REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇANAKKALE ONSEKIZ MART UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMME

THE CRITICAL THINKING DISPOSITIONS OF PREPARATORY STUDENTS AND

ITS ROLE ON IMPROVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMPETENCE

MUHAMMED KÖK

(MASTER'S THESIS)

ÇANAKKALE

JUNE, 2020

Republic Of Turkey

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

Institute Of Graduate Education

Department Of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Programme

The Critical Thinking Dispositions Of Preparatory Students and

Its Role On Improving English Language Competence

Muhammed KÖK

(MASTER'S THESIS)

Supervisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sercan UZTOSUN

Çanakkale

June, 2020

Taahhütname

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum "The Critical Thinking Dispositions Of Preparatory Students and İts Role On İmproving English Language Competence" adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve değerlere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yaparak yararlanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

22/ 06 /2020

Muhammed KÖK

Acknowledgement

i

Abstract

The Critical Thinking Dispositions Of Preparatory Students' And Its Role On

Improving English Language Competence

Language development is a complex issue which can be influenced by various factors. In the literature, it is believed that critical thinking may be one of these factors. To address this assumption, this study has been carried out to explore possible relationship between the critical thinking disposition and English language competence. It investigates the critical thinking dispositions of preparatory students studying in a state university (N=87) and its relationship with some variances such as perceived language competence, and competences in different language skills (i.e. reading, writing, listening, speaking). The participants were 40 ELT and 45 ELL preparatory students studying in the fall term of 2019-2020 academic year. The total number of the participants was 87. Thirty-eight of them were male whereas 49 were female participants. The scale, "Emotional Intelligence Critical Thinking Disposition (EMI)" inventory developed by Ricketts and Ruds (2005) and translated into Turkish by Demircioğlu (2012), was utilized as a data collection tool. It is a 5 point scale with three sub-sections, namely engagement, cognitive maturity and innovativeness. The data were analyzed via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Mann-Whitney U and Spearman analyses were carried out. Results showed that the participants had moderate levels of critical thinking disposition levels. The critical thinking disposition levels of participants did not reveal any correlation with English language competence and perceived English competence. Moreover, it was found that perceived reading, writing and pronunciation had low correlation with engagement and innovativeness. These findings suggest that there may not be relationships between CT, language competence and perceived language competence.

Key words: critical thinking, disposition, language exams, language competence

Özet

Hazırlık Öğrencilerinin Eleştirel Düşünce Eğilimleri Ve Bunun İngilizce Dil Yeterliliğini Geliştirmedeki Rolü

Dil gelişimi çeşitli faktörler tarafından etkilenen karmaşık bir konudur. Alanyazında eleştirel düşünmenin bu faktörlerden biri olabileceğine inanılmaktadır. Bu varsayıma hitap ederek, bu çalışma, eleştirel düşünme eğilimi ve İngilizce dil yeterliği arasındaki olası ilişkiyi ortaya çıkarmak için yapılmıştır. Çalışma, bir devlet üniversitesinde öğrenim gören hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin (*N*=87) eleştirel düşünme eğilimlerini ve bunun algılanan dil yeterliği ve farklı dil becerileri yeterliliği (okuma, yazma, dinleme, konuşma) gibi bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisini araştırmaktadır. Katılımcılar, 2019-2020 akademik yılı güz döneminde eğitim gören 40 İngilizce Öğretmenliği ve 45 İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı hazırlık sınıfı öğrencileridir. Katılımcılarım toplam sayısı 87 idi. Katılımcıların 49'u kadın, 38'i erkekti. Ricketts and Ruds (2005) tarafından geliştirilen ve Demircioğlu (2012) tarafından Türkçeye çevirilen " Duygusal Zeka Eleştirel Düşünme Eğilim Envanteri" ölçeği veri toplama aleti olarak kullanılmıştır. Envanter, 5'li Likert ölçeğe ve 3 alt faktöre yani öngörü, bilişsel olgunluk ve yenilikçiliğe sahiptir. Veriler Sosyal Bilimler için İstatistik Paketi (SPSS) 21. versiyon ile analiz edilmiştir. Mann-Whitney U and Spearman analizleri yapılmıştır. Bulgular, katılımcıların orta seviyede eleştirel düşünme eğilimine sahip olduklarını göstermiştir. Katılımcıların eleştirel düşünme eğilimleri, İngilizce dil yeterliği ve algılanan İngilizce yeterliğiyle ilişki göstermemiştir. Dahası, algılanan okuma, yazma ve telaffuz öngörü ve yenilikçilik alt faktörleriyle düşük ilişkiye sahip oldukları saptanmıştır. Bu bulgular, eleştirel düşünme, dil yeterliği ve algılanan dil yeterliği arasında ilişki olmadığını göstermiştir. Bu çalışmada, eleştirel düşünme ve dil arasındaki ilişki sorgulanabilir bulunmuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Eleştirel düşünme, eğilim, dil sınavları, dil yeterliği

Dedication

This thesis

is dedicated to

Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı ERTEN

who passed away soon before this thesis was published.

