

Developing the scale of writing, speaking, listening, reading self- efficacy for learners of Turkish as a foreign language

Dilek Unveren*, Department of Turkish and Social Studies Education, Faculty of Education, Suleyman Demirel University, 32200 Isparta, Turkey

Suggested Citation:

Unveren, D. (2019). Developing the scale of writing, speaking, listening, reading self efficacy for learners of Turkish as a foreign language. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 14(4), 676-693. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v11i4.4440>

Received July 12, 2019; revised from October 11, 2019; accepted from December 6, 2019.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Huseyin Uzunboylu, Near East University, Cyprus.

©2019 United World Center of Research Innovation and Publication. All rights reserved.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to develop a scale to measure Turkish reading, listening, speaking and writing self-efficacy of foreign students in Turkey. The sample group of this study consists of 412 foreign students studying in TOMER. At the first phase, four sets of items consisting of 200 items were prepared as a data collecting tool. Eliminating 90 of the items upon expert evaluations, a draft scale consisting of 110 items was applied to mentioned foreign students. The data obtained from the study were analysed by item analysis, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis methods. At the end of the study, the self-efficacy scale of Turkish reading, writing, speaking and listening skills, which consists of 94 items and targets foreigners who learn Turkish as a foreign language, was found to be a reliable and valid scale.

Keywords: Self-efficacy scale, learning Turkish as a foreign language.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Dilek Unveren**, Department of Turkish and Social Studies Education, Faculty of Education, Süleyman Demirel University, 32200 Isparta, Turkey. *E-mail address:* dilekkapanadze@sdu.edu.tr / Tel.: +0-246-211-3876

1. Introduction

The term 'self-efficacy' is defined as 'beliefs in one's capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments' (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Therefore, it refers to the ability to organize and implement activities necessary for people to perform certain tasks or preliminary opinion regarding their capacity in terms of some actions. Stating that there are four main sources determining self-efficacy beliefs, of which the most influential of them that individuals gain information directly from their own experience; other sources are performance accomplishments, verbal persuasion and physiological states (Bandura, 2002).

There are many factors that affect the skills of foreign language learners. These include motivation, age, intelligence, learning style, attitude, anxiety, perception, learning environment (physical, human and instructional), needs and interests. The effects and characteristics of each of these factors are unique and interrelated (Sen & Boylu, 2015). Ambiguity and unpredictability negatively affect self-efficacy by causing pressure and anxiety. Self-efficacy affects an individual's academic achievement, activity and the amount of efforts to continue possible tasks (Bandura & Locke, 2003; Pajares, 1996; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007).

There is a relationship between self-efficacy and foreign language learning. Individuals with a high level of self-efficacy will endeavour to achieve maximum success in all language skills by making more efforts when they face difficulties in learning a new language. Within these skills, the development of four fundamental skill areas is very important. Studies show that there is a vital relationship between the basic skills of language and self-efficacy of learners. In this respect, it was seen that self-efficacy perception is an important explanatory factor in teaching Turkish as a foreign language (Aktas, 2013; Bulbul, 2015; Demirci, 2015; Deniz & Dasoz, 2015; Soyseker, 2013). Difficulties and hindrances of learning a language are not the problems of yesterday, which is always the centre of many studies. The known and commonly used methods should always be checked in terms of their appropriateness to target language and the skills that needed to be developed. In addition, in language teaching, applying only universal principles and methods is not enough; considering the environment and conditions, self-efficacy of learners is so important and needed to pay attention (Gokcebag, 2015; Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Savas, 2015).

Today, an increasing number of people from many countries come to Turkey to learn Turkish for various reasons and also they learn Turkish in Turkish teaching centres, founded abroad (Unveren, 2017). However, it cannot be said that studies on learning Turkish as a foreign language are enough, mostly based on skill development and cultural studies. Most studies in the field of self-efficacy have been found as focused on a single area. Some self-efficacy studies were conducted on writing skill self-efficacy (Aytaç & Tuncel, 2015; BUyUkikiz, 2012; Gungör & Kan, 2015; Melanlıoğlu & Atalay 2016), on speaking skills self-efficacy (Melanlıoğlu & Deniz, 2015) and on identifying reading skills of learners of Turkish as a second language (Kan & Gungor, 2015; Sallabas, 2013). While scale development studies focused on the competence of a single skill, other scale development studies, in general, focused on anxiety in learners (Aytaç & Tuncel, 2005; İscan, 2015; Tuncel, 2015).

However, there are no studies on self-efficacy which encompass the four basic skills. In a qualified language teaching process, four basic language skills should be developed with equal importance. However, this is not the case in practice and it is seen that different levels of importance are attached to each of the skills both in the teaching environment and the academic studies conducted in this area. In short, while there are dozens of studies in the literature on one skill, there are very few studies related to another skill or no studies at all, and it is one of the points that should be emphasised. Considering this fact, it is thought necessary to develop scales and doing studies, especially on self-efficacy, which encompass all of the four basic skills of writing, listening and reading. Based on the abovementioned necessity, in this study, self-efficacy scale of writing, reading, listening and speaking was developed for learners of Turkish as a foreign language.

