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

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; Soysekerci, 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 (Aytan & Tuncel, 2015; BUyUkikiz, 2012; Gungör & Kan, 2015; Melanlioglu & Atalay 2016), on speaking skills self-efficacy (Melanlioglu & 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 (Aytan & Tuncel, 2005; Iscan, 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 *p*ercentage *d*istributions of *l*earners i-n *t*erms of *a*ge

		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; Kurudayıoglu & Gungor, 2017; Melanlioglu & Demiratalay, 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.

Table 3. KMO and Bartlett's Test

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

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings[a]
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
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 Emprical 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). Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogretiminde okuma becerisini gelistirmek uzere sozcuk ogretimi ve ornek ders gereci gelistirme onerisi. *E-Dil Dergisi, 1*, 1–26.

Aydin, G, Sahin, A, Yagmur, E, Emre, K & Sali, M. (2017). Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogrenenlerin konusma oz yeterliliklerinin belirlenmesi (Comu Tomer ornegi). *Journal of Awareness, 2*(3), 549–564. doi:10.26809

Atakan, S. S. (2016). Duzenleyici odaklar olceklerinin kavramsal ve ampirik olarak incelenmesi. *Tuketici ve Tuketim Arastirmalari 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.

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

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). *Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogrenen universite ogrencilerinin kullandıkları dil ogrenme stratejileri uzerine bir degerlendirme*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Retrieved from thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0006895.pdf

Bugday, E. B. (2015). *Bilincli tuketici olcegi gelistirme calismasi* (Yayimlanmamis Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitisu, Aile ve Tuketici Bilimleri Anabilim Dali, Ankara).

Bulbul, F. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Turkce ogretiminde kavram haritalarının okudugunu anlama becerisine etkisi. *Mustafa Kemal Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi, 12* (31), 187–201.

Buyukikiz, K. (2012). Turkceyi ikinci dil olarak ogrenen yabancilar icin yazma becerisi oz yeterlilik olceginin gelistirilmesi: gecerlilik ve guvenilirlik calismasi. *Mustafa Kemal Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi, 9*(18), 69–80.

Ceyhan, E. & Namlu, A. G. (2000). Bilgisayar kaygı olcegi (bko): Gecerlik ve guvenirlik Calismasi. *Anadolu Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 10* (2), 77–93.

Cokluk, O., Sekercioglu, G. & Buyukozturk, S. (2010). *sosyal bilimler icin cok degiskenli istatistik: spss ve lisrel uygulamaları.* Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.

Demirci, M. (2015). B1 Seviyesinde Turkce ogrenen suriyeli ogrencilerin sesli okuma becerisiyle ilgili tespitler. *Turkish Studies, 10* (7), 333–358. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.8149

Demirel, O. (2010*). Yabancı dil ogretimi dil pasaportu dil biyografisi dil dosyasi* (5th ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Yayınları.

Emiroglu, S. (2013). Konusma egitimi. In M. Durmus & A. Okur (Eds.), *Yabancılara Turkce ogretimi el kitabı* (pp. 277–291). Ankara, Turkey: Grafiker Yayinlari.

Deniz, K. & Dasoz, T. (2015). Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogrenenlerin yazma becerilerinde gerekçelendirme. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, *UDES 2015*, 1515–1526.

Erdil, M. (2017). Turkce okutmanlarının yabanci ogrencilerin turkce yazma becerisine karsi oznel algilari. *Turkish Studies, 12*(28), 281–306. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.12409

Gokcebag, D. (2015). Guney Kibrıs'ta yabanci dil olarak Turkçenin ogretiminde karsilasilan zorluklar. *E-Dil Dergisi, 4*, 14–25.

Gungor, H. & Kan, A. (2015). *Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogrenen ogrencilere yonelik yazma becerisi ozyeterlik olcegi gelistirme calismasi*. 8. Uluslararası Turkcenin Egitimi-Ogretimi Kurultayi (1–3 Ekim 2015, Istanbul Universitesi Hasan Ali Egitim Fakultesi), Ozetler, 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 ogretimi.* Ankara, Turkey: Ani Yayincilik.

Hamzadayi, E. & Buyukikiz, K. K. (2015). Turkce ogrenen yabanci ogrencilerin konusma becerisi oz-yeterlik algilari ile kisilik tipleri arasındaki iliski. *Turkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 19* (1), 297–312.

