19	20.2
Newspaper	0	0
Thesis	10	10.6
Others	2	2.1
Total	94	100.0

As can be seen in Table 4, the most frequently utilized resource by the academicians to gain knowledge about their subject of interest is articles. When their preferred resources are examined in relation to gender, it is seen that 56.8% of the females first use articles, 11.4% of them first use theses, 31.8% of them first use books. Of the male academicians, 76% use articles, 10% theses, 10% books and 4 others. When their preferred resources are examined in relation to title, 56.5% of the research assistants use articles, 13% of them use theses, 30.4% of them use books; 60% of the instructors use books, 20% of them use theses, 20% of them use books; 74.3% of the assistant professors use articles, 11.4% of them use theses, 14.36% of them use books; 73.7% of the associate professors use articles, 15.8% of them use books and 10.5% use others; 57.1% of the professors use articles, 14.3% of them use theses, 28.6% of them use books. When their preferred resources are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 71.4% of the academicians from the department of primary education use articles, 7.1% use theses, 21.4% use books; 75% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education use articles, 25% use books; 77.8% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education use articles, 5.6% use theses, 11.1% use books; 54.5% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education use articles, 27.3% use theses, 18.2% use books; 53.3% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education use articles, 40% use books and 6.7% use others; 73.1% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences use articles, 15.4% use theses, 11.5% use books; 50% of the academicians from the department of special education use articles, 50% use books.

When their preferred resources are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 58.3% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less” use articles, 11.1% use theses, 27.8% use books, 2.8% use others; 67.6% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” use articles, 14.7% use theses, 17.6% use books; 79.2% of the academicians in the group “21 years or more” use articles, 4.2% use books, 12.5% use books, 4.2% use others. When their preferred resources are examined in relation whether they have taken a course, it is seen that 71.9% of the academicians having taken a course use articles, 9.4% use theses, 17.2% use books, 1.6% use others; 56.7% of the academicians not having taken any course use articles, 13.3% use theses, 26.7% use books, 3.3% use others. When their preferred resources are examined in relation to whether they see themselves competent in reviewing the national literature, it is seen that 67.8% of the academicians seeing themselves competent use articles, 11.1% use theses, 18.9% use books, 2.2% use others; 50% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature use articles, 50% use books. When their preferred resources are examined in relation to whether they see themselves competent in reviewing the international literature, it is seen that 70.7% of the academicians seeing themselves competent use articles, 12% theses, 16% books, 1.3% others; 52.6% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing the international literature use articles, 5.3% theses, 36.8% books, 5.3% others.

Table 5. Types of resources most used by the academicians in their research

Variable	f	%
National resources	42	42.9
International resources	56	57.1
Total	98	100.0

As can be seen in Table 5, the academicians mostly use international resources. When the types of resources used by the academicians are examined by gender, it is seen that both the females (56.8%) and the males (57.4%) prefer international resources. When their preferences of resources are examined in relation to title, it is seen 50% of the research assistants, 66.7% of the assistant professors, 55% of the associate professors, 75% of the professors were found to be preparing international resources. On the other hand, 70% of the instructors prefer national resources. When their preferences of resources are examined in relation to department, 57.1% of the academicians from the primary education department, 54.5% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education, 93.3% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education prefer national resources. On the other hand, 87.5% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education, 89.5% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education, 60.7% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences and 100% of the academicians from the department of special education prefer international resources. When the types of resources preferred by the teachers depending of seniority are examined, it is seen that 59.5% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less”, 57.1% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” and 53.8% of the academicians in the group “21 years and more” prefer international resources. When their preferences for the types of resources are examined in relation to whether they have taken a course, it is seen that 56.1% of the academicians having taken a course before and 59.4% of the academicians not having taken a course prefer international resources. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature, 58.5% prefer international resources while 75% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent prefer national resources. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the international literature, 69.2% prefer international resources while 90% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent prefer national resources.