2. Sampling

The sample of the study consisted of 412 learners (138 females and 274 males) in 10 Turkish teaching centres (TOMER) as shown in Table 1. Headings should be placed above tables, left-justified. Leave one line space between the heading and the table. Only horizontal lines should be used within a table, to distinguish the column headings from the body of the table, and immediately above and below the table. Tables must be embedded in the text and not supplied separately. An example which authors may find useful is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distributions of learners in terms of gender

		Frequency	Valid percent
Valid	Female	138	33.5
	Male	274	66.5
	Total	412	100.0

Table 2. Frequency and percentage distributions of learners in terms of age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Valid	16–18	46	11.1	11.2
	19–21	174	42.0	42.2
	22–24	88	21.3	21.4
	25 and above	104	25.1	25.2
	Total	412	99.5	100.0

3. Development of the scale

This section describes the steps for developing the writing, speaking, listening and reading self-efficacy scale. The following phases were conducted to develop the scale.

3.1. Literature review

First, the related literature was reviewed in detail. The relationship between self-efficacy perceptions of language learners and listening, reading, writing and speaking skills were deeply examined by analysing related researches (Aydın, Sahin, Yagmur, Emre & Sali, 2017; Barut, 2015; BUyUkikiz, 2012; Erdil, 2017; Hamzadayi & Buyukikiz, 2015; Kurudayıoğlu & Gungor, 2017; Melanlıoğlu & Demiralay, 2016; Tulumcu, 2014). As a result of the research, a total of 200 scale items were created because of the fact that the number of items in the draft scale should be three or four times or more than the actual desired one (Tezbaşaran, 1996). The scale was prepared as a Likert-type scale where '5 = Strongly Agree', '4 = Agree', '3 = Undecided', '2 = Disagree', '1 = Strongly Disagree' and its range is arranged as '1,00-1,80 = Strongly Disagree', '1,81-2,60 = Disagree', '2,61-3,40 = Undecided', '3,41- 4,20 = Agree' and '4,21-5,00 = Strongly Agree' (Tekin, 1996).

3.2. Content validity (expert opinion, conformity analysis)

After developing the items, they were presented to the experts on Turkish teaching and scale development to consult their opinions. Following this process, items were finalised to 110 scale items by making necessary corrections/amendments in line with the recommendations of them (Basbay & Kagnici, 2011). The scope validity of the items in accordance with the opinions given by the experts in this process was determined by the scope validity ratio developed by Veneziano and Hooper (1997). Expressions were evaluated by the experts in terms of clarity, fluency, proper use of language, various expression styles and intelligibility criteria (Otrar & Argin, 2015).

3.3. Application phase (pre-application, pilot application, general application)

After the pilot phase, the scale was put into general practice. For this purpose, 52 students were selected according to the appropriate sampling method. The final scale was conducted on 412 students.

3.4. Validity analysis (Factor analysis, KMO Barlett value)

In order to test the validity of the scale, the opinions of the experts were benefited. At this stage, the validity study was conducted, which is known as Lawshe technique (1975). Factor analysis was performed in order to determine the content validity of the scale and to determine the factor loads of the items. Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Barlett Sphericity test were calculated to determine the appropriateness of the data before starting factor analysis. Finally, item-total, substance-residual and substance-discriminatory procedures were performed (Basbay & Kagnici, 2011; Otrar & Argin, 2015).

3.5. Reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha coefficient, Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient)

The scale developed in order to determine learners' reading, writing, speaking and listening self-efficacy is Likert-type scale. As the scores in the scale were between 1.00 and 5.00, it was accepted that the students' levels of participation in the propositions were lower as they approached 1.00 and were higher as the scores approached 5.00.

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the reliability of the Likert-type scales. Pearson Product–Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated for all items, sub-dimensions and scale (Otrar & Argin, 2015; Tekin, 1993).

4. Findings

In order to determine the sub-factors and reliability level of the instrument, the data loss was checked first. After confirming that there is no missing or incorrect data, KMO and Barlett's Test of Sphericity (BTS) tests were conducted to measure the adequacy of the sample used in the study. KMO and Bartlett values were determined in the factor analysis process, the principal components analysis was carried out and the varimax rotation was performed. The KMO test result of the instrument was 0.961. The findings of KMO and Bartlett's test are shown in Table 3.

