

Exploring Musicological Discourses: A Preliminary Meta-Analysis of Slovenian Scholarly Articles

Tjaša Ribizel Popič
Univerza v Ljubljani
University of Ljubljana

Introduction

In Slovenia, musicological discourse is predominantly disseminated through academic journals, which serve as vital platforms for researchers to present findings, debate theories, and chart the course of future inquiries. Understanding the prevailing trends within these publications not only illuminates the current state of musicological scholarship but also helps identify emerging areas of interest.

This study conducts a meta-analysis using corpus-linguistic methodology to examine a breadth of musicological articles from four prominent Slovenian journals. Meta-analysis is a research method that systematically combines and synthesizes results from multiple studies to derive broader insights and identify overarching patterns.¹ By aggregating and analyzing numerous existing analyses within these articles, we aim to uncover patterns and trends that may not be immediately apparent through traditional qualitative approaches. The term “meta-analysis” here signifies our comprehensive examination of multiple analyses to derive holistic insights into the musicological literature. By constructing a specialized corpus of these texts, we aim to uncover patterns and trends that may not be immediately apparent through traditional qualitative analyses. Corpus linguistics, with its ability to handle large volumes of textual data systematically, provides

1 Gene V. Glass, “Primary, Secondary, and Meta-Analysis of Research,” *Educational Researcher* 5, no. 10 (1976): 3–8.

robust tools for examining linguistic features such as frequency of terms, collocations, and thematic clusters.

By shedding light on the linguistic and thematic characteristics of musicological writings, this study not only maps the landscape of Slovenian musicology but also demonstrates the utility of corpus-linguistic and other digital-humanist methods in humanities research. The findings may have implications for educators, researchers, and policymakers interested in the progression of musicological studies both within Slovenia and in the broader international context.

Background

This section describes the main theoretical underpinnings of the methods and processes employed in the present paper.

Meta-Analyses in Scholarly Research

Meta-analysis is a systematic research methodology that aggregates and synthesizes results from multiple studies to draw more comprehensive conclusions than those offered by individual analyses.² Initially developed within the fields of medicine and psychology to resolve discrepancies among study findings³, meta-analysis has been increasingly adopted across various disciplines, including the social sciences and humanities.

Meta-analyses are employed to achieve a holistic understanding of a research topic by combining findings from numerous studies. This comprehensive approach enables researchers to identify general patterns and overarching themes that might not be evident in isolated studies. By resolving inconsistencies that often arise due to differences in methodology, sample sizes, or contexts among individual studies, meta-analysis provides more robust and reliable conclusions. The method enhances statistical power by combining data, reducing the likelihood of Type II errors (false negatives), which is particularly valuable when individual studies have small sample sizes or subtle effects.⁴ Moreover, meta-analyses help in identifying research gaps by highlighting areas where findings are consistently inconclusive

² Ibid.

³ Mary Lee Smith and Gene V. Glass, "Meta-Analysis of Psychotherapy Outcome Studies," *American Psychologist* 32, no. 9 (1977): 752–60.

⁴ Robert Rosenthal, *Meta-Analytic Procedures for Social Research*. Applied Social Research Methods (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1991), <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984997>.

or where research is lacking, thereby guiding future research efforts. In fields such as medicine, education, and social policy, meta-analyses offer evidence-based conclusions that inform best practices and decision-making processes.

Corpus Linguistics as A Meta-Analysis Driver

Corpus linguistics is a branch of linguistics that involves the systematic study of language through large collections of texts, known as corpora.⁵ It employs computational tools and quantitative methods to analyze authentic language use, enabling researchers to uncover patterns and trends that may not be apparent through traditional qualitative analyses.⁶

Key features of corpus linguistics include:

- 1) Empirical analysis: Focusing on real-world language data as opposed to intuition or anecdotal evidence.⁷
- 2) Quantitative methods: Utilizing statistical techniques to examine frequencies, distributions, and associations of linguistic features.
- 3) Computational tools: Employing software for processing and analyzing large datasets efficiently.⁸
- 4) Representative sampling: Building corpora that reflect the diversity and complexity of the language or discourse being studied.⁹

The application of corpus linguistics is particularly pertinent to this research due to several key factors. First, the study involves a substantial number of articles from four different journals, resulting in a large volume of textual data. Corpus linguistics provides the methodologies and tools necessary to manage and analyze such extensive datasets systematically.¹⁰ By employing corpus analysis, the research can handle this abundance of information efficiently and effectively.