He was a precious academic from our field and university,

who helped many academics and teachers grow all around Turkey.

His contributions to our field with several academic books, and articles are beyond measure.

Bu tez,

yayımlanmadan kısa süre önce vefat eden

Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı ERTEN'e

ithaf edilmiştir.

Erten, tüm Türkiye'de akademisyenlerin ve öğretmenlerin yetişmesine yardımda bulunmuş

alanımızdan ve üniversitemizden değerli bir akademisyendi. Birçok akademik kitapları ve

makaleleriyle alanımıza katkısı sayısızdır.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

List of Abbreviations

CT	Critical Thinking
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELL	English Language Literature
ELT	English Language Teaching
FL	Foreign Language
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences

"All humans think. It is our nature to do so. But much of our thinking, left to itself, is biased, distorted, partial, uninformed, or down-right prejudiced. Critical thinking begins, when we start thinking about our thinking with a view toward improving it" (Paul & Elder, 2002, p.6).

Chapter One

Introduction

Introduction

This chapter displays the review of the background of the study by referring to the significance of the study with reference to the research questions. Then, it draws attention to the assumptions and limitations of the study so as to give the general overview of the study.

Background of the Study

CT has been a trend topic in the education field for the last two decades (Altıntaş, 2019; Bür, 2014) and it has caught the interest of many researchers lately since it is seen as a major way of preparing individuals for life. Therefore, in the 21st century, improving students' CT is regarded as one of the most important aims of education (Serin, 2013; Willingham, 2007).

There is no doubt that although CT seems to be a trend topic in the educational arena in these days, its roots go back to Socrates, Plato, and Dewey. Socrates was the first pioneer who emphasized the importance of reasoning, logicality and clarity on any thinking. The journey that began with the Socratic questioning method still holds importance in today's world. Though its roots date back to 2,500 years ago, it is still questionable what factors exactly constitute CT.

In the literature, there are two perspectives of CT: dispositional and skill profile of CT. The dispositional profile is associated with the inclination or tendency of an individual towards being a critical thinker. This is also called as a characteristic trait that is often brought from birth. It is assumed that if an individual has an inquiry spirit, s/he is attributed to be dispositional towards CT (Facione & Facione, 1992; Facione et al., 2000). On the other hand, the skill profile of CT is related to higher order skills or metacognitive skills (Choy & Cheah, 2009). This profile emphasizes that if an individual is able to use the metacognitive skills such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation stages included in Bloom's taxonomy (1956), s/he may benefit from CT through the skill profile of CT.

These two different conceptualizations regarding CT made researchers vary their descriptions and led to several definitions. For instance, some researchers (e.g. Ennis, 1987; Facione, 1990) approach CT from a dispositional profile and perceive critical thinkers as the ones who look for clear reasons and statements, and the ones who have an inquiry spirit which are curious of other alternatives and perspectives and analytic minds which like reasoning on any topic. Altıntaş (2019) states that dispositional profile of CT is generally attributed to include factors such as "truth-seeking, inquisitiveness, open-mindedness, confidence, analyticity, systematicity, and maturity" (p. 31). These are the indicators of an inclined critical thinker. On the other hand, some other researchers (e.g. Harpern, 2010; Paul, 1993) consider CT as a skill and describe it as a set of metacognitive strategies that are often used purposefully, systematically, disciplinedly. Skill profile regards CT as a way of strengthening the weak thoughts or thinking by using a set of intellectual standards. Therefore, the last three stages of Bloom's taxonomy namely, analysis, synthesis and evaluation is often attributed to contribute the development of CT.

The conceptualizations mentioned above might sound different from each other. Therefore, these two perspectives contributed differently to the concept of CT. Both aspects of

CT should be reciprocally integrated, emphasized and reinforced (King & Kitchener, 1995). Thus, there is no need to debate whichever profile of CT is most necessary to have and cultivate since they cannot be thought as two separate profiles.