KMO and Bartlett's Test	
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.961
BTS	Approx. Chi-Square 3.184E4
	df 5,995
	Sig. 0.000

According to Field (2002), in the KMO statistics, the values between '0.50–0.70' were regarded as moderate, the values between '0.70–0.80' as good, the values between '0.80–0.90' as very good and the values between '0.90 and above' as excellent; the sample size and data obtained in this study are appropriate and sufficient for the selected analysis (0.78). The significance of the Bartlett values ($p < 0.005$) also supports the hypothesis that the data come from the multivariate normal distribution. This value which is statistically significant as a result of Bartlett Test Sphericity analysis ($B = 3.184E4$, $p < 0.005$) indicates that the sample is sufficient for data reduction (Geçgil & Tikici, 2015). Thus, it can be said that the factor analysis of these data gives reliable results.

In order to make factor selection, Kaiser Normalisation and Varimax methods have been analysed (Field, 2002). Although the factor load value of a substance should not be less than .30, there are also theorists who argue that this magnitude should be .40 (Cokluk, Sekercioglu & Buyukozturk, 2012). In this study, in varimax rotation, the items having a factor loading of 0.40 as the lower cut-off point of the factor loadings were processed and the items with a factor load of less than 0.40 were neglected. Therefore, in the general practice, the item load below 0.40 was removed, it was determined that the 19 factors having initial values higher than 1 that emerged at the end of the analysis explained the total variance and 65, 416% of the variance together. According to Kline, this value should be higher than 40% (Akt: Ceyhan & Namlu, 2000). However, 19 factors are so high, hence analysis was repeated by constricting it to 5 factors because the items prepared were based on 4 factors. The items of A20 and A13 were removed from the structure because it has two similar loadings in two different dimensions. After this elimination was done, the last explained variance was found to be 49,444 which is higher than 30% and is acceptable.

Table 4. Total variance explained at the End of the factor analysis

Component	Total Variance Explained						Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings ^a
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	
1	41,989	38.879	38.879	41,989	38.879	38.879	33,703
2	4,217	3.904	42.783	4,217	3.904	42.783	29,596
3	2,784	2.578	45.361	2,784	2.578	45.361	28,314
4	2,530	2.342	47.703	2,530	2.342	47.703	2,714
5	1,880	1.740	49.444	1,880	1.740	49.444	19,913

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain total variance.

The variance amounts explained by the factors were 38,879% for the first factor, 3,904% for the second factor, 2,578% for the third factor, 2,342% for the fourth factor and 1,740% for the fifth factor. One factor is blank; therefore, there are actually four factors for the structure. Furthermore, it is not possible to reach very high variance rates in social sciences, and variance rates varying from 40% to 60% are accepted as sufficient (Tavsancil, 2010).

As shown in Table 5, a scale having a total of 94 items having 4 factors is shown, where the first factor has 38 items (B24-B13-B37-B11-B20-B29-B15-B22-B16-B36-B25-B14-B33-B7-B3-B34-B2-B9-B23-B35-B17-B8-B19-B28-B26-B27-B30-B21-B4-B38-B5-B10-B1-B12-B18-B31-B32-B6), the second factor consists of 21 items (C17-C1-C18-C15-C16-C4-C10-C13-C20-C9-C2-C14-C8-C12-C6-C11-C3-C5-C19-C7-C21), the third factor has 22 items (A10-A4-A2-A1-A21-A14-A11-A26-A9-A17-A3-A12-A6-A15-A7-A23-A22-A5-A16-A8-A19-A18) and the fourth factor consists of 13 items (items D19-D14-D22-D4-D15-D17-D12-D11-D24-D18-D20-D5-D1). Sub-dimensions were formed and named by examining the items in each factor. In this context, the first sub-dimension is named as the Induction sub-dimension, the second dimension is named as Hypothetical sub-dimension, third sub-dimension is named as Empirical sub-dimension and the fourth sub-dimension is named as deductive sub-dimension (see Tables 6–8).

Table 5. Sub-dimensions determined as a result of factor analysis

Factors	Number of Items	The Item Numbers
1	38	B24-B13-B37-B11-B20-B29-B15-B22-B16-B36-B25-B14-B33-B7-B3-B34-B2-B9-B23-B35-B17-B8-B19-B28-B26-B27-B30-B21-B4-B38-B5-B10-B1-B12-B18-B31-B32-B6

2	21	C17-C1-C18-C15-C16-C4-C10-C13-C20-C9-C2-C14-C8-C12-C6-C11-C3-C5-C19-C7-C21
3	22	A10-A4-A2-A1-A21-A14-A11-A26-A9-A17-A3-A12-A6-A15-A7-A23-A22-A5-A16-A8-A19-A18
4	13	D19-D14-D22-D4-D15-D17-D12-D11-D24-D18-D20-D5-D1

As a result of the reliability studies, Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient of the whole scale was determined as 983. Therefore, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the scale is acceptable because the value is very close to 1, hence the structure of the scale is rather reliable (Atakan, 2016; Yorulmaz, 2017).