Table 6. Types of national resources most preferred by the academicians

Variable	f	%
Article	69	71.1
Presentation	0	0
Book	13	13.4
Newspaper	0	0
Thesis	15	15.5
Others	0	0
Total	97	100.0

As can be seen in Table 6, the type of national resource most preferred by the academicians is article. When the types of national resources most preferred by the academicians are examined by gender, it is seen that 63.6% of the female academicians prefer articles, 15.9% prefer theses and 20.5% prefer books. Of the male academicians, 77.4% prefer articles, 15.1% prefer theses and 7.5% prefer books. When their preferences for national resources are examined depending on title, it is seen that 58.3% of the research assistants prefer articles, 29% prefer theses, 12.5% prefer books; 60% of the instructors prefer articles, 10% prefer theses, 30% prefer books; 74.3% of the assistant professors prefer articles, 14.3% prefer theses, 11.4% prefer books; 85% of the associate professors prefer articles, 5% prefer theses, 10% prefer books and 75% of the professors prefer articles, 12.5% prefer theses, 12.5% prefer books. When their preferences are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 71.4% of the academicians from the department of primary education prefer articles, 28.6% prefer theses; 75 of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education prefer articles, 25% prefer books; 73.7% of the academicians from the department of science and math prefer articles, 15.8% prefer theses, 10.5% prefer books; 36.4% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education prefer articles, 27.3% prefer theses, 36.4% prefer books; 80% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education prefer articles, 20% prefer books; 78.6% of the academicians from

the department of educational sciences prefer article, 17.9% prefer theses, 3.6% prefer books; 50% of the academicians from the department of special education prefer articles, 50% prefer books.

When the types of national resources most preferred by the academicians are examined depending on seniority, it is seen that 62.2% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less” prefer articles, 27% prefer theses, 10.8% prefer books; 76.5% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” prefer articles, 11.8% prefer theses and 11.8% prefer books; 76.9% of the academicians in the group “21 years or more” prefer articles, 3.8% prefer theses, 19.2% prefer books. When their preferences are examined in relation to whether they have taken a course are examined, it is seen that 77.3% of the academicians having taken a course prefer articles, 12.1% prefer theses, 10.6% prefer books while 58.1% of the academicians not having taken a course before prefer articles, 22.6% prefer theses, 19.4% prefer books. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national literature 73.1% prefer articles, 15.1% prefer theses, 11.8% prefer books. Of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 25% prefer articles, 25% prefer theses, 50% prefer books. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 74% prefer articles, 14.3% prefer theses, 11.7% prefer books. Of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 60% prefer articles, 20% prefer theses, 20% prefer books.

Table 7. Types of international resources most preferred by the academicians

Variable	f	%
Article	77	80.2
Presentation	1	1
Book	16	16.7
Newspaper	0	0
Thesis	1	1
Others	1	1
Total	96	100.0

As can be seen in Table 7, the type of international resource most preferred by the academicians is article. When the types of international resources most preferred by the academicians are examined by gender, it is seen that 77.3% of the female academicians prefer articles, 2.3% prefer presentations, 20.5% prefer books while 82.7% of the male academicians prefer article, 1.9% prefer theses, 13.5% prefer books and 1.9% prefer others. When the types of international resources most preferred by the academicians are examined in relation to title, it is seen that 75% of the research assistants prefer articles, 25% prefer books; 40% of the instructors prefer articles, 10% prefer presentations, 40% prefer books, 10% prefer others; 82.9% of the assistant professors prefer articles, 2.9% prefer theses, 14.3% prefer books; 95% of the associate professors prefer articles, 5% prefer books; 100% of the professors prefer articles. When the types of international resources most preferred by the academicians are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 78.6% of the academicians from the department of primary education prefer articles, 21.4% prefer books; 75% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education prefer articles, 25% prefer books; 89.5% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education prefer articles, 10.5% prefer books; 36.4% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education prefer articles, 9.1% prefer presentations, 45.5% prefer books, 9.1% prefer others; 80% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education prefer articles, 20% prefer books; 96.3% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences prefer articles, 3.7% prefer theses; 50% of the academicians from the department of special education prefer articles, 50% prefer books.