5 Tony McEnery, and Andrew Hardie, *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

6 Douglas Biber, Susan Conrad, and Randi Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

7 John Sinclair, *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

8 Paul Baker, *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis* (London: Continuum, 2006).

9 Graeme Kennedy, *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1998).

10 McEnery and Hardie, *Corpus Linguistics*.

Second, corpus linguistics facilitates the identification of linguistic and thematic patterns within the musicological literature. By examining word frequencies, collocations, and concordances, it enables the discovery of prevalent themes, stylistic features, and discourse structures.¹¹ This analytical capability is crucial for uncovering trends and shifts in the scholarly discourse of Slovenian musicology.

Third, the quantitative nature of corpus analysis allows for objective measurement of linguistic phenomena, enhancing the reliability and reproducibility of the findings.¹² This objectivity is essential for ensuring that the study's conclusions are based on empirical evidence rather than subjective interpretation. The reproducibility of results also strengthens the study's validity within the academic community.

Furthermore, corpus linguistics complements the meta-analytical approach used in this study. While meta-analysis synthesizes findings across studies, corpus linguistics analyzes the language of the studies themselves. This dual approach enriches the research by providing both a synthesis of content and an analysis of linguistic expression. By integrating these methodologies, the study offers a more comprehensive understanding of the musicological literature.

Lastly, corpus linguistics provides insights into the disciplinary discourse of musicology. It enables the exploration of how musicologists construct knowledge and engage with scholarly debates, shedding light on the conventions and evolutions within the discipline's discourse. Understanding these aspects is vital for mapping the intellectual landscape of Slovenian musicology and identifying emerging areas of interest.

Advantages of A Data-Driven Approach

The application of corpus linguistics in this study offers several significant advantages. Firstly, it enhances efficiency in data processing. Automated text analysis enables the handling of extensive datasets that would be impractical to analyze manually. Given the substantial number of articles from multiple journals, corpus linguistic tools facilitate systematic examination and allow for comprehensive analysis without the prohibitive time investment that manual methods would require.

11 Biber, Conrad, and Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics*.

12 Susan Hunston, *Corpora in Applied Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524773>.

Secondly, corpus linguistics provides the capability for diachronic analysis. Corpus methods can track changes in language use and thematic focus over time, aligning with the study's goal of identifying trends in the literature. By analyzing texts from different publication periods, the research can uncover how musicological discourse in Slovenia has evolved, highlighting shifts in topics, methodologies, and theoretical perspectives.

Thirdly, the approach supports language-specific analysis. Tools like SketchEngine are designed to handle multiple languages, including Slovenian, accommodating the specific linguistic context of the research.¹³ This capability ensures that the analysis accurately reflects the nuances of the Slovenian language, such as its morphological complexity and use of diacritics, which is essential for obtaining valid and reliable results.

Moreover, using corpus linguistics enhances the objectivity and reproducibility of the study. The quantitative data derived from corpus analysis provide empirical evidence that strengthens the validity of the findings. This empirical foundation allows for objective measurement of linguistic phenomena, reducing the potential for subjective bias and enabling other researchers to replicate the study if desired.

Finally, the integration of corpus linguistics contributes to methodological innovation within musicological research. By combining computational linguistic techniques with traditional humanities methodologies, the study demonstrates an interdisciplinary approach that can inspire similar research in other fields. This not only advances the current study but also opens new avenues for future research that bridges linguistic analysis and musicology.

Methodology

By integrating corpus linguistics into the methodological framework, the study leverages computational analysis to enhance traditional research methods:

- 1) Data-driven insights: The empirical nature of corpus analysis grounds the study's conclusions in observable data patterns.¹⁴

13 Adam Kilgariff, et al., "The Sketch Engine: Ten Years on," *Lexicography* 1, no. 1 (2014): 7–36, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9>.

14 Elena Tognini-Bonelli, *Corpus Linguistics at Work* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001).

- 2) Interdisciplinary approach: Combining linguistic analysis with musicological inquiry exemplifies methodological innovation, potentially contributing to both fields.
- 3) Enhanced validity: Cross-validation of findings through both corpus analysis and meta-analytical synthesis strengthens the validity of the research outcomes.