4.1. Confirmatory factor analysis

The 94-item scale was applied to 412 Turkish learners from 10 Teaching Turkish Language Centres, (TOMER) in Turkey. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to test the construct validity of the original structure of the scale. In the first analysis, χ^2 / SD is less than 3, indicating that the model is in good agreement as a result of the analysis. However because the CFI and GFI values are above 0.90 and the RMSEA value is between 0.05 and 0.08, and it can be said that the compatibility of the model is not sufficient (Bugday, 2015). The following values were obtained again as follows indicating that our model is compatible with the expected values for CFA.

Table 6. Results of the last CFA of the scale

χ^2 / SD	1.423	A value of 2 or less indicates the goodness of the model.
CFI	0.945	Values greater than 0.95 indicate the model fit is very good.
GFI	0.917	The GFI values greater than 0.90 indicate that the model is a good model.
IFI	0.934	Values between 90 and 0.95 indicate that the model is acceptable.
TLI	0.925	The value between 0.90 and 0.95 indicates the acceptability of the model.
RMSEA	0.063	If it is below 08, it is an acceptable goodness value.
RMR	0.067	The value above 0.50 indicates acceptable model-data compliance.

5. Conclusion and discussion

The construct validity and reliability analyses of the scale, which was prepared to measure reading, speaking, listening, writing self-efficacy perceptions of foreign students who are learning Turkish, constitute the scope of this study. The construct validity of the scale was analysed by AFA and DFA. First of all, Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett test were used to test whether the data were suitable for factor analysis.

According to Field (2002), in the KMO statistics, the values between ‘0.50 and 0.70’ were regarded as moderate, the values between ‘0.70 and 0.80’ as good, the values between ‘0.80 and 0.90’ as very good and the values between “0.90 and above” as excellent; the sample size and data obtained in this study are appropriate and sufficient for the selected analysis (0.78). The significance of the Bartlett values ($p < 0.005$) also supports the hypothesis that the data come from the multivariate normal distribution. This value, which is statistically significant as a result of Bartlett Test Sphericity analysis ($B = 3.184E4$, $p < 0.005$), indicates that the sample is sufficient for data reduction. Thus, it can be said that the factor analysis of these data gives reliable results.

In the DFA, where the model based on the four-factor structure was tested with the data; GFI value was 0.917, CFI value was 0.945, RMSEA value was 0.063 and RMR value was 0.067. This indicates an agreement between the model and the data.

When the four-factor structure of the scale was examined, it was seen that the items in the first factor were related to the appropriate expression and grammar characteristics of speaking, the items in the second factor were related to listening comprehension, the third factor was related to the use of grammar rules in writing and the fourth factor was related to comprehension and interpretation of reading.

As a conclusion, the results of the exploratory and CFA of writing, reading, listening and speaking skill self-efficacy scale prepared for foreign students learning Turkish were acceptable. As a result of the analyses, it was determined that all items of the scale differentiate students with high levels of self-efficacy in writing, reading, listening and speaking, and students with low self-efficacy in writing, reading, listening and speaking. It is thought that this scale will be useful for researchers to study self-efficacy perceptions of writing, reading, listening and speaking skills of learners of Turkish as a foreign language.

When the items that were gathered around the first sub-dimension of the scale were examined, it was seen that self-efficacy items were collected for the questions on listening comprehension. Since listening is a collection of sounds that are perceived selectively and voluntarily, depending on the preference of the person, there is the factor of selectivity related to listening (Aktas & Gunduz 2004). In foreign language learning, as in the acquisition of mother tongue, children should first be expected to develop a sense of closeness to that language through listening (Hanbay, 2013). One of the most difficult four basic language skills in foreign language teaching is listening skill (Demirel, 2010).

When the items gathered around the second and third dimensions were examined, it was seen that they were distributed on the dimension of speaking and writing and finally on reading. Learners of the Turkish language should pay special attention to speaking, since it is a more important skill than others (Emiroglu, 2013). Speaking is one of the main indicators of the communicative competence status of a new language to be learned. One of the general aims of foreign language teaching, perhaps the most important, is that the students can clearly speak in the language they learn (Demirel, 2010). Vocabulary is the basis of the conversation. It is one of the situations that the instructors should also pay attention to enable students to use the words they have learned effectively in their daily life and academic area (Ateş & Sis, 2016). Reading, which is one of the four basic language skills, is considered as the main skill area in learning/comprehending all kinds of subjects. The real purpose of reading is to grasp texts accurately and quickly. The process of reading in Turkish as a foreign language requires the reader, on one hand, to recognize the structures such as sound, syllable, vocabulary and sentence structure, and, on the other hand, to comprehend the meaning in a text (Act. Ulper, 2011, p. 942). Thus, self-efficacy of learners in reading skills is very important for them to see what they already learnt in a text; in other words, they can comprehend language in its use. That is why we think this study will help not only future researchers but also Turkish teachers to understand their students better and act accordingly.