When their preferences are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 78.4% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less” prefer articles, 21.6% prefer books; 85.3% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” prefer articles, 2.9% prefer theses, 11.8% prefer books; 76% of the academicians in the group “21 years or more” prefer articles, 4% prefer presentations, 16% prefer books, 4% prefer others. When their preferences are examined in relation to whether they have taken a course, it is seen that 78.5% of the academicians prefer articles, 20% prefer books, 1.5% prefer others while 83.9% of the academicians not having taken any course prefer articles, 3.2% prefer presentations, 3.2% prefer theses, 9.7% prefer books. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing

national resources, 80.4% prefer articles, 1.1% prefer theses, 17.4% prefer books, 1.1% prefer others. Of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 75% prefer articles, 25% prefer presentations. Of the academicians seeing themselves as competent in reviewing international resources, 82.9% prefer articles, 1.3% prefer theses, 15.8% prefer books. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 70% prefer articles, 5% prefer presentations, 20% prefer books.

Table 8. The state of the academicians' making reference to resources they use in their works

Variable	f	%
Yes	97	98
No	2	2
Total	99	100.0

As can be seen in Table 8, the academicians almost always make reference to the resources they use in their works. When the state of making reference to the resources used is examined in relation to gender, it is seen 95.6% of the female academicians and 100% of the male academicians make reference. When the state of making reference is examined in relation to title, it is seen that 100% of the research assistants, 80% of the instructors, 100% of the assistant professors, 100% of the associate professors and 100% of the professors make reference to the resources they use. When this is examined in relation to department, it is seen that 100% of the academicians from the department of primary education, 100% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education, 100% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education, 81.8% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education, 100% of the department of Turkish and social sciences education, 100% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences, 100% of the academicians from the department of special education make reference to the resources they use.

When this is examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 100% of the academicians in the group "10 years or less", 97.2% of the academicians in the group "11-20 years" and 96.2% of the academicians in the group "21 years or more" make reference to the resources they use. When the state of the academicians' making reference to the resources they use is examined in relation to their state of having taken a course, it is seen that 98.5% of the academicians having taken a course and 96.9% of the academicians not having taken a course make reference to the resources they use. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing the national resources, 98.8% make reference to the resources they use while 75% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent make reference to the resources they use. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 100% make reference to the resources they use while 90% of the academicians seeing themselves as competent in reviewing international resources make reference to the resources they use.

Table 9. Type of online search most preferred by the academicians

Variable	f	%
Research Engine	39	41.1
Data Base	50	52.6
Indices	5	5.3
Others	1	1.1
Total	95	100.0

As can be seen in Table 9, the type of online search most preferred by the academicians is data base. When the type of online search most preferred by the academicians is examined depending on gender, it is seen that 45.5% of the female academicians prefer search engines, 45.5% prefer data bases, 9.1% prefer indices while 37.3% of the male academicians prefer search engines, 58.8% prefer data bases, 2% prefer indices, 2% prefer others. When the type of online search most preferred is examined in relation to title, it is seen that 41.7% of the research assistants prefer search engines, 45.8% prefer data bases, 8.3% prefer indices, 4.2% prefer others; 70% of the instructors prefer search engines, 30% prefer data bases; 37.1% of the assistant professors prefer search engines, 54.3% prefer data bases, 8.6% prefer indices; 31.6% of the associate professors prefer search engines, 68.4% prefer data bases; 42.9% of the professors prefer search engines, 57.1% prefer data bases. When their preferences are examined

in relation to department, it is seen that 28.6% of the academicians from the department of primary education prefer search engines, 57.1% prefer data bases, 7.1% prefer indices, 7.1% prefer others; 50% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education prefer search engines, 50% prefer data bases; 31.6% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education prefer search engines, 63.2% prefer data bases, 5.3% prefer indices; 36.4% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education prefer search engines, 36.4% prefer data bases, 27.3% prefer indices; 46.7% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education prefer search engines, 53.3% prefer data bases; 42.6% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences prefer search engines, 53.8% prefer data bases; 100% of the academicians from the department of special education prefer search engines.

