

Perceptions of Turkish teachers about listening types

Fatih Can

Turkish Education and Social Studies Education Department, Turkish Education Department, Amasya University, Amasya, Turkey.

ABSTRACT

In this study, the perceptions of Turkish teacher candidates towards listening styles was evaluated according to the variables such as gender, university of education, grade level, academic grade point average, type of high school graduated from and the opinions of teacher candidates. For this purpose, quantitative and qualitative data were collected from Turkish teacher candidates and a research was conducted according to mixed research design. The quantitative sample of the study was 319 Turkish Teacher candidates studying at 5 different state universities and the qualitative sample was 24 people selected among these. Data were collected from teacher candidates with the help of a scale and an interview guide. SPSS 20.0 program and content analysis method were used in the analysis of the data. Quantitative and qualitative data were examined holistically and Turkish teacher candidates' approaches to listening styles were revealed. According to the results of the study, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the variables of grade point average and high school type and the types of listening, that the teacher candidates mostly use relational listening and how they use the listening styles they use in daily listening was revealed. These results are expected to contribute to the listening education processes.

Keywords: Listening types, mixed design, teacher candidate, listening education.

E-mail: fcan.fcn@gmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

Language is an indispensable tool for human beings that they need from the moment they exist. Thanks to language, people can communicate, understand each other, manage their lives more easily and systematically. Since the basis of language is understanding between people, one of the basic building blocks of it is listening. Better understanding of the spoken language (Rost, 2006, p. 47 as cited in Shintani and Wallace, 2014, p. 72) according to the definitions in the dictionary of Turkish Language Institution (2020): 1. "To listen to hear.", 2. "To accept someone's word and advice and behave accordingly.", 3. "To examine the patient with an ear or a listening device.", 4. "To obey, bow down, obey.", 5. "The act of listening.". Therefore, it is possible to define listening simply as the act of listening to what is spoken.

In order for a conversation or communication to exist, listening must be performed in a healthy way. In this sense, it can be said that listening is the basis of communication (Yazar and Yazar, 2018, p.80). Verbal inputs are interpreted by listening. Accordingly, the listening process is completed with the perception of the

stimuli, understanding, interpretation and reacting to them (Gürel and Tat, 2012, p.276-297). Because listening is complex, it is one of the most important human characteristics, which includes many processes and activities, and directly affects many abilities such as decision making, decision taking and thinking.

The four basic language skills include reading, writing, speaking and listening. Among these basic language skills, listening stands out as the most basic skill. However, listening is the hardest acquired skill among these four basic skills (Zarrabi, 2016, p. 154). Because the skill of listening is the most common skill that human beings use since they arrived on earth. Late development of listening skill or any negativity that may occur due to the development of listening skill will adversely affect other language skills. The most used one is the listening skill among these basic language skills in daily life. Conflicts are minimized by strengthening the understanding between individuals by having good listening skills. In this respect, it is a skill that contributes significantly to social life (Melanlıoğlu, 2011, p.69). The

skill of listening plays an important role in ensuring healthy and correct communication in all aspects of social life and has an indispensable place in every moment of daily life (Yazar and Yazar, 2018, p.82). Because it is not possible to isolate or remove listening from daily life. Listening stands out as an action that is at the center of daily life.

Listening, which is at the heart of learning, has an absolute place in human life to realize all kinds of learning. Therefore, listening, which offers new perspectives and learning to the person, opens the doors to gaining success and learning knowledge in the field of education and training. According to Cossit (1978), considering the strong ties of individuals with listening, the effect of listening on language development and learning, programs at all levels should be designed to teach listening more effectively (Güzel and Karatay, 2014, p. 156). In addition, listening inputs should be provided by considering general teaching purposes (Kadagıdze, 2006, p. 148). It is necessary to focus more on listening in teaching education. This will play an important role in both increasing the speed of learning and making their learning more questionable. In addition, it is necessary to include more direct listening instruction in education and training. According to Ford et al. (2000, p. 1), listening education improves people's awareness of their listening disabilities, helping them to evaluate their listening competencies more realistically. Therefore, this will enable people to understand the importance of listening more in education and make them better listeners.

When the sources related to the listening types are scanned, it is observed that various classifications are made regarding the listening types. The most used listening types in these classifications are: (Akyol, 2011, p. 10-19; Doğan, 2013, p.30; Güneş, 2014, p.100-101; Güzel and Karatay, 2014, p.165; Kaya, 2014, p.324-325; Yıldız et al., 2008, p. 183-186):

- Distinctive Listening: In this type of listening, the elements accompanying nonverbal communication are determined by distinguishing sounds and visual stimuli (Doğan, 2013, p.30).
- Analyzing Listening: In this type of listening, the listener, while responding to what the speaker says, thinks about all sides of the subject and tends not to make decisions about the opinions of others (Kaya, 2014, p.324).
- Aesthetic Listening: In this type of listening, listening is carried out for pleasure and entertainment (Akyol, 2011, p. 10).
- Effective Listening: In this type of listening, the listener aims to fully and accurately understand what they are actively listening to (Yıldız et al., 2008, p. 184).
- Interactive Listening: In this type of listening, the listener tries to make the speaker realize that they are

being listening to in a simple interaction environment (Kaya, 2014, p.324).