Field, A. (2002). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Iscan, A. (2016). Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogretiminde yazma kaygisi uzerine bir inceleme (Urdun Universitesi ornegi). *Dil ve Edebiyat Egitimi Dergisi, 17*, 106–120.

Kurudayioglu, M, & Gungor, H. (2017). Yabanci Dil Olarak Turkce Ogrenenlerin Konusma Oz Yeterliklerinin Cesitli Degiskenler Acısindan Incelenmesi. *Uluslararasi Turkce Edebiyat Kultur Egitim (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). Yabanci Ogreniciler icin Dinleme Becerisine Yonelik Ustbilissel Dereceli Puanlama Anahtarı. *Erzincan Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusü Dergisi*, *OS-II*, 391–404.

Melanlıoglu, D. & Atalay, T. D. (2016). Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogrenenlerin yazma oz yeterlikleri uzerinde yaratici yazma uygulamalarinin etkisi. *Turkiye Sosyal Arastırmalar Dergisi*, *20* (3), 697–721.

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

Otrar, M. & Argin F.S. (2015). Ogrencilerin sosyal medyaya ilişkin tutumlarını belirlemeye yonelik bir olcek gelistirme calismasi. *Egitim ve Ogretim Arastirmalari 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). Yabancilara Turkce ogretiminde karsilasilan okuma ve telaffuz zorluklari*. International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, UDES 2015*, 2379–2386.

Sallabas, M. E. (2013). Turkceyi Yabancı dil olarak ogrenenlerin konusma oz yeterliliklerinin degerlendirilmesi. *TUrkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 16* (2), 269–290.

Soysekerci, G. (2013). Dil-kultur bagintisi ve avrupa ortak basvuru metni baglamında yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogretiminde okuma becerisini gelistirmeye yonelik gerec hazirlama. *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). Turkceyi yabanci dil olarak ogrenen iranli ogrencilerin konusma kaygilarinin degerlendirilmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi, 12* (30), 13–25.

Tavsancil, E. (2010). *Tutumlarin olculmesi ve spss ile veri analizi*. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Yayın Dagıtim.

Tekin, H. (1993). *Egitimde olcme ve degerlendirme.* Ankara, turkey: Yargi.

Tezbasaran, A. A. (1996). *Likert tipi olcek gelistirme kilavuzu.* Ankara, Turkey: TPD Yayinlari

Tulumcu, F. M. (2014). *Yabanci dil olarak Turkce ogrenenlerin anlama becerilerine yönelik öz yeterlilikleri* (Yayımlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Universitesi, Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu, Turkce Egitimi Anabilim Dali, Sakarya).

Turgut, M. F. (1997). *Egitimde olcme ve degerlendirme metotlari.* Ankara, Turkey: Gul Yayinevi.

Tuncel, H. (2015). Yabancı Dil Olarak Turkce Konusma Kaygisinin Cesitli Degiskenler Acisindan Incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Universitesi Yabancı Dil Olarak Turkce Arastirmalari Dergisi,* (2), 107–135.

Unveren, D. (2017). Cevrimici ogrenme ortamlarinda Turkcenin yabanci dil olarak ogretimi. In H. Ulper (Ed.), *9. Uluslararası Turkcenin Egitimi ve Ogretimi Kurultayi 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 (Turkceyi yabanci dil olarak ogrenenler icin yazma, konusma, dinleme ve okuma ozyeterlilik olcegi)

A- KONUŞMA-SPEAKING		Kesinlikle Katılıyorum Absolutely I agree	Katılıyorum I Agree	Kararsızım Undecided	Katılmıyorum I do not agree	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum I strongly disagree
1	Turkce konusmaya baslarken uygun ifadeler kullanabilirim.					
	I can use appropriate expressions when starting to speak Turkish.					
2	Turkce konusurken kullandigim kelimeleri dogru olarak soyleyebilirim.					
	I can correctly say the words I use when I speak Turkish.					