When the academicians' preferences for the type of search are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 37.8% of the academicians in the group "10 years or less" prefer search engines, 51.4% prefer data bases, 8.1% prefer indices, 2.7% prefer others; 47.1% of the academicians in the group "11-20 years" prefer search engines, 47.1% prefer data bases, 5.9% prefer indices; 37.5% of the academicians in the group "21 years and more" prefer search engines, 62.5% prefer data bases. When their preferences are examined in relation to their having a course, it is seen 36.9% of the academicians having taken a course prefer search engines, 56.9% prefer data bases, 4.6% prefer indices, 1.5% prefer others while 50% of the academicians not having taken a course prefer search engines, 43.3% prefer data bases, 6.7% prefer indices. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 38.5% prefer search engines, 54.9% prefer data bases, 5.5% prefer indices, 1.1% prefer others. Of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 100% prefer search engines. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 34.2% prefer search engines, 60.5% prefer data bases, 5.3% prefer indices. Of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 68.4% prefer search engines, 21.1% prefer data bases, 5.3% prefer indices, 5.3% prefer others.

Table 10. Type of search used by the academicians while doing research in the data bases and indices in the Internet

Variable	f	%
Simple search	40	41.2
Detailed search	57	58.8
Total	97	100.0

As can be seen in Table 10, while the academicians doing search in the indices and data bases in the Internet, they mostly use detailed search. When the type of search used by the academicians is examined in relation to gender, it is seen that 59.1% of the female academicians do detailed search while 58.5% of the male academicians do detailed search. When their preferences are examined in relation to title, it is seen that 58.3% of the research assistances do simple search; 70% of the instructors, 58.3% of the assistant professors, 60% of the associate professors and 100% of the professors do detailed research. When the type of search used by the academicians is examined in relation to department, it is seen that 64.3% of the academicians from the department of primary education, 52.6% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education, 63.6% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education, 53.3% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education, 63% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences, 100% of the academicians from the department of special education do detailed search. On the other hand, 62.5% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages do simple search. When their preferences are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 59.5% of the academicians in the group "10 years or less", 51.4% of the academicians in the group "11-20 years", 68% of the academicians in the group "21 years or more" do detailed search.

When the type of search preferred by the academicians is examined in relation to state of having taken a course, it is seen that 63.1% of the academicians having taken a course and 50% of the academicians not having taken a course prefer detailed search. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 60.2% prefer detailed search while 75% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent prefer simple search. Of the academicians seeing themselves

competent in reviewing international research, 59.7% prefer doing detailed search and 55% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent prefer doing detailed search.

Table 11. Type of national indices most preferred by the academicians in the Internet

Variable	f	%
Ulakbim	55	57.3
Dergipark	25	26
Turkish Bibliography of Articles	8	8.3
Others	8	8.3
Total	96	100.0

As can be seen in Table 11, the type of national index most preferred by the academicians is Ulakbim. When the type of national index most preferred by the academicians is examined in relation to gender, it is seen that 54.5% of the female academicians prefer Ulakbim, 31.8% prefer Dergipark, 6.8% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 6.8% prefer others while 59.6% of the male academicians prefer Ulakbim, 21.2% prefer Dergipark, 9.6% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 9.6% prefer others. When their preferences are examined in relation to title, it is seen that 75% of the research assistants prefer Ulakbim, 16.7% prefer Dergipark, 4.2% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 4.2% prefer others; 20% of the instructors prefer Ulakbim, 20% prefer Dergipark, 40% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 20% prefer others; 51.4% of the assistant professors prefer Ulakbim, 34.3% prefer Dergipark, 5.7% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 8.6% prefer others; 70% of the associate professors prefer Ulakbim, 20% prefer Dergipark, 5% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 5% prefer others; 42.9% of the professors prefer Ulakbim, 42.9% prefer Dergipark, 14.3% prefer others.

When their preferences are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 64.3% of the academicians from the department of primary education prefer Ulakbim, 28.6% prefer Dergipark, 7.1% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles; 50% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages prefer Ulakbim, 12.5% prefer Dergipark, 37.5% prefer others; 68.4% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education prefer Ulakbim, 5.3% prefer Dergipark, 15.8% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 10.5% prefer others; 36.4% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education prefer Ulakbim, 27.3% prefer Dergipark, 36.4% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles; 46.7% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education prefer Ulakbim, 53.3% prefer Dergipark; 66.7% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences prefer Ulakbim, 22.2% prefer Dergipark, 11.1% prefer others; 100% of the academicians from the department of special education prefer Dergipark. When their preferences are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 67.6% of the academicians in the group “10 years or less” prefer Ulakbim, 24.3% prefer Dergipark, 2.7% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 5.4% prefer others; 58.8% of the academicians in the group “11-20 years” prefer Ulakbim, 29.4% prefer Dergipark, 2.9% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 8.8% prefer others; 40% of the academicians in the group “21 years or more” prefer Ulakbim, 24% prefer Dergipark, 24% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 12% prefer others.