- Critical Listening: This type of listening is not meant to be understood purely; at the same time, it is aimed to score, evaluate or judge (Güzel and Karatay, 2014, p.165).
- Selective Listening: In this type of listening, the listener performs a selection according to the need and taste, and does not listen to all the sounds that reach them (Yıldız et al., 2008, p. 183).
- Creative Listening: In this type of listening; it is tried to reach new results based on known, understood and interpreted elements (Güneş, 2014, p.101).
- Transferring Listening: In this type of listening, which is frequently used in education, it is aimed for the listener to determine the purpose and main idea of the speech and to organize and use the information obtained from it appropriately. (Akyol, 2011, p. 11-12).
- Relational Listening: In this type of listening, listening is performed to understand the feelings of the speaker and to establish a relationship with others (Kaya, 2014, p. 324-325).

In addition to these types of listening in the literature, the types of listening included in the Turkish Lesson Curriculum are stated as participatory listening, non-participatory listening, listening by taking notes, listening by putting yourself in place of the speaker (empathic listening), creative listening, selective listening and critical listening (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Listening is a competency and language skill that has a very important place in education and training. However, the person's listening skills and tendencies towards listening types differ. According to Tabak (2013, p. 183), individuals' individual differences lie at the basis of these differences. Therefore, it can be easily argued that the act of listening varies considerably according to the person.

When the relevant literature on listening types is examined, it is observed that some studies have been carried out. In the study of Melanlıoğlu (2011), Turkish curriculum was evaluated in terms of listening styles. In the study conducted by Maden and Durukan (2011), the listening styles of Turkish teacher candidates were evaluated in terms of gender and grade level variables. In the study conducted by Mert (2013), the listening types were associated with the listening activities in the middle school Turkish workbooks and it was determined that which listening styles were used at which grade level. In the study by Tabak (2013), the listening styles of Turkish teacher candidates were examined in terms of various variables. In the study of Yıldız and Kılıncı (2015), the effect of teaching listening strategies on acquisition of listening skills in the fifth grade Turkish lessons was examined. The study conducted by Karahan (2016) aimed to determine the listening styles of Turkish teacher

candidates. Özkan and Başkan (2019) and Şahin (2020) examined the listening styles of Turkish teacher candidates. In this study, the listening styles of Turkish teacher candidates were examined in a mixed pattern by using quantitative and qualitative data. In addition, data were collected from five state universities and more general results were obtained.

Purpose of the research

The aim of this research is to determine the perceptions of Turkish teacher candidates towards listening styles; gender, the university he studied class level, academic grade point average, the type of high school graduated from and the opinions of teacher candidates. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

- 1) Do Turkish teacher candidates' perceptions of listening types differ according to gender?
- 2) Do Turkish teacher candidates' perceptions of listening types differ by grade level?
- 3) Do Turkish teacher candidates' perceptions of listening types differ according to their academic grade point average?
- 4) Do Turkish teacher candidates' perceptions of listening types differ according to the type of high school they graduated from?
- 5) What are the opinions of Turkish teacher candidates on listening types?

METHODOLOGY

Research pattern

In the study, the listening type scores used by Turkish teacher candidates were examined in terms of various variables and interviews were conducted to obtain in-depth information. The research was designed as an exploratory sequential mixed design in order to utilize qualitative data to support quantitative data. According to this method, qualitative and quantitative studies and their data are combined and presented in a holistic way (Creswell, 2013, p.14). In the research, a holistic approach was demonstrated by using qualitative and quantitative data together.

Population and sampling

The population of this research constitutes of Turkish teacher candidates studying at state universities in Turkey. The sample of the study is 319 Turkish teacher candidates studying in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade in five state universities in Turkey in 2019-2020 academic

year. Simple random sampling method was used in sample selection. There are 238 female and 81 male teacher candidates in the sample.

24 Turkish teacher candidates were included in the qualitative part of the study. In this sample selection, a suitable sampling method was preferred for ease of application. There are 14 female and 10 male teacher candidates in the study group.

Data collection

In the study, "Listening Types Scale" adapted to Turkish by Kaya (2014) was used to determine the listening types of Turkish teacher candidates. This scale was prepared by the researcher in a 7-point Likert type consisting of four sub-dimensions and 18 items by performing validity and reliability analyzes. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .83 (Kaya, 2014). In this study, the reliability coefficient was determined as .83. It has been stated that the reliability coefficient value accepted in the literature is 0.70 and above (McMillan and Schumacher, 2010; Büyüköztürk, 2011). Since the scale used in the study was above this specified limit, it was concluded that this scale was appropriate for use in the study.