The idea of applying CT in all disciplines have been argued and accepted as a necessity of 21st century skill (Bür, 2014; Gündüz, 2017). This has also accepted as one of the necessary outcomes of today's education. Students require learning CT skills, therefore, what we as teachers need to do is to foster their minds by letting them criticize what they learnt and evaluate their ideas, biases and thoughts and see alternatives (Fisher & Scriven, 1997). For this reason, rather than 'what to think', 'how to think' should be emphasized in classrooms. Only education leads to more conscious, accurate, logical and intellectual thinking (Paul & Elder, 2002). These reasons and justifications have helped CT take a place in the educational arena. Thus, today's education requires individuals to have intellectual and rational minds that direct his/her own thinking process.

An ideal critical thinker is the one who identifies the central argument or problems, ask questions, see alternatives and make logical and reasonable deductions based on his/her objective evaluations (Ennis, 1987). Taking into account the features of a critical thinker and the dimensions of CT, it has been thought that CT might have an impact on the language development.

Naturally, the popularity and necessity of CT in the educational arena have also taken its place in the language classrooms and the debates still carry on regarding the role of CT on foreign language development. For years, foreign language learning and its correlation with some variances such as age, gender, attitude, learning strategies have been investigated by several studies. Lately, the impact and role of CT on language learning has been investigated since it is thought that language and thinking are intertwined.

By using discussions, thought and curiosity evoking questions and problem solving based instructions and tasks, CT has been integrated in language classrooms (Devine, 1962). Though there are still arguments to what extent CT might have an influence on language development, there are several studies (e.g. Bardakçı 2010; Davidson, 1994; Malmir & Shoorcheh, 2012; Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014; Yang & Gamble, 2014; Zhang, 2019) that confirmed the positive and significant impact of CT on the development of EFL. Furthermore, a bunch of research studies (e.g. Beşoluk & Önder, 2010; Çubukçu, 2006; Tufan, 2008) have also been put forward regarding dispositions of prospective teachers or teacher trainers towards CT in Turkish context. However, none of them precisely focused on the relationship between CT dispositions and English language competence. In this sense, this current study is thought to fulfill the gap in the literature.

Research Questions

- RQ1: What are the CT dispositions of preparatory students?

- RQ2: Is there any significant correlation between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students?

- RQ3: What are the differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores?

- RQ4: Is there any significant correlation between CT dispositions and perceived language competence?

- RQ5: What are the differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence?

- RQ6: What do students think about the connection between their CT dispositions and language competence?

Significance of the Study

CT is not a new concept since its roots go back to from Socrates to Dewey, to the renaissance, to Bacon. However, today, in the educational arena, it is getting more and more popular than ever as it has been seen as the 21st century skill that assists individuals gain critical perspective that filters every thought and thinking ways, resulting in the awareness towards particular action or belief.

There are various studies that focus on determining the critical dispositions of learners and comparing it with different variables such as gender, grade point average, class, language background etc. Nevertheless, not only in the local studies but also in the international studies, there is no study which has been devoted to find out the critical dispositions of learners and its correlation with English language competence particularly referring to each skill. Bearing in this mind, this study is thought to address this gap in the relevant literature.

Assumptions of the Study

It is assumed that participants' responses to the scale items are true. Also, it is assumed that the questionnaire items tested CT and its dimensions thoroughly. Moreover, participants' mid-term results assumed to reflect their actual language competence.

Limitations of the Study

The study has following limitations:

1) The questionnaire was applied to 87 English learning students in preparatory classes in a state university. For this reason, the number of the participants might be considered as a constraint. Eighty-seven is a limited number and the context includes ELT-ELL preparatory students. Therefore, results cannot be generalized to other contexts.

2) The items of scale are 25 in total. Therefore, there may be some aspects related to CT which are not addressed in the items of the scale.

3) The proficiency exam results of the participants were based on the result of the mid-term exam scores of the participants. However, the exam questions may not reflect the real English competence of the participants.

4) The scale results were based on self-report. And these may not be true. Participants may have given wrong or deceptive results, which are the limitations of questionnaire such as self-deception and social desirability. Participants may tend to give socially accepteable and approval responses and conceal their true answers, attidudes or feelings rather than their actual and current behaviour (Dörnyei, 2003).

Organizations of the Study

The current study has 5 chapters. Chapter 1 firstly starts with an introduction to the study and overviews the background of the study. Then, research questions are presented. The significance of the study is discussed and then, assumptions and limitations are also highlighted.

Chapter 2 mainly presents the literature review of the study by discussing the theoretical backbone of the study in detail. Besides, it discusses each language skill and its major issues in a detailed way. Then, CT and its journey in time was highlighted. Lastly, Turkish and international studies are provided.