The application of corpus linguistics to musicological texts offers several unique benefits with significant implications for the field. Firstly, it enables the revelation of implicit trends within musicology. By analyzing linguistic patterns, researchers can identify shifts in theoretical perspectives, methodological preferences, and emerging topics that may not be immediately apparent through traditional analysis. This insight helps to understand how the discipline evolves and how scholarly focus areas change in response to new developments.

Secondly, corpus linguistics supports critical discourse analysis within musicology. Examining language use in scholarly texts allows for critical examinations of power dynamics, ideologies, and practices prevalent in the field.¹⁵ This approach uncovers underlying assumptions and biases that may influence musicological scholarship, contributing to a more reflective and self-aware discipline.

Thirdly, insights derived from corpus analysis can inform pedagogy and scholarship in musicology. The findings can be applied to curriculum development, helping educators align teaching content with current trends and address gaps identified in the literature. Understanding patterns in scholarly communication practices guides researchers in effectively disseminating their work and engaging with the broader academic community. By highlighting underexplored or emerging areas, corpus linguistics directs future research efforts, fostering the advancement of the field.

Implementation of Meta-Analysis into Research

The process of conducting a meta-analysis begins with a clear definition of the research scope and criteria for including studies in the analysis. Researchers perform a systematic literature review, thoroughly searching academic databases, journals, and other sources to collect relevant studies, ensuring a comprehensive dataset. Key information from each study—such as

15 Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2013).

sample characteristics, methodologies, and findings—is extracted and coded. Statistical techniques are then used to synthesize the extracted data, calculating overall effect sizes, identifying patterns, and assessing the strength of the evidence. Researchers evaluate variability among studies (heterogeneity) and assess potential biases, such as publication bias, to ensure the validity of the meta-analysis. The final step involves interpreting the results in the context of the research question and existing literature, discussing implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

While meta-analysis is traditionally associated with quantitative fields, its principles are increasingly applied in humanities disciplines like musicology to synthesize qualitative findings and explore trends within scholarly literature.¹⁶

In musicology, studies often employ diverse theoretical frameworks and methodologies.¹⁷ A meta-analytical approach allows researchers to integrate these varied analyses to understand broader trends and shifts in the field.¹⁸ By examining a large corpus of musicological literature, meta-analysis aids in identifying prevalent themes, topics, and areas of emphasis within the discipline over time.¹⁹ It also evaluates methodological approaches by assessing the effectiveness and popularity of different research methods used in musicology, highlighting methodological advancements or preferences.²⁰ The findings from meta-analyses contribute to scholarly discourse by providing evidence-based insights into the evolution of musicological thought and practice.²¹

In this study, meta-analysis is combined with corpus-linguistic methodology to analyze musicological literature from Slovenian journals. This integration offers several advantages. Corpus linguistics provides tools for quantifying textual data, allowing statistical analysis of language use, thematic frequency, and stylistic features within the corpus.²² The systematic nature of meta-analysis reduces subjective biases, enabling a more objective

16 Jim Samson, *Music in the Balkans* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

17 Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist, eds., *Rethinking Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

18 Raymond Monelle, *The Sense of Music: Semiotic Essays* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000).

19 Joseph Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985).

20 Marion A. Guck, "Analytical Fictions," *Music Theory Spectrum* 16, no. 2 (1994): 217–30.

21 Leo Treitler, *Music and the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

22 McEnery and Hardie, *Corpus Linguistics*.

identification of trends and patterns in musicological research.²³ Additionally, the large volume of articles analyzed necessitates efficient data processing methods; corpus linguistics facilitates handling and analyzing extensive textual data effectively.²⁴

By employing a meta-analytical approach within a corpus-linguistic framework, this study aims to map the intellectual landscape of Slovenian musicology, providing a comprehensive overview of the country's musicological scholarship. It highlights key developments, influential themes, and emerging areas of interest, thereby informing future research by identifying gaps or underexplored topics in the literature. This approach contributes to the advancement of musicological research and demonstrates methodological innovation by showcasing the applicability of combining meta-analysis with corpus linguistics in humanities research. The study has the potential to inspire similar interdisciplinary methodologies in other fields.