An interview guide was prepared to determine how they use listening types and to support quantitative data in the study. The guide was shaped by taking expert opinions of two faculty members in the field of Turkish education. Data were collected with the answers given to the questions in this interview guide.

Analysis of the data

The quantitative data collected within the scope of the study were analyzed with the SPSS 20.0 package program. The positive items in the study were scored between 1-7. While analyzing, firstly, independent group t-test was conducted in order to determine the differentiation of teacher candidates' listening types scores according to gender variable. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to calculate the difference between the variables of class, grade point average and the type of high school graduated from and the scores of listening types. Correlation analysis was conducted in order to determine the relationship with the sub-dimensions of the scale and its overall.

Content analysis was used in the qualitative part of the study. In content analysis, similar data were combined together within the framework of certain concepts and themes and arranged and interpreted in a way that the reader can understand (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008). Accordingly, the data were transformed into codes and categories, presented and interpreted in tables. In order

to ensure the reliability of the data, the study was detailed by putting examples from views of students. Two different coders were used in the coding of the data in the study.

FINDINGS

Quantitative findings

The averages of the listening types scale and its sub-dimensions according to the gender variable of the teacher candidates are presented in Table 1. No significant relationship was determined in terms of the scores belonging to the difference between the relational, interactional, critical, analytical listening sub-dimensions and the general total with gender ($p>0.05$). This finding indicates that there is no difference in the listening types of teacher candidates according to gender.

Table 1 shows that average age (year) of women is 23.30 ± 2.05 , height (cm) is 166.46 ± 5.73 , body mass (kg) is 58.30 ± 5.57 and body mass index (kg / m²) is 21.05 ± 1.87 . The table also shows that average age (year) of men is 23.82 ± 2.51 , height (cm) is 177.47 ± 7.87 body mass (kg) is 74.78 ± 11.68 and body mass index is (kg / m²) 23.71 ± 3.21 .

According to Table 2, it is observed that the first grade teacher candidates have the highest average in terms of the general scores of the listening types scale. The lowest average belongs to teacher candidates in the 3rd grade.

Looking at Table 3, it was determined that the F values regarding the difference between the grade variable and the listening types scale and the relational, interactional, critical, analytical listening sub-dimensions were not significant at the $p>0.05$ significance level. This finding indicates that there is no relationship between the pre-service teachers' grade levels and listening types. When Table 4 is examined, it is observed that the highest average in terms of the general scores of the listening types scale is in the teacher candidates with 3,51-4,00 grade point average. The lowest average belongs to teacher candidates with a grade point average of 0,00-2,00.

When Table 5 is examined, it is determined that the F values for the difference between the GPA variable and the listening types scale and the relational, interactional, analytical listening sub-dimensions were significant at the $p<0.05$ significance level, and the F values of the difference between the critical listening sub-dimension were not significant at the $p>0.05$ significance level. According to the Post Hoc tests conducted to determine the source of the difference, it can be asserted that the group with a grade point average of 0,00-2,00 has a lower average than the other groups and that there is a difference between them. According to this finding, there is a significant relationship between teacher candidates'

GPA and listening types.

When Table 6 is analyzed, it is observed that Science: High School graduate teachers have the highest average in terms of general scores of the listening types scale. The lowest average belongs to teacher candidates who graduated from Social Sciences High Schools. According to Table 7, the F values for the difference between the graduated high school type variable and the listening types scale and the interactional, analytical listening sub-dimensions are significant at the $p<0.05$ significance level, and the F values for the difference between the relational and critical listening sub-dimensions are not significant at the $p>0.05$ significance level. According to the Post Hoc tests conducted to determine the source of the difference, it can be asserted that there is a difference between science high school graduates and vocational and technical Anatolian high school graduates in the interactive listening sub-dimension, between the graduates of social sciences high school and Anatolian Imam Hatip High Schools in the analytical listening sub-dimension, and a difference between social sciences high school graduates and science high schools, Anatolian high schools and Anatolian Imam Hatip high schools in the general total. According to this finding, there is a significant relationship between the type of high school that teacher candidates graduated from and their listening types.

Relationships were examined according to the correlation analysis between the sub-dimension scores of the teacher candidates' listening types scale (Table 8). Accordingly, the correlation value between scale subscale scores was found to be significant. This finding indicates that there is a correct relationship between the sub-dimensions of the scale and the its relationship with the overall. The sub-dimension that has the strongest relationship with the overall scale is relational listening.