References

- Aktas, S. & Gunduz, O. (2004). *Yazili ve sozlu anlatim kompozisyon sanatı* (5th ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Akcag.
- Aktas, T. (2013). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde okuma becerisini geliştirmek üzere sözcük öğretimi ve örnek ders gereci geliştirme önerisi. *E-Dil Dergisi*, 1, 1–26.
- Aydin, G, Sahin, A, Yagmur, E, Emre, K & Sali, M. (2017). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin konuşma öz yeterliliklerinin belirlenmesi (Comu Tomer örneği). *Journal of Awareness*, 2(3), 549–564. doi:10.26809
- Atakan, S. S. (2016). Düzeyleyici odaklar ölçeklerinin kavramsal ve ampirik olarak incelenmesi. *Tüketici ve Tüketim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8 (1), 1–27.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman
- Bandura, A. (2002). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Bandura, A. & Locke E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87–99. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.87
- Barut, A. (2015). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen üniversite öğrencilerinin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri üzerine bir değerlendirme*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Retrieved from thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0006895.pdf
- Bugday, E. B. (2015). *Bilinçli tüketici olceği geliştirme çalışması* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aile ve Tüketici Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Ankara).
- Bulbul, F. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kavram haritalarının okuduğunu anlama becerisine etkisi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (31), 187–201.
- Buyukikiz, K. (2012). Türkçeyi ikinci dil olarak öğrenen yabancılar için yazma becerisi öz yeterlilik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(18), 69–80.
- Ceyhan, E. & Namlu, A. G. (2000). Bilgisayar kaygı ölçeği (bko): Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10 (2), 77–93.
- Cokluk, O., Sekercioglu, G. & Buyukozturk, S. (2010). *sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: spss ve lisrel uygulamaları*. Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Demirci, M. (2015). B1 Seviyesinde Türkçe öğrenen Suriyeli öğrencilerin sesli okuma becerisiyle ilgili tespitler. *Turkish Studies*, 10 (7), 333–358. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.8149
- Demirel, O. (2010). *Yabancı dil öğretimi dil pasaportu dil biyografisi dil dosyası* (5th ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Yayınları.
- Emiroglu, S. (2013). Konuşma eğitimi. In M. Durmus & A. Okur (Eds.), *Yabancılar Türkçe öğretimi el kitabı* (pp. 277–291). Ankara, Turkey: Grafiker Yayınları.
- Deniz, K. & Dasoz, T. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin yazma becerilerinde gerekçeleştirme. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, UDES 2015*, 1515–1526.
- Erdil, M. (2017). Türkçe okutmanlarının yabancı öğrencilerin Türkçe yazma becerisine karşı öznel algıları. *Turkish Studies*, 12(28), 281–306. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.12409
- Gokcebag, D. (2015). Güney Kıbrıs'ta yabancı dil olarak Türkçenin öğretiminde karşılaşılan zorluklar. *E-Dil Dergisi*, 4, 14–25.
- Gungor, H. & Kan, A. (2015). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilere yönelik yazma becerisi öz yeterlilik ölçeği geliştirme çalışması*. 8. Uluslararası Türkçenin Eğitimi-Oğretimi Kurultayı (1–3 Ekim 2015, İstanbul Üniversitesi Hasan Ali Eğitim Fakültesi), Özetler, pp. 19.
- Gregersen, T. & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 562–570. doi:10.1111/1540-4781.00161
- Hanbay, O. (2013). *Cocuklara yabancı dil öğretimi*. Ankara, Turkey: Ani Yayıncılık.
- Hamzadayi, E. & Buyukikiz, K. K. (2015). Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin konuşma öz-yeterlilik algıları ile kişilik tipleri arasındaki ilişki. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 19 (1), 297–312.
- Field, A. (2002). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Iscan, A. (2016). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde yazma kaygısı üzerine bir inceleme (Ürdün Üniversitesi örneği). *Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi*, 17, 106–120.
- Kurudayıoğlu, M, & Gungor, H. (2017). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğrenenlerin Konuşma Öz Yeterliliklerinin Çesitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitimi (Teke) Dergisi*, 6 (2), 1105–1121.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the SL. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283–305. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x
- Melanlioglu, D. (2015). Yabancı Öğrenciler için Dinleme Becerisine Yönelik Ustbilisel Dereceli Puanlama Anahtarı. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, OS-II*, 391–404.
- Melanlioglu, D. & Atalay, T. D. (2016). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin yazma öz yeterlilikleri üzerinde yaratıcı yazma uygulamalarının etkisi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 20 (3), 697–721.