Selection of Journals and Corpus Compilation

The study focuses on four prominent Slovenian musicological journals: *Muzikološki zbornik*, *De musica disserenda*, *Glasbenopedagoški zbornik*, and *Studia musicologica labacensia*. These journals were selected due to their significant contributions to the field of musicology in Slovenia and their availability in digital format. Including all available online issues ensures a comprehensive dataset that reflects a wide temporal range and a diversity of scholarly works within Slovenian musicology.²⁵

Data Collection and Preparation

All articles from the selected journals were downloaded in PDF format from their respective online archives. PDFs are a common format for digital documents; however, they often present challenges for textual analysis due to their fixed-layout nature and potential encoding issues. To facilitate effective corpus analysis, it was necessary to convert these PDFs into plain text files.

23 Baker, *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*.

24 Biber, Conrad, and Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics*.

25 All articles used in this study are publicly available academic publications. The analysis was conducted solely for scholarly purposes, respecting the intellectual property rights of authors and publishers. Data handling procedures complied with ethical guidelines for research, ensuring confidentiality and integrity of the data.

A custom algorithm was used to convert the PDF documents into plain text, but several common issues were encountered during PDF-to-text conversion, such as:

- 1) Encoding challenges: PDFs use various character encodings, which resulted in incorrect character representation in the extracted text.
- 2) Layout complexities: Academic articles often include columns, footnotes, headers, and footers, which disrupt the linear flow of text when extracted, leading to incorrect automatic text recognition.
- 3) Musicology-specific textual and graphic features in the text, which make automatic text processing difficult.
- 4) Multilingual and parallel texts in individual issues.

These issues merit further manual cleanup of the articles and the compilation of several individual corpora in different languages; which is something we intend to do in further research so as to provide a publicly available resource for further quantitative analyses.

Corpus Construction and Analysis

After extracting text from the articles into plain text, we uploaded raw textual data into the SketchEngine platform. SketchEngine²⁶ is a comprehensive corpus management and analysis tool widely utilized in linguistic research.²⁷ It allows researchers to create custom corpora and provides a suite of analytical functions, including frequency lists, concordances, collocations, and keyword analyses.

In order to facilitate in-depth analysis of the texts in question, we have to compile the uploaded texts, which essentially means that we have to assign a value to each and every word in the corpus, and this makes statistical research possible. This process is two-fold and is called lemmatization and part-of-speech tagging. The corpus was lemmatized, and parts of speech were tagged to facilitate more precise searches and analyses.

The following analyses were conducted:

- 1) Frequency analysis: Generated word and lemma frequency lists to identify the most commonly used terms across the corpus. This

²⁶ *Sketch Engine*, <https://www.sketchengine.eu/>.

²⁷ Kilgariff, et al., "The Sketch Engine: Ten Years on."

step highlight's prevalent themes and subjects within the musicological literature.

- 2) Keyword analysis: Compared the corpus against a reference corpus of general Slovenian language to identify keywords – terms that appear significantly more frequently in the musicological corpus. This helps in pinpointing specialized vocabulary unique to the discipline.
- 3) Collocation analysis: Examined word pairings and collocations to uncover significant associations between terms, shedding light on conceptual linkages and common thematic pairings in the texts.²⁸

The quantitative data obtained from SketchEngine were interpreted in the context of musicological research. Patterns identified through frequency and collocation analyses were cross-referenced with the content of the articles to validate the findings. For instance, a high frequency of terms related to ethnomusicology would suggest a strong scholarly interest in that subfield.

Qualitative assessments were also made by examining concordance lines to understand the nuances of term usage. This dual approach of combining quantitative data with qualitative insights enhances the reliability and depth of the analysis.²⁹

Exploratory Analysis of Slovenian Musicological Literature

In this section, we provide the preliminary results of the exploratory analysis of Slovenian musicological literature.

Dataset

In this section, we present the dataset in numbers. Table 1 gives the overview of the entire corpus markup by numbers.

28 John Sinclair, *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse* (London: Routledge, 2004).

29 Biber, Conrad, and Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics*.

Table 1: The dataset in numbers.

Category	Count
Tokens	8,547,948
Words	6,432,984
Sentences	278,769

As we can see in Table 1, the entire dataset includes roughly 6.5 million words and roughly 8.5 million tokens. Tokens include words, punctuation, symbols, etc. The following table shows the markup of words and tokens within the dataset according to individual journals.

Table 2: Distribution of texts per journal by words, tokens and percentage.