According to Table 9, the arithmetic mean of the general and sub-dimensions of the listening types scale was calculated. The correlational listening mean score is $5.97 \pm .78$; the interactive listening mean score was $5.60 \pm .98$; critical listening mean score was 5.80 ± 1.04 ; the mean analyzing listening score was 5.77 ± 1.09 ; and the average of the overall score is $5.80 \pm .67$. According to this finding, it is understood that relational listening has a higher average among the sub-dimensions.

Qualitative findings

Participants mostly stated that they listened in order to obtain information, show respect, understand, help and communicate (Table 10). Some of the participants stated that they listened to empathize, draw attention, improve themselves, get to know people, solve problems and make comments. Considering the opinions revealed, it is understood that the participants use the relational

Table 1. T-test results for the types of listening participants use according to the gender variable.

	Gender	N	Mean	sd	t	p
Relational listening	Female	238	5.9825	.75987	-.152	.879
	Male	81	5.9671	.87059		
Interactive listening	Female	238	5.6050	.93519	-.040	.968
	Male	81	5.6000	1.13093		
Critical listening	Female	238	5.8246	1.04838	-.715	.475
	Male	81	5.7284	1.03923		
Analytical listening	Female	238	5.7325	1.05592	-.436	.663
	Male	81	5.7941	1.21612		
Total	Female	238	5.8112	.60932	-.440	.660
	Male	81	5.7730	.83874		

Table 2. Arithmetic average and standard deviation values for the types of listening participants use according to the grade variable.

	Grade	N	Mean	sd
Relational listening	1	14	36.7857	4.06067
	2	38	35.7632	6.11350
	3	90	36.1556	4.79679
	4	177	35.6780	4.42015
Interactive listening	1	14	28.1429	5.44705
	2	38	28.0000	6.45986
	3	90	27.5000	4.19537
	4	177	28.2768	4.88936
Critical listening	1	14	23.5000	2.98071
	2	38	23.9211	4.43805
	3	90	22.5778	4.96726
	4	177	23.3390	3.73836
Analytical listening	1	14	16.8571	3.54872
	2	38	17.0789	3.64196
	3	90	17.6333	3.41329
	4	177	17.2768	3.14375
Total	1	14	105.2857	9.41708
	2	38	104.7632	16.52260
	3	90	103.8667	11.65149
	4	177	104.5706	11.52797

listening type more intensively and listen regarding their relationships with other people. However, it is observed that the reasons for listening including critical and

interactive listening has been stated. The reasons for listening to the other person are important in terms of showing which type of listening the participants use more.

Table 3. Variance analysis of the types of listening participants use according to the grade variable.

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p.
Relational listening	Between groups	26.039	3	8.680	.386	.763
	Within groups	7083.692	315	22.488		
	Total	7109.730	318			
Interactive listening	Between groups	36.238	3	12.079	.494	.687
	Within groups	7703.649	315	24.456		
	Total	7739.887	318			
Critical listening	Between groups	59.280	3	19.760	1.132	.336
	Within groups	5499.880	315	17.460		
	Total	5559.160	318			
Analytical listening	Between groups	14.297	3	4.766	.438	.726
	Within groups	3430.812	315	10.891		
	Total	3445.110	318			
Total	Between groups	46.526	3	15.509	.105	.957
	Within groups	46725.493	315	148.335		
	Total	46772.019	318			

Table 4. Arithmetic average and standard deviation values of the types of listening participants use according to the grade average variable.

		N	Mean	sd
Relational listening	1	3	25.3333	15.30795
	2	27	34.9630	5.88663
	3	125	35.6880	3.85716
	4	130	36.0846	4.53246
	5	34	37.3824	4.92990
Interactive listening	1	3	21.0000	12.16553
	2	27	28.7778	3.34357
	3	125	28.5840	4.10583
	4	130	27.4615	5.18966
	5	34	28.0882	6.38354
Critical listening	1	3	18.0000	11.78983
	2	27	24.1111	3.27383
	3	125	22.9600	4.44392
	4	130	23.2077	3.77404
	5	34	23.7941	4.24106
Analytical listening	1	3	11.6667	7.57188
	2	27	18.0000	2.81480
	3	125	17.2800	3.12276
	4	130	17.2692	3.39582
	5	34	17.7647	3.07540

Table 4. Continues.

	1	3	76.0000	45.90207
	2	27	105.8519	10.42447
Total	3	125	104.5120	10.14859
	4	130	104.0231	11.31471
	5	34	107.0294	15.29009

Table 5. Variance analysis for the types of listening participants use according to the grade point average variable.