- Otrar, M. & Argin F.S. (2015). Ogrencilerin sosyal medyaya ilişkin tutumlarını belirlemeye yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4 (1), 391–403.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-Efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research* 66 (4), 543–578. doi:10.3102/00346543066004543
- Savas, S. (2015). Yabancılara Türkçe öğretiminde karşılaşılan okuma ve telaffuz zorlukları. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, UDES 2015*, 2379–2386.
- Sallabas, M. E. (2013). Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin konuşma öz yeterliliklerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 16 (2), 269–290.
- Soyseker, G. (2013). Dil-kültür bağintisi ve Avrupa ortak başvuru metni bağlamında yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde okuma becerisini geliştirmeye yönelik gereç hazırlama. *E-Dil Dergisi*, 1, 36–50.
- Schunk, D. H. & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23, 7–25. doi:10.1080/10573560600837578
- Sen, U. & Boylu, E. (2015). Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen İranli öğrencilerin konuşma kaygılarının değerlendirilmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (30), 13–25.
- Tavsancıl, E. (2010). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Tekin, H. (1993). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme*. Ankara, Turkey: Yargı.
- Tezbasaran, A. A. (1996). *Likert tipi ölçek geliştirme kılavuzu*. Ankara, Turkey: TPD Yayınları
- Tulumcu, F. M. (2014). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin anlama becerilerine yönelik öz yeterlilikleri* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Sakarya).
- Turgut, M. F. (1997). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme metotları*. Ankara, Turkey: Gul Yayınevi.
- Tuncel, H. (2015). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Konuşma Kaygısının Cesitli Degiskenler Acısından İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (2), 107–135.
- Unveren, D. (2017). Çevrimici öğrenme ortamlarında Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi. In H. Ulper (Ed.), 9. *Uluslararası Türkçenin Eğitimi ve Öğretimi Kurultayı Bildirileri* (pp. 128–141). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem.
- Veneziano, L. & Hooper, J. (1997). A method for quantifying content validity of health-related questionnaires. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 21(1), 67–70. doi:10.17556/erziefd.297741
- Yorulmaz, O. (2017). The relationship between socio-economic development, corruption and health indicators: application of partial least squares structural equation modeling. *Alphanumeric Journal*, 5(2), 191–206. doi:10.17093/alphanumeric.323277

Appendix

A.1. *The scale of writing, speaking, listening, reading self-efficacy for learners of Turkish as a foreign language (Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenler için yazma, konuşma, dinleme ve okuma öz yeterlilik ölçeği)*

A- KONUŞMA-SPEAKING		Kesinlikle Katılıyorum Absolutely I agree	Katılıyorum I Agree	Kararsızım Undecided	Katılmıyorum I do not agree	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum I strongly disagree
1	Türkçe konuşmaya başlarken uygun ifadeler kullanabilirim.					
	I can use appropriate expressions when starting to speak Turkish.					
2	Türkçe konuşurken kullandığım kelimeleri doğru olarak söyleyebilirim.					
	I can correctly say the words I use when I speak Turkish.					

3	Turkce konuŖurken dil bilgisi kurallarına uygun cümleler oluşturabilirim.					
	I can create sentences according to grammar rules while speaking Turkish.					
4	Anadili Turkce olan bir kisiyle kolaylıkla konusabilirim.					
	I can speak easily with a native Turkish speaker.					
5	Hazirliksiz konusmalarda uygun ifadeler kullanabilirim.					
	I can use appropriate expressions in prompt speeches.					
6	Anlasilmasi zor metinleri anlayip karsimdakine aktarabilirim.					
	I can understand complicated texts and convey them easily.					
7	Bilgi sahibi oldugum konulardaki konusmalara katilabilirim.					
	I can participate in the conversations on the topics I have knowledge.					
8	Dusuncelerimi konudan sapmadan aktarabilirim.					
	I can tell my thoughts without deviating from the subject.					
9	Duygularımı ve hayallerimi dogru sekilde ifade edebilirim.					
	I can express my feelings properly.					
10	Uygun bir plan dogrultusunda konuŖmaya baslayabilirim ve konusmayı bitirebilirim					
	I can start and finish a conversation in accordance with an appropriate plan					
11	Konusmanın konusuna uygun orneklerden yararlanabilirim.					
	I can use the examples appropriate to the subject of a conversation.					
12	Verilen bir konu hakkında konusma yapabilirim.					
	I can talk about a given topic.					
13	Turkceyi akici konusabilirim.					
	I can speak fluently in Turkish.					

14	Dusuncelerimi kesin bir dille ifade edebilirim. I can express my thoughts clearly.					
15	Konusma esnasında atasozu, deyim vb. mecazlari kullanabilirim. I can use proverbs, idioms and metaphors during the conversation.					
16	Konusma esnasında baglama uygun kelimeler secebilirim. I can choose appropriate words depending on a context during a conversation.					
17	Konusma esnasında yeni ogrendigim kelimeleri kullanabilirim. I can use the words I just learned during a conversation.					
18	Izledigim/dinledigim/okuduğum bir konu hakkında konuşabilirim. I can talk about a topic I've watched/listened/read					
19	Sınıf ortamında kendimi Turkce ifade edebilirim. I can express myself in class in Turkish.					
20	Turkce konusurken vurgu ve tonlamalara dikkat edebilirim. I can pay attention to stress and intonation while speaking Turkish.					
21	Turkce konuşma sinavında kendimi rahatlıkla ifade edebilirim. I can express myself easily in a speaking exam.					
22	Topluluk karsisinda kendimi Turkce rahatlıkla ifade edebilirim. I can express myself easily in Turkish in front of public					
B-DİNLEME-LISTENING						
23	Dinlediklerime yogunlasabilirim. I can focus on what I listen to.					
24	Turkce izledigim bir filmi/diziyi vb. altyazi olmadan anlayabilirim.					