Name	Tokens	Words	%
GPZ	203,834	~153,522	2.3
DMD	2,374,001	~1,788,041	27.1
ML	1,337,088	~1,007,063	15.3
MZ	4,836,859	~3,643,007	55.3

As Table 2 demonstrates, by far the largest subset of the dataset comes from *Muzikološki zbornik*³⁰, followed by *De musica disserenda*³¹, *Studia musicologica Labacensia*³² and *Glasbenopedagoški zbornik*³³ with only a minute margin. The distribution between the journals is of course very important, as the present markup represents a significant skew towards *Muzikološki zbornik*. In terms of understanding and interpreting the data, this is of note as this journal, its layout, and topics are more widely represented than, say, those of *Glasbenopedagoški zbornik*. However, in such cases, we must keep the data as diverse as possible, even with unbalanced representation. The article counts and the distribution of volumes included in the database are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of files and timespans included in the dataset.

Journal	ML	GPZ	MZ	DMD
Nr. of articles	7	25	42	255
Volumes included	2017–2024	2010–2023	2000–2023	2005–2023

³⁰ Hereinafter *MZ*.

³¹ Hereinafter *DMD*.

³² Hereinafter *ML*.

³³ Hereinafter *GPZ*.

As Table 3 shows, the journals cover roughly the same timeframe, which is of course also governed by the prerequisite for the digital format.

Exploratory Analysis

In this section, we present a brief analysis of the prevalent themes in the four journals. For this, we used selected keywords within each of the sub-corpora (journals).³⁴ The overall counts and relative frequencies are given in Table 4, with visual representation with data bars in terms of frequency.³⁵

- 1) *Above average frequency words across datasets:*
 - The terms “koncert” [concert] and “orkester” [orchestra] are the most frequently occurring in all datasets, with notably high per-million occurrences in *MZ* (159.2 and 154.9, respectively) and *ML* (90.5 and 129.4).
 - “Zbor” [choir] also appears frequently across corpora, especially in *ML* and *DMD*, indicating a possible strong representation of choral and orchestral contexts in the dataset.
- 2) *Terms with significant variation:*
 - “Dirigent” [conductor] shows a higher frequency in *ML* (97.97 per million) compared to *MZ* (53.3), which might indicate a specialized focus in *ML* content.
 - “Izvajalec” [performer] and “umetnik” [artist] have low or missing data in some corpora (notably zero occurrences in *GPZ*), suggesting variability in terminology across texts.
- 3) *Bellow average-frequency and specialized terms:*
 - Words like “poustvarjanje” [interpretation] and “uprizarjanje” [performing, staging] are rare across all datasets, which could reflect more niche topics or less common terms in the domain.
 - The term “recepција” [reception] is notably present in *MZ* (20.67 per million), but it is far less common or missing in the other datasets, indicating it may relate to specific scholarly or analytical texts within *MZ*.

34 dirigent, orkester, solist, poustvarjanje, glasbenik, zbor, ansambel, koncert, ustvarjanje, podajanje, recepcija, izvedba, praksa, umetnik, interpretiranje, uprizarjanje, izražanje, izvajalec

35 The keywords are given in-text with my (free) translations in square brackets.

4) *Interpreting dataset variation:*

- Each corpus may emphasize different aspects of musicology. For example, *ML* may focus more on conductors and ensembles, while *MZ* and *DMD* might provide broader coverage of terms like “izvedba” [performance] and “praksa” [practice].

Table 4: Overall scores for selected keywords.

Word	Count- -MZ	Per milli- on-MZ	Count- -ML	Per milli- on-ML	Count- -GPZ	Per mil- lion-GPZ	Count- -DMD	Per mil- lion-D- MD
koncert	770	159.19421	121	90.49516	17	83.4012	132	55.60234
orkester	749	154.85255	173	129.38565	3	14.71786	109	45.91405
zbor	650	134.38474	214	160.0493	4	19.62381	226	95.19794
glasbenik	341	70.5003	97	72.54571	6	29.43572	147	61.92078
dirigent	258	53.3404	131	97.97411	2	9.81191	55	23.16764
ustvarjanje	159	32.87257	10	7.47894	11	53.96548	31	13.05812
izvedba	158	32.66583	42	31.41154	7	34.34167	30	12.63689
praksa	130	26.87695	21	15.70577	8	39.24762	68	28.64363
recepција	100	20.67457	6	4.48736	1	4.90595	35	14.74304
izvajalec	71	14.67895	1	0.74789	#N/A	#N/A	19	8.00337
umetnik	64	13.23173	46	34.40312	3	14.71786	29	12.21566
ansambel	56	11.57776	51	38.14259	#N/A	#N/A	18	7.58214
solist	47	9.71705	24	17.94946	1	4.90595	19	8.00337
izražanje	28	5.78888	#N/A	#N/A	2	9.81191	5	2.10615
interpretiranje	19	3.92817	2	1.49579	#N/A	#N/A	6	2.52738
uprizorjanje	17	3.51468	14	10.47052	#N/A	#N/A	4	1.68492
podajanje	11	2.2742	2	1.49579	3	14.71786	7	2.94861
poustvarjanje	9	1.86071	3	2.24368	#N/A	#N/A	12	5.05476