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p.
Relational listening	Between Groups	443.170	4	110.793	5.218	.000
	Within Groups	6666.560	314	21.231		1-2,3,4,5
	Total	7109.730	318			
Interactive listening	Between Groups	243.809	4	60.952	2.553	.039
	Within Groups	7496.078	314	23.873		1-2,3,4,5
	Total	7739.887	318			
Critical listening	Between Groups	122.742	4	30.686	1.772	.134
	Within Groups	5436.418	314	17.313		
	Total	5559.160	318			
Analytical listening	Between Groups	115.548	4	28.887	2.724	.030
	Within Groups	3329.561	314	10.604		1-2,3,4,5
	Total	3445.110	318			
Total	Between Groups	2731.478	4	682.870	4.869	.001
	Within Groups	44040.541	314	140.256		1-2,3,4,5
	Total	46772.019	318			

Table 6. Arithmetic average and standard deviation values of the listening types used by the participants according to the type of high school graduated from variable.

		N	Mean	Sd
Relational listening	1	4	37.0000	2.30940
	2	11	33.0909	9.83315
	3	196	36.0663	4.30869
	4	38	36.1842	5.98130
	5	43	36.4419	3.70522
	6	7	35.0000	4.65475
	7	20	33.7500	3.73990
Interactive listening	1	4	35.0000	.00000
	2	11	27.4545	7.82769
	3	196	28.0051	4.66465
	4	38	26.3684	5.78171
	5	43	29.0233	4.82794
	6	7	26.2857	3.14718
	7	20	28.6500	3.51351

Table 6. Continues.

Critical listening	1	4	22.0000	6.92820
	2	11	20.6364	6.36039
	3	196	23.5459	3.70210
	4	38	22.9737	5.04299
	5	43	22.8140	4.82185
	6	7	22.5714	4.39155
	7	20	22.9500	3.17017
Analytical listening	1	4	19.0000	2.30940
	2	11	14.1818	5.79341
	3	196	17.4490	3.01831
	4	38	16.9474	3.84811
	5	43	18.4419	1.96762
	6	7	17.4286	3.59894
	7	20	15.9500	4.03243
Total	1	4	113.0000	6.92820
	2	11	95.3636	27.57997
	3	196	105.0663	10.84486
	4	38	102.4737	15.29483
	5	43	106.7209	9.52272
	6	7	101.2857	11.87033
	7	20	101.3000	6.74420

Table 7. Variance analysis of the listening types used by the participants according to the type of high school graduated from variable.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p.
Relational listening	Between groups	210.618	6	35.103	1.587	.150
	Within groups	6899.112	312	22.113		
	Total	7109.730	318			
Interactive listening	Between groups	374.368	6	62.395	2.643	.016
	Within groups	7365.520	312	23.607		1-4
	Total	7739.887	318			
Critical listening	Between groups	113.878	6	18.980	1.087	.370
	Within groups	5445.282	312	17.453		
	Total	5559.160	318			
Analytical listening	Between groups	219.820	6	36.637	3.544	.002
	Within groups	3225.290	312	10.337		2-5
	Total	3445.110	318			
Total	Between groups	2731.478	4	682.870	4.869	.001
	Within groups	44040.541	314	140.256		2-1,3,5
	Total	46772.019	318			

Table 8. Correlation analysis of the listening types scale and its sub-dimensions.

		Relational listening	Interactive listening	Critical listening	Analytical listening	Total
Relational listening	r	-	.188**	.449**	.577**	.778**
Interactive listening	r	.188**	-	.311**	.140*	.625**
Critical listening	r	.449**	.311**	-	.370**	.747**
Analytical listening	r	.577**	.140*	.370**	-	.681**
Total	r	.778**	.625**	.747**	.681**	-

** . p < 0.01, * . p<0.05.

Table 9. Arithmetic average and standard deviation values of listening types scale and its sub-dimensions.

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	sd
Relational listening	319	1.33	7.00	5.9786	.78806
Interactive listening	319	1.00	7.00	5.6038	.98670
Critical listening	319	1.00	7.00	5.8002	1.04528
Analytical listening	319	1.00	7.00	5.7785	1.09715
Total	319	1.28	7.00	5.8015	.67376

Table 10. Opinions of the participants about the reasons for listening to the conversation.

Reasons of listening	
Get information	10
Show respect	8
Understand	8
Help	5
Communicate	5
Empathize	2
Draw attention	2
Improve oneself	2
Get to know people	2
Solve problems	1
To be able to comment	1

One participant who stated that they listened in order to communicate and empathize, stated that they were performing relational listening with the following words:

K3: First of all, the reason I listen to the other person is to communicate. I listen in order to exchange ideas with the other person, to empathize with and understand the other person. In addition, since human beings are social creatures, they are in constant communication. People constantly feel the need to listen to each other, both in order to belong to the society and the individual, and as a sign of reputation. In order to meet these needs, I listen carefully to the other person.

The participant, who stated that they listen to filter what they listen to in order to help the other person, expressed their opinion with the following sentences:

K10: I listen because I feel close to that person, I listen to what they are saying by mentally filtering it in order to help them.

A participant, who stated that they listen in order to obtain information and reach a conclusion, stated they do analyzing listening with these words:

K24: I listen in order to benefit from their knowledge, learn something, come to a conclusion on any subject.