	I can understand a movie/series without subtitle.					
25	Dinledigim bir metinde her bir kelimenin anlamını bilmesem de metnin konusunu anlayabilirim.					
	I can comprehend what I listen even though I do not know the meaning of each word.					
26	Ana dili Turkce olan biri ile konusurken onu rahatlikla anlayabilirim.					
	I can easily understand a native Turkish speaker					
27	Dinledigim zor ve karisik metinleri anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand difficult and complicated texts that I listen.					
28	Sınıfta ogretmenin Turkce sordugu sorulari anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand Turkish questions that a teacher asks in class.					
29	Etrafta gurultu bile olsa birebir konusmalari anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand one-to-one conversations even in a noisy environment					
30	Konusmacının yuzunu gormesem de dinlediklerimi anlayabilirim.					
	Although I do not see the face of the speaker, I can understand s/he says					
31	Turkçe telefon konusmalarını anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand Turkish phone conversations					
32	Sessiz bir ortamda birebir Turkce konusmalari anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand one-to-one Turkish speaking in a quiet environment.					
33	Turkce radyo programlarini anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand Turkish radio programs.					
34	Turkce sorulan kısa sorulara cevap verebilirim.					

	I can answer short questions which are asked in Turkish.					
35	Turkce sarkilari anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand Turkish songs.					
36	Turkce konusan biriyle tanistigimda soylediklerini eksiksiz anlayabilirim.					
	When I meet someone who speaks Turkish, I can fully understand what they say.					
37	Dinledigim Turkce metinlerde genel olarak neden bahsedildigini anlayabilirim					
	I can understand the general idea of Turkish texts that I listen.					
38	Turkce metinleri ilk dinlemede anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand Turkish texts at first hearing					
39	Dinleme etkinliklerinde es anlamlı ve zıt anlamlı kelimeleri ayirt edebilirim.					
	I can distinguish between synonyms and antonyms in listening activities.					
40	Dinledigim bir cümlenin ogelerini ayirt edebilirim.					
	I can distinguish the elements of a sentence that I listen to.					
41	Dinledigim cümlelerde sozcuk turlerini(isim, sifata, zarf, edat vb.) anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand the word types (name, adjective, adverb, preposition etc.) in the sentences I listen to.					
42	Dinlediklerimde gercek ve mecaz anlamlı kelimeleri anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand real words and figurative expressions when I listen.					
43	Dinlerken sestese (es sesli) kelimeleri ayirt edebilirim.					
	I can distinguish homonyms during listening.					
44	Turkce dinlerken kacirdigim kisimlari tahmin edebilirim.					
	I can imagine the parts I missed during listening					

45	Turkce konusan birinin ses tonuna ve vurgusuna gore dinlediklerimin anlamını cikarabilirim.					
	I can understand a Turkish speaker depending on his/her tone and stress					
46	Dusunme suresinin az oldugu dinleme etkinliklerinin sorularını cevaplayabilirim.					
	I can answer the questions of listening activities which has little listening time					
47	Dinlediklerim ile ilgili sorular sorabilirim.					
	I can ask questions about what I have listened.					
48	Dinleme esnasında, onceden bildiklerimden yararlanabilirim.					
	During listening, I can benefit from existing knowledge					
49	Dinledigim metnin sonunu kendim kurgulayabilirim.					
	I can create an end for a text that I listen					
50	Dinlediklerimde one cikan ve onemli olan fikirleri fark edebilirim.					
	I can recognize prominent and important ideas in a text that I listen					
51	Dinlediklerimi ayrıntılı bir biçimde degerlendirebilirim.					
	I can evaluate in detail what I listen to.					
52	Dinlediklerimde olayın gectigi yeri ve zamani tespit edebilirim.					
	I can identify time and place of event that I listen					
53	Dinlediklerimde anlamını bilmedigim kelimeleri bağlamdan cikarabilirim.					
	I can infer meanings of words from context during listening					
54	Dinledigim konu ile ilgili soru sorabilirim.					
	I can ask a question about what I have listened.					
55	Dinlediklerimi zihnimde kurgulayabilirim.					