As already mentioned, the individual journals and their representation in the dataset are unbalanced, which means that the overall counts are not the most representative criterion. For this reason, the scores giving relative frequencies (= frequency of a word per million words) are given in Table 5, with data bars showing the most and the least frequent items.

1) *High-frequency terms:*

– “Koncert” [concert], “orkester” [orchestra], and “zbor” [choir] are the most frequently occurring terms across journals, especially in *MZ* and *ML*. For instance, “koncert” [concert] has a relative frequency of 159.2 in *MZ* and 90.5 in *ML*, showing a consistent focus on concert settings. Similarly, “zbor” [choir] is highly prominent in *ML* (160.0) and *DMD* (95.2), indicating that choral music is a common topic, particularly within these journals.

– “Orkester” [orchestra] also shows high relative frequencies in *MZ* (154.9) and *ML* (129.4), while *GPZ* has a much lower value (14.7), suggesting that orchestral discussions may be more central to *MZ* and *ML*.

2) *Low-frequency terms:*

– Terms such as “interpretiranje” [interpreting], “izražanje” [expression], and “poustvarjanje” [re-creation, interpretation] appear infrequently across most datasets, with relative frequencies mostly below 10. For example, “interpretiranje” [interpreting] has very low values in *ML* (1.5) and *MZ* (3.9), and is absent in *GPZ*. This trend indicates these terms are less central in the studied content or potentially more specialized/niche as a word form (cf. “interpretacija” [interpretation]).

– “Podajanje” [presentation, execution] shows a low relative frequency in *MZ* (2.3) and *ML* (1.5), but stands out with a higher value in *GPZ* (14.7), possibly reflecting a focus on presentation aspects in *GPZ*-related discourse.

3) *Variation across journals:*

– *MZ* has high relative frequencies for terms across the board, notably “koncert” [concert], “orkester” [orchestra], and “zbor” [choir], which may suggest a broader coverage of performance-focused topics.

– *ML* shows an interest in both performance and conductor-related terms, as indicated by high frequencies for “zbor” [choir] (160.0) and “dirigent” [conductor] (98.0). This might reflect thematic coverage of musical direction and ensemble settings.

– *GPZ* generally has lower frequencies, with a few exceptions like “praksa” [practice] (39.2) and “ustvarjanje” [creating] (54.0), po-

tentially indicating a focus on creative practices and applied musical contexts in this dataset.

– *DMD* shows more balance, with relatively high values for “zbor” [choir] and “glasbenik” [musician] but otherwise lower across terms, suggesting broader thematic coverage without a single dominant focus.

4) *Distinct terms by journal:*

– “Dirigent” [conductor] and “solist” [soloist] appear with higher frequency in *ML* and *DMD*, reflecting an emphasis on individual musicians or directors within these journals.

– “Recepcija” [reception] is more present in *MZ* (20.7), while less so in others, suggesting a potential focus on the reception or audience perception in *MZ*’s publications.

In summary, this analysis of relative frequencies highlights thematic focuses by journal, where *MZ* and *ML* often emphasize performance-related terms, while *GPZ* and *DMD* show more specialized or varied topic distributions, as Table 5 demonstrates.

Table 5: Relative frequencies for given keywords.