When the type of national index most preferred by the academicians is examined in relation to the state of having taken a course, it is seen that 56.9% of the academicians having taken a course prefer Ulakbim, 27.7% prefer Dergipark, 9.2% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 6.2% prefer others while 58.1% of the academicians not having taken any course prefer Ulakbim, 22.6% prefer Dergipark, 6.5% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 12.9% prefer others. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 56.5% prefer Ulakbim, 7.6% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 27.2% prefer Dergipark, 8.7% prefer others while 75% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing national literature prefer Ulakbim, 25% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 60.5% prefer Ulakbim, 5.3% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 26.3% prefer Dergipark, 7.9% prefer others while 45% of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources prefer Ulakbim, 20% prefer Turkish Bibliography of Articles, 25% prefer Dergipark, 10% prefer others.

Table 12. Type of international indices most preferred by the academicians in the Internet

Variable	f	%
EBSCO	30	31.9
Elsevier-Science Direct	11	11.7
SCI Expanded	3	3.2
ERIC	16	17
SSCI	23	24.5
AHCI	1	1.1
Others	10	10.6
Total	94	100.0

As can be seen in Table 12, the type of international index most preferred by the academicians is EBSCO. When the type of international index most preferred by the academicians is examined in relation to gender, it is seen that 38.6% of the female academicians prefer EBSCO, 6.8% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 2.3% prefer SCI Expanded, 20.5% prefer ERIC, 18.2% prefer SSCI, 13.6% prefer others while 26% of the male academicians prefer EBSCO, 16% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 4% prefer SCI Expanded, 14% prefer ERIC, 30% prefer SSCI, 2% prefer AHCI, 8% prefer others. When the academicians' preferences are examined in relation to title, it is seen that 26.1% of the research assistants prefer EBSCO, 17.4% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 26.1% prefer ERIC, 26.1% prefer SSCI, 4.3% prefer others; 40% of the instructors prefer EBSCO, 10% prefer SCI Expanded, 40% prefer SSCI, 10% prefer others; 37.1% of the assistant professors prefer EBSCO, 11.4% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 5.7% prefer SCI Expanded, 14.3% prefer ERIC, 20% prefer SSCI, 11.4% prefer others; 36.8% of the associate professors prefer EBSCO, 15.8% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 10.5% prefer ERIC, 21.1% prefer SSCI, 5.3% prefer AHCI, 10.5% prefer others; 42.9% of the professors prefer ERIC, 28.6% prefer SSCI, 28.6% prefer others.

When their preferences are examined in relation to department, it is seen that 50% of the academicians from the department of primary education prefer EBSCO, 7.1% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 14.3% prefer ERIC, 14.3% prefer SSCI, 14.3% prefer others; 37.5% of the academicians from the department of foreign languages education prefer EBSCO, 25% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 37.5% prefer others, 22.2% of the academicians from the department of maths and science education prefer EBSCO, 16.7% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 5.6% prefer SCI Expanded, 22.2% prefer ERIC, 22.2% prefer SSCI, 11.1% prefer others; 33.3% of the academicians from the department of fine arts education prefer EBSCO, 9.1% prefer SCI Expanded, 9.1% prefer ERIC, 45.5% prefer SSCI, 9.1% prefer others; 33.3% of the academicians from the department of Turkish and social sciences education prefer EBSCO, 6.7% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 33.3% prefer ERIC, 13.3% prefer SSCI, 6.7% prefer AHCI, 6.7% prefer others; 26.9% of the academicians from the department of educational sciences prefer EBSCO, 15.42% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 3.8% prefer SCI Expanded, 15.4% prefer ERIC, 34.6% prefer SSCI, 3.8% prefer others; 50% of the academicians from the department of special education prefer EBSCO, 50% prefer SSCI.