	I can image what I listen to					
56	Dinlediklerimde seslendirme hatalarını fark edebilirim.					
	I can notice over mistake when I listen.					
57	Dinlediklerimde bilgi yanlisi varsa bunu fark edebilirim.					
	I can notice wrong information if there is in a text that listen					
58	Dinlediklerimi metnin planına göre özetleyebilirim.					
	I can summarize what I listen to according to the plan of a text.					
59	Dinlediklerimde önemli gördüğüm noktaları not edebilirim.					
	I can take note important things during listening					
60	Temel bilgileri yansıtan sesli mesaj, duyuru ve uyarı gibi metinleri anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand texts such as voice messages, announcements and warnings that contains basic information.					
C-YAZMA-WRITING						
61	Türkçe planlı bir paragraf ya da kompozisyon yazabilirim					
	I can write a planned paragraph or composition in Turkish.					
62	Türkçe bir kompozisyon yazarken dilbilgisi kurallarını doğru bir şekilde kullanabilirim					
	I can use grammatical rules correctly when I write a composition in Turkish.					
63	Türkçe metinleri yazım kurallarına uygun bir şekilde kullanabilirim					
	I can use Turkish texts in accordance with spelling rules					
64	Türkçe metin yazarken açık ve anlaşılır bir dil kullanabilirim.					
	I can use a clear and understandable language when I write Turkish texts.					
65	Türkçe yazarken belirli konulara vurgu yaparak metinler oluşturabilirim.					
	I can write texts with an emphasis on certain subjects					

66	Turkce bir metni kendi cümlelerim ile yeniden yazabilirim.					
	I can rewrite a Turkish text with my own sentences.					
67	Dilekce, başvuru formu vs gibi günlük metinleri yazabilirim.					
	I can write daily texts such as petition, application form etc					
68	Yazı yazarken ekleri doğru ve yerinde kullanabilirim					
	I can use prefixes and suffixes when I write a text					
69	Ana fikri destekleyen ve geliştiren paragraflar oluşturabilirim.					
	I can create paragraphs that support and develop the main idea.					
70	Bir plan doğrultusunda metin yazabilirim.					
	I can write a text according to plan.					
71	Bir yazıda konunun dışına çıkmadan düşüncelerimi ifade edebilirim.					
	I can express my thoughts without leaving the subject in an article					
72	Yazıma uygun başlık bulabilirim.					
	I can find a title for my writing					
73	Bildiğim bir konuda bir yazı yazabilirim					
	I can write about something I know.					
74	Duygu ve düşüncelerimi ifade eden yazılar yazabilirim					
	I can write articles expressing my feelings and thoughts					
75	Bir yazı yazarken fikirlerimi destekleyecek örnekler verebilirim					
	I can give examples to support my ideas when writing an article					
76	Hayallerimi anlatan yazılar yazabilirim					
	I can write articles about my dreams.					
77	Yazıma uygun bir girişle başlayabilirim					

	I can start my writing with a proper introduction.					
78	Yazimi uygun bir sonucla bitirebilirim.					
	I can finish my writing with a proper conclusion					
79	Kendimi tanıtın bir yazı yazabilirim					
	I can write about myself.					
80	Ailemi anlatan bir yazı yazabilirim					
	I can write an article that describes my family.					
81	Türkçe uygun bir üslupla akademik yazı yazabilirim					
	I can write in an appropriate academic manner in Turkish					
D-OKUMA-READING						
82	Türkçe okuma parçalarını okudumda anlayabilirim					
	I can understand Turkish reading texts while I am reading					
83	Okudum Türkçe metinlerin ana fikrini belirleyebilirim.					
	I can determine the main idea of the Turkish texts I read.					
84	Okudum şiirlerin ana duygusunu çıkarabilirim.					
	I can make the main sense of the poems I read.					
85	Okudum metinlerin içeriği hakkındaki düşüncelerimi belirtebilirim					
	I can express my thoughts on the content of the texts I read					
86	Okudum metinlerin yazarları hakkındaki düşüncelerimi belirtebilirim.					
	I can express my thoughts on the authors of the texts I read					
87	Okudum metinlerde sebep sonuç ilişkisini belirleyebilirim.					
	I can determine the cause and effect relation in the texts I read.					
88	Okuduklarımda deyimlerin anlamlarını belirleyebilirim.					
	I can determine the meanings of idioms in reading.					

89	Okudugum metinlerdeki zıt anlamlı kelimeleri belirleyebilirim. I can identify antonyms in reading texts.					
90	Okudugum metinlerde es anlamlı kelimeleri belirleyebilirim I can identify synonyms in the texts I read					
91	Okudugum metinlerde sonuc bildiren ifadeleri (sonuc olarak, ozetle, kısaca) tespit edebilirim. I can determine the statements that give conclusions in the texts when I read (finally, in summary, briefly)					
92	Turkce metinleri onem belirten ifadeleri dikkate alarak okurum. I read Turkish texts by taking into account the expressions that indicate importance					
93	Turkce metinleri Ozel yargi belirten ifadeleri (ozellikle, ozel olarak) dikkate alarak okurum. I read Turkish texts taking into consideration the expressions that indicate personal judgment (especially, specially)					
94	Okudugum kısa mesaj, uyari, tabela gibi bilgilendirici metinleri anlayabilirim I can understand informative texts such as texts, warning, signage					