Item	Per million-MZ	Per million-ML	Per million-GPZ	Per million-DMD
koncert	159,19421	90,49516	83,4012	55,60234
orkester	154,85255	129,38565	14,71786	45,91405
zbor	134,38474	160,0493	19,62381	95,19794
glasbenik	70,5003	72,54571	29,43572	61,92078
dirigent	53,3404	97,97411	9,81191	23,16764
ustvarjanje	32,87257	7,47894	53,96548	13,05812
izvedba	32,66583	31,41154	34,34167	12,63689
praksa	26,87695	15,70577	39,24762	28,64363
recepcija	20,67457	4,48736	4,90595	14,74304
izvajalec	14,67895	0,74789	/	8,00337
umetnik	13,23173	34,40312	14,71786	12,21566
ansambel	11,57776	38,14259	/	7,58214
solist	9,71705	17,94946	4,90595	8,00337
izražanje	5,78888	/	9,81191	2,10615
interpretiranje	3,92817	1,49579	/	2,52738
uprizorjanje	3,51468	10,47052	/	1,68492
podajanje	2,2742	1,49579	14,71786	2,94861
poustvarjanje	1,86071	2,24368	/	5,05476

Conclusion

The integration of corpus linguistics and meta-analysis in this study underscores the vital importance of interdisciplinary approaches in advancing scholarly research. By bridging methodologies from linguistics and musicology, the research demonstrates how computational tools and quantitative methods can enrich the understanding of complex humanities subjects. This interdisciplinary effort not only deepens the analytical scope but also opens new avenues for exploring scholarly discourse within and across disciplines.

Utilizing meta-analysis has allowed for a synthesis of findings from numerous studies, providing a panoramic view of overarching trends in musicological literature. This approach is particularly valuable in identifying patterns, shifts in theoretical perspectives, and emerging areas of interest that may not be evident through individual studies alone. Meta-analysis contributes to building a cohesive understanding of the field's evolution, informing both current scholarship and future research directions.

The application of corpus linguistics offers empirical, data-driven insights into the language and themes prevalent in musicological texts. It facilitates the systematic examination of large volumes of textual data, enabling researchers to uncover linguistic patterns and thematic developments over time. This not only enhances the objectivity and reproducibility of the findings but also demonstrates the utility of computational methods in humanities research.

Interdisciplinary efforts such as this study highlight the potential for methodological innovation and collaboration across fields. By combining the strengths of different disciplines, researchers can address complex questions more effectively, contribute to the advancement of knowledge, and foster a more integrated academic community. Embracing such approaches and leveraging meta-analytical methods can lead to significant contributions in understanding scholarly trends, ultimately shaping the future of research in musicology and beyond.

Additionally, this analysis explores key themes in four music journals by examining the frequency of important terms. The journals *MZ* and *ML* primarily concentrate on performance-related topics, such as concerts and choirs. In contrast, *GPZ* places more emphasis on creative practices, while *DMD* offers a more balanced range of themes. Furthermore, terms that appear infrequently often highlight specialized or niche topics, reflecting the diverse focus of each journal.

The present paper thus shows potential viable strands of further research, as well as presents a potential methodological approach for studying musicological literature to determine overarching topics and trends.

Bibliography

Literature

- Baker, Paul. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad, and Randi Reppen. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Cook, Nicholas, and Mark Everist, eds. *Rethinking Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Hedges, Larry V., and Ingram Olkin. *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 1985.
- Hunston, Susan. *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524773>.
- Kennedy, Graeme. *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Kerman, Joseph. *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- McEnery, Tony, and Andrew Hardie. *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Monelle, Raymond. *The Sense of Music: Semiotic Essays*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Rosenthal, Robert. *Meta-Analytic Procedures for Social Research*. Applied Social Research Methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1991. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984997>.
- Samson, Jim. *Music in the Balkans*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Sinclair, John. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Sinclair, John. *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Tognini-Bonelli, Elena. *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- Treitler, Leo. *Music and the Historical Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Periodicals

- Glass, Gene V. "Primary, Secondary, and Meta-Analysis of Research." *Educational Researcher* 5, no. 10 (1976): 3–8.
- Guck, Marion A. "Analytical Fictions." *Music Theory Spectrum* 16, no. 2 (1994): 217–30.
- Kilgarriff, Adam, Vít Baisa, Jan Bušta, Miloš Jakubíček, Vojtěch Kovář, Jan Michelfeit, Pavel Rychlý, and Vít Suchomel. "The Sketch Engine: Ten Years on." *Lexicography* 1, no. 1 (2014.): 7–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9>.
- Smith, Mary Lee, and Gene V. Glass. "Meta-Analysis of Psychotherapy Outcome Studies." *American Psychologist* 32, no. 9 (1977): 752–60.

Other Sources

- Sketch Engine*. <https://www.sketchengine.eu/>.