When their preferences are examined in relation to seniority, it is seen that 30.6% of the academicians in the group "10 years or less" prefer EBSCO, 16.7% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 2.8% prefer SCI Expanded, 22.2% prefer ERIC, 25% prefer SSCI, 2.8% prefer others; 41.2% of the academicians in the group "11-20 years" prefer EBSCO, 8.8% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 2.9% prefer SCI Expanded, 11.8% prefer ERIC, 23.5% prefer SSCI, 11.8% prefer others; 20.8% of the academicians in the group "21 years or more" prefer EBSCO, 8.3% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 4.2% prefer SCI Expanded, 16.7% prefer ERIC, 25% prefer SSCI, 4.2% prefer AHCI, 20.8% prefer others. When the type of international index most preferred by the academicians is examined in relation to the state of having taken a course, it is seen that 29.7% of the academicians having taken a course prefer EBSCO, 12.5% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 3.1% prefer SCI Expanded, 14.1% prefer ERIC, 28.1% prefer SSCI, 1.6% prefer AHCI, 10.9% prefer others while 36.7% of the academicians not having taken any course prefer EBSCO, 10% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 3.3% prefer SCI Expanded, 23.3% prefer ERIC, 16.7% prefer SSCI, 10% prefer others. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 31.1% prefer EBSCO, 10% prefer Elsevier-Science Direct, 3.3% prefer SCI Expanded, 17.8% prefer ERIC, 25.6% prefer SSCI, 1.1% prefer AHCI, 11.1% prefer others. Of the

academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing national resources, 50% prefer EBSCO, 50% prefer Elsevier- Science Direct. Of the academicians seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 32% prefer EBSCO, 12% prefer Elsevier- Science Direct, 2.7% prefer SCI Expanded, 18.7% prefer ERIC, 21.3% prefer SSCI, 1.3% prefer AHCI, 12% prefer others. Of the academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, 31.6% prefer EBSCO, 10.5% prefer Elsevier- Science Direct, 5.3% prefer SCI Expanded, 10.5% prefer ERIC, 36.8% prefer SSCI, 5.3% prefer others.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In the current study, it has been revealed that the academicians first and most prefer the Internet in their academic search, that the first source capitalized on by the academicians is article and that they use international resources the most in their studies. Moreover, it has also been found that the most preferred national and international resources by the academicians are articles, that they make reference to the resources they use in their studies, that the most preferred type of online search is data base and that they more frequently use detailed search while conducting search in data bases and indices in the Internet.

The national index most preferred by the academicians in the Internet is Ulakbim while the international index is EBSCO. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there is no Turkish research on how academicians search resources; in addition, there is no international research thoroughly investigating this subject.

In light of the findings of the current research, it can be suggested that activities to inform academicians not having taken any course about literature review should be conducted. As there are academicians not seeing themselves competent in reviewing international resources, activities can be organized to show how to conduct reviews of international literature. Among the national indices, academicians seem to prefer Ulakbim and among the international indices, they prefer EBSCO. Researchers can be informed about other indices.

References

- Anameriç, H. (2015). Kitabın teknolojik değişimi, *Bilgi Dünyası*, 15 (1), 176-188.
- Arseven, A.D. (2001). *Alan araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim ve Yayıncılık
- Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review*. Sage.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi
- Demirci, A. (2014). Literatür taraması. Y. Arı ve İ. Kaya (Ed.). *Coğrafya araştırma yöntemleri* (s.73-108). Balıkesir: Coğrafyacılar Derneği.
- Köroğlu, S.A. (2015). Literatür taraması üzerine notlar ve bir tarama tekniği, *GiDB Dergisi*, 61.
- Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). *The literature review: Six steps to success*. Corwin Press.
- Oliver, P. (2012). *Succeeding with your literature review: A handbook for students*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Frels, R. K. (2015). Using Q methodology in the literature review process: A mixed research approach. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 1(2), 90-109.
- Özdamar, K. (2003). *Modern bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi
- Rhoades, E. A. (2011). Literature reviews. *Volta Review*, 111 (3), 353-368.
- Üstdal, M. & Gülbahar K. (1997). *Bilimsel araştırma nasıl yapılır?* İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