The opinions of a participant who stated that they were trying to understand the world of emotions and thoughts of the other person are as follows:

K7: To understand the reason why the other person contacted me. To learn their feelings and thoughts about an event.

When Table 11 was examined, participants expressed their views on what they did to better understand the other person. Accordingly, the participants mostly noted behaviors such as focusing, making eye contact, asking questions as what they commonly do. In addition, taking notes, not interrupting, empathizing, paying attention to gestures and facial expressions, giving feedback, being unprejudiced and analyzing are also behaviors they conduct. They stated that among these items, behaviors such as focusing and making eye contact help people to understand better and express themselves comfortably. It is understood that the relational listening style comes to the fore in these views. However, there are participants who use critical listening with behaviors such as asking questions and taking notes, interactive listening with feedback behavior, and who use analyzing listening by being unprejudiced and analyzing. Accordingly, participants reveal the type of listening they are close to by showing different behaviors.

Table 11. Participants' views on their behavior while listening to the speaker.

Listening behaviors	f
Focusing	14
Making eye contact	11
Asking questions	3
Taking notes	2
Not interrupting	2
Empathizing	2
Paying attention to gestures and facial expressions	2
Giving feedback	2
Being unprejudiced	1
Analyzing	1

One of the participants, who stated that they listen by making eye contact with the other person and listen without interrupting wants a positive communication and the relationship to develop. Their views on this are as follows:

K2: I make eye contact and listen without interrupting the speaker.

The participant, who tries to ensure effective communication by empathizing with the other person during listening, expressed their opinions as follows:

K10: I try to understand them better by empathizing with what they are telling.

The opinions of the participant, who stated that they try to understand the real ideas of the person by paying attention to gestures and facial expressions while listening, are as follows:

K16: Following gestures and gestures makes speech more understandable. Sometimes we can even tell if the things said are true or false. Second, using a door-setting language allows the speaker to continue speaking. Thus, I can understand better.

The participant who tries to learn by asking the speaker about the deficiencies and gaps in their speech while communicating explains that he does critical listening:

K6: First of all, I take care to listen carefully to the person in front of me. If for any reason the other person has a sentence that I cannot hear, I ask the other person to repeat the sentence. I ask questions to that person if a question appears in my mind.

According to Table 12, the participants noted that they prefer to listen to informative and controversial conversations about the topics they find interesting. In addition, they also stated that they listened to conversations using a clear and understandable style, conversations on current issues, conversations on interesting topics and useful speeches. A smaller number of participants stated that they preferred to listen to

Table 12. Participants' opinions on the conversations they prefer for listening.

Preferred subjects	f
Informative speech	7
Controversial talk	5
Clear and understandable style	4
Current issues	3
Interesting topics	3
Useful conversation	3
Needed subject	2
Planned speech	2
Education subject	2
Entertaining speeches	2
Artistic subjects	1

speeches on needed topics, planned speeches, educational topics, entertaining speech and artistic subjects. The most prominent views are the speeches that appeal to the cognitive side of people. Some participants expressed that they prefer to listen according to the formal feature rather than the content of the speech. Accordingly; it is observed that the participants expect listening to contribute to them and prefer listening that requires more active use of their mental abilities.

A participant, who thinks that speaker should be prepared, use appropriate style and the speech should be based on interaction, expressed their views as follows:

K6: I find plain speech boring. The speaker should be well prepared beforehand about the subject they will discuss. In addition, they should support what is being told with materials and examples. There should be no uniform narration. If the speaker narrates something dynamically, if the voice, emphasis and intonation is good, the listening rate may increase.

The participant, who states that they prefer to listen to controversial topics, approaches the speeches with a critical perspective. Their views on this are as follows:

K2: I am more interested in listening to disputable topics. Stating that they try to obtain information by listening to conferences and discussions, the participant expressed their opinions as follows:

K20: I like to listen to conferences. I also like to listen to discussions. I try to get information from discussions and conferences.

The views of the participant who stated that they listen according to his interests and needs are as follows:

K3: First of all, I prefer to listen to topics that suit my interests and needs.

When we look at Table 13, regarding how participants define themselves as listeners, relational and interactional listener profiles are predominant and there

Table 13. Participants' opinions on the types of listening they use.

Listening types	f
Relational	13
Interactional	7
Critical	4
Analyzing	3

are also critical and analyzing types of listeners. Participants revealed their perceptions about themselves with the opinions they expressed. When compared with other opinions, it is understood that there are compatible findings between listening behaviors and their listening perceptions.

The participant, who noted that he values the other person and cares about their feelings, stated that they use relational listening with these words:

K1: Since I think that they are a person who cares about listening and speaking, I will not do things that I do not want to be done to myself, so I consider the person in front of me valuable and have a focused listening to their speech.