3	Turkce konuşurken dil bilgisi kurallarına uygun cumleler oluşturabilirim.					
	I can create sentences according to grammar rules while speaking Turkish.					
4	Anadili Turkce olan bir kisiyle kolaylikla 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 katılabilirim.					
	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 konuşmaya baslayabilirim ve konusmayi 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 hakkinda 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 esnasinda baglama uygun kelimeler secebilirim.					
	I can choose appropriate words depending on a context during a conversation.					
17	Konusma esnasinda 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 sinavinda 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	Konuşmacının 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 tanistigımda 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 anlamli ve zit anlamli kelimeleri ayirt edebilirim.					
	I can distinguish between synonyms and antonyms in listening activities.					
40	Dinledigim bir cümlenin ogelerini ayırt edebilirim.					
	I can distinguish the elements of a sentence that I listen to.					
41	Dinledigim cümlelerde sozcuk turlerini(isim, sifat, 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 anlamli kelimeleri anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand real words and figurative expressions when I listen.					
43	Dinlerken sestes (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 esnasinda, 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 ayrintili bir bicimde degerlendirebilirim.					
	I can evaluate in detail what I listen to.					
52	Dinlediklerimde olayin gectigi yeri ve zamani tespit edebilirim.					
	I can identify time and place of event that I listen					
53	Dinlediklerimde anlamını bilmedigim kelimeleri baglamdan 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 gore ozetleyebilirim.					
	I can summarize what I listen to according to the plan of a text.					
59	Dinlediklerimde onemli gordugum noktalari not edebilirim.					
	I can take note important things during listening					
60	Temel bilgileri yansıtan sesli mesaj, duyuru ve uyari gibi metinleri anlayabilirim.					
	I can understand texts such as voice messages, announcements and warnings that contains basic information.					
C-YAZMA-WRITING						
61	Turkce planli bir paragraf ya da kompozisyon yazabilirim					
	I can write a planned paragraph or composition in Turkish.					
62	Turkce bir kompozisyon yazarken dilbilgisi kurallarini dogru bir sekilde kullanabilirim					
	I can use grammmatical rules correctly when I write a composition in Turkish.					
63	Turkce metinleri yazim kurallarına uygun bir sekilde kullanabilirim					
	I can use Turkish texts in accordance with spelling rules					
64	Turkçe metin yazarken acik ve anlasilir bir dil kullanabilirim.					
	I can use a clear and understandable language when I write Turkish texts.					
65	Turkce yazarken belirli konulara vurgu yaparak metinler olusturabilirim.					
	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 gunluk 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 gelistiren paragraflar olusturabilirim.					
	I can create paragraphs that support and develop the main idea.					
70	Bir plan dogrultusunda metin yazabilirim.					
	I can write a text according to plan.					
71	Bir yazida konunun disina cikmadan dusuncelerimi ifade edebilirim.					
	I can express my thoughts without leaving the subject In an article					
72	Yazima uygun baslik bulabilirim.					
	I can find a title for my writing					
73	Bildigim bir konuda bir yazı yazabilirim					
	I can write about something I know.					
74	Duygu ve dusuncelerimi ifade eden yazılar yazabilirim					
	I can write articles expressing my feelings and thoughts					
75	Bir yazı yazarken fikirlerimi destekleyecek ornekler 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	Yazima uygun bir girisle baslayabilirim					

	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 tanıtan bir yazi yazabilirim					
	I can write about myself.					
80	Ailemi anlatan bir yazi yazabailirim					
	I can write an article that describes my family.					
81	Turkce uygun bir uslupla akademik yazi yazabilirim					
	I can write in an appropriate academic manner in Turkish					
D-OKUMA-READING						
82	Turkce okuma parcalarini okudugumda anlayabilirim					
	I can understand Turkish reading texts while I am reading					
83	Okudugum Turkce metinlerin ana fikrini belirleyebilirim.					
	I can determine the main idea of the Turkish texts I read.					
84	Okudugum siirlerin ana duygusunu cikarabilirim.					
	I can make the main sense of the poems I read.					
85	Okudugum metinlerin icerigi hakkındaki disuncelerimi belirtebilirim					
	I can express my thoughts on the content of the texts I read					
86	Okudugum metinlerin yazarlari hakkındaki dusuncelerimi belirtebilirim.					
	I can express my thoughts on the authors of the texts I read					
87	Okudugum metinlerde sebep sonuç ilişkisini belirleyebilirim.					
	I can determine the cause and effect relation in the texts I read.					
88	Okuduklarımda deyimlerin anlamlarini 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 anlamli kelimeleri belirleyebilirim					
	I can identify synonyms in the texts I read					
91	Okudugum metinlerde sonuc bildiren ifadeleri (sonuc olarak, ozetle, kisaca) 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 expessions 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					