The opinions of the participant, who stated that they interacted by interfering with the conversation and use interactive listening, are as follows:

K16: I can ask questions on matters that catch my attention without waiting for the speaker to finish.

The participant who tries to understand the parts he did not understand in the listening process by asking questions expressed how they use critical listening as follows:

K20: I am someone who tries to listen carefully. I am a listener who asks the person I am communicating with about the parts I don't understand from what I am listening to.

Regarding how they perceive themselves, a participant stated that he used the analyzing listening, in a solution-oriented manner without interrupting the speech in the following words:

K24: First of all, I listen to the other person without interrupting. Instead of designing my own words while listening or just pretending to listen, I seriously give my attention to the other person and become solution-oriented.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study, which aims to evaluate perceptions of Turkish teacher candidates regarding listening types according to the variables of gender, university, grade

level, academic grade point average, the type of high school graduated from and the opinions of teacher candidates, data were collected with the scale to determine the types of listening used by Turkish teacher candidates and interviews were conducted to examine the findings in depth. Within the scope of the study, the relationship between teacher candidates' gender, grade level, grade point average and the type of high school graduated from and listening styles were examined. As a result of the analysis conducted, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the variables of gender and grade and the types of listening used by teacher candidates. In the study of Maden and Durukan (2011), it was determined that there is a significant difference between the grade variable and the listening style, but there is no significant difference with the gender variable. In Tabak's (2013) study, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the listener styles of Turkish teacher candidates and the gender variable. In the study of Özkan and Başkan (2019), it was determined that there is a difference in relational dimension between gender and listening style and no difference in other dimensions. In Şahin's (2020) study, it was expressed that there was no significant difference between gender and listening style. When studies examining the grade variable are considered, it was observed that there was no significant relationship between the grade variable and listening styles in the studies conducted by Tabak (2013) and Ürün Karahan (2016), while the studies conducted by Özkan and Başkan (2019) and Şahin (2020) did not show a significant difference between the grade variable and the listening styles. The research findings revealed similar results with the studies in the literature. On the other hand, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the variables of grade point average and the type of high school graduated from and the listening styles used.

When the difference between the grade point average of the teacher candidates and the types of listening they use are considered, it was observed that there is a difference between the students with a GPA of 0,00-2,00 and the students with higher scores. Accordingly, it is understood that the students with low grade point average also have lower listening types scores than others. In this respect, it can be asserted that there is a relationship between listening types and academic achievement.

When the difference between the type of high school teacher candidates graduated from and the listening types used is examined, it is observed that the graduates of sciences high schools have higher scores in interactive listening than graduates of vocational and technical Anatolian high schools, the graduates of Anatolian Imam Hatip high school have higher averages than social sciences high school graduates in analyzing listening and

in general, graduates of sciences high schools, Anatolian high schools and Anatolian Imam Hatip high schools have a higher average than the graduates of social sciences high schools. Accordingly, the type of high school teacher candidates graduated from is an important determinant on the types of listening they use.

According to the correlation analysis between the sub-dimension scores of the listening types of the teacher candidates, there are significant relationships between them. Accordingly, it can be claimed that there is a positive relationship between the sub-dimensions and the overall relationship of the scale. The dimension that has the highest relationship with the overall score of the scale is relational listening. It can be asserted that the relational listening reflects the overall scale better.

Considering the arithmetic mean of the listening types scale and its sub-dimensions, it is observed that it generally has high averages. The relational listening dimension has the highest average among the sub-dimensions. Relational listening score average stands out a little more than the others and proves that it is used more by teacher candidates. As a result of the interviews with the teacher candidates, it was determined that the relational listening type was used more than the other types.

According to the results of the interviews, when the reasons for listening to the other person are considered, it is observed that they listen for reasons such as showing respect, understanding, helping and communicating, and they listen in terms of their relationships with other people. However, they showed that they used different listening types by stating that they listened to gain knowledge, improve themselves, solve problems and make comments.

When the behaviors of the teacher candidates during listening are considered, behaviors such as focusing, making eye contact, and asking questions come to the fore. In addition, they also show behaviors of taking notes, not interrupting, empathizing, paying attention to gestures and facial expressions, giving feedback, being unprejudiced and analyzing. The teacher candidates showed that they use different types of listening with these behaviors they exhibit. It is understood from these types that relational listening behaviors are performed more.

When the speeches that the teacher candidates prefer to listen to are examined, it is observed that they prefer to listen to informative and controversial speeches more. In addition, they are also interested in speeches using a clear and understandable style, talks about current issues, talks about interesting topics and useful speeches. It is observed that teacher candidates prefer listening that requires more active use of their mental abilities.

Looking at how the teacher candidates perceive themselves as listeners, it is observed that there are

more people who see themselves as relational and interactional listeners. Perceptions of other types of listeners are lower. The types of listeners who value and maintain good relationships with speakers reflect the wider audience. Accordingly, it can be claimed that teacher candidates use critical and analyzing listening styles less. Based on the results of the study, it is possible to make the following recommendations:

- The relationship between teachers candidates' listening types and their academic achievements requires these aspects to be considered in the learning process. Their success can also be improved by improving their ability to use different listening types.
- Considering the meaningful relationship between the type of high school graduated from and the listening type, it is necessary to include activities that will improve various listening types in all high schools. Thus, students can improve their versatile thinking skills.
- Based on the fact that teacher candidates mostly use relational listening, creating environments in which they can use different types of listening at all levels of education can help students to become more effective listeners.

REFERENCES

- Akyol, H. (2011).** Türkçe Öğretim Yöntemleri. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2011).** Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı - İstatistik, Araştırma Deseni, Spss Uygulamaları ve Yorum. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013).** Araştırma Deseni (Translation Edt. S. B. Demir). Ankara: Eğiten Kitap.
- Doğan, Y. (2013).** Dinleme Eğitimi. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Ford, W. S. Z., Wolvin, A. D., and Chung, S. (2000).** Students' Self-Perceived Listening Competencies in the Basic Speech Communication Course. *International Journal of Listening*, 14(1): 1-13.
- Gürel, E. and Tat, M. (2012).** Bir İletişim Edimi Olarak Dinleme ve Türkçede Bulunan Dinleme Temalı Atasözleri İle Deyimler Üzerine Bir İçerik Analizi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5(23), 276-297.
- Güneş, F. (2014).** Türkçe Öğretimi – Yaklaşımlar ve Modeller. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Güzel, A., and Karatay, H. (2014).** Türkçe Öğretimi El Kitabı. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10904018.2000.10499032?needAccess=true>.
- Kadagidze, L. (2006).** Different types of Listening Materials. *IBSU International Refereed Multi-disciplinary Scientific Journal*, 1, 148-154.
- Karahan, B. Ü. (2016).** Türkçe Öğretmen Adaylarının Dinleme Stilllerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi (Kafkas Üniversitesi Örneği). *Kafkas Üniversitesi, e – Kafkas Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(3): s.19-25.
- Kaya, M. F. (2014).** Dinleme Türleri Ölçeğinin Türk Kültürüne Uyarlanması, Dil Geçerliliği ve Faktör Yapısının Belirlenmesi. *AİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Sayı: 3(14): 321-340.
- Maden, S. and Durukan, E. (2011).** Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarının Dinleme Stilllerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3(4): 101-112.
- McMillan, J. H., and Schumacher, S. (2010).** *Research in Education*:

- Evidence - Based Inquiry, (7 th Edition), Pearson, London.
- Melanliođlu, D. (2011).** İlköğretim Türkçe Öğretim Programının “Dinleme Türleri” Bakımından Değerlendirilmesi. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt 12, Sayı 3, 65-78.
- Mert, E. L. (2013).** Ortaokul Türkçe Çalışma Kitaplarında Yer Alan Etkinliklerde Kullanılan Dinleme Türlerine İlişkin Bir İnceleme. Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 15, Sayı: 2, s. 52-73.
- Özkan, E., and Başkan, A. (2019).** Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarına Ait Dinleme Türlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Ekev Akademi Dergisi, Yıl: 23 Sayı: 78, s. 175-190.
- Şahin, H. (2020).** Investigation of listening types of Turkish pre-service teachers in terms of the various variables: A case of Kafkas University. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16(1): 306-315.
- Shintani, N., and Wallace, M. P. (2014).** The Effectiveness of Listening Support on L2 Learners’ Listening Comprehension Ability: A Meta-Analysis. English Teaching and Learning, 38.3, 71-101.
- Tabak, G. (2013).** Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarının Dinleme Stilllerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Cilt: 10, Sayı: 22, s. 171-181.
- Yazar, S., and Yazar, İ. (2018).** Dinleme Öğretimi. (Edt. Serhan Musa Taşkaya ve Ruhan Karadağ) Türkçe Öğretimi içinde İstanbul: Lisans Yayıncılık. ss. 79-102.
- Yıldırım, A., and Şimşek, H. (2008).** Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldız, C., Okur, A., Arı, G., and Yılmaz, Y. (2008).** Türkçe Öğretimi. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Yıldız, N., and Kılınc, A. (2015).** Dinleme Stratejileri Öğretiminin Beşinci Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Dinlediğini Anlama Becerilerine Etkisi. Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (ERZSOSDE), ÖS-II, s. 17-34
- Zarrabi, F. (2016).** The impact of listening strategy training on the meta-cognitive listening strategies awareness of different learner types. English Language Teaching, 9(5): 154-165.

Citation: Can, F. (2020). Perceptions of Turkish teachers about listening types. African Educational Research Journal, 8(3): S76-S88.