Chapter 3 describes the methodological basis of the study. It firstly presents the pilot study and then gives details regarding the research design of the main study by presenting the profile of the participants, settings and data collection tools. Lastly, it introduces data analysis method of the study.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study gathered from the questionnaire and interviews. After reporting the findings, discussions were made based on the results and interpretations were presented in line with the literature.

Chapter 5 finalizes the study by giving major findings and results. Lastly, conclusions and pedagogical implications are presented.

Summary

This introductory chapter mainly mentions the background of the study. Then, the significance of the study is emphasized and research questions are stated. Lastly, assumptions and limitations are explained in detail.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review chapter mainly deals with the theoretical framework and the literature of the study by referring to the two main areas of the study: language skills and CT. This section is basically devoted to clarifying the outline of all language skills with reference to their definition (s), major issue(s), and CT and its theoretical backbone with reference to the relevant concepts. Lastly previous studies conducted in both Turkish and international contexts are presented.

Language Competence

What is a language?

Language is a scientific discipline that has been dealt with by a variety of disciplines such as linguistics, anthropology, psychology, sociology etc. Hence, until now, different definitions and attributions have been associated with language. DeCapua (2008, p.7) defines language as being "rule-governed, systematic, and organized or grammatical". Bür (2014) defines it as "articulating the sounds, turning them into sentences and using these sentences in contexts" (p.4). Also, Aksan (1999) stresses that language is unique to human being and it is a powerful and magical system that people use in oral or written ways. It begins to be acquired when people are born. All alive languages have some common characteristics and these maintain that languages are recursive, human product and social based interaction and communication-oriented (Yule, 2010). Recursiveness implies that by using a set of structures, rules and words, infinite number of sentences can be produced. Human product displays that

language is solely used by people and it is mainly based on social interaction therefore it requires communication supported by signs or gestures in line with the necessary rules (Sapir,1921). Social-based interaction implies that the context of the interaction forms the language namely the types of dialog and roles of participants and language is formed by the social atmosphere. Communication-orientedness means that language has an aim to do and this is the sharing of ideas, thoughts or a piece of information to communicate.

Furthermore, Yule (2010) proposes that a language has six properties and these are "reflexivity, displacement, arbitrary, productivity, cultural transmission and duality" (p.11). Reflexivity implies that people are able to talk about the language itself and think about it. Displacement implies that languages can refer to past events or future. Arbitrary means that there is no close relationship between what is written and the referred object itself. Productivity refers that people can produce as indefinite sentences as possible. This is more related to the creativity of the language. As the name suggests, cultural transmission means that languages are transferrable from generation to generation. And lastly, duality is the limitless combinations of sounds, resulting in producing words, which have different meanings.

What does it mean to know a language?

There is a difference between acquisition and learning a language. Acquisition simply means the language learnt in the natural settings without any effort to study on it (Yule, 2010). On the other hand, learning a language means that the target language is explicitly instructed in a conscious way. Native speakers are the competent speakers who use their language fluently and accurately without any hesitation. On the other hand, foreign language learners develop their language competence in time with effort and enthusiasm since for learners it might be challenging to turn their input into output.

It is worth mentioning how linguistics have approached the concept of knowing a language until now. Firstly, as a cognitivist linguist in 1960-1970s, Chomsky drew attention to the two types of notions in the framework of what knowing a language is. The proposed notions are competence and performance, which in turn are similar what Saussure identifies langue and parole (Olshewsky, 1974). Chomsky argues that knowing a language and putting it into practice are very different concepts. Therefore, there is a clear-cut difference between competence and performance. According to him, competence refers to the general linguistic knowledge of one's own language; on the other hand, the actual capacity to practice of it is called as performance, which is more related to the productive skills. Therefore, it is implied that the general language competence is different from the actual language performance.

In the 1970s, Dell Hymes proposed communicative competence as opposed to the linguistic competence of Chomsky. He claims that a learner needs not only correctness but also appropriateness when using the language. Children intrinsically acquire the language grammatically correct and also, they know how to use the language appropriately in different context in different manner (Hymes, 1972). In this regard, he declares that grammatical rules and knowledge provide correctness and accuracy however, it may lack properness in the current context of communicative event. In this stance, a learner of foreign language should know both the accuracy of the language and properness of the language in the present context. At this point, Hymes suggests communicative competence, which is a crucial element that language learners should have. It covers linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. The first one refers to the structural and grammatical rules that govern the language itself. It covers phonology, phonetic, morphology, syntax and semantic. Sociolinguistics refers to the properness of the language use and language types in the target speech event, community or the society it is used. It is important to take into account the speech community in which the type of the language might change depending upon addressee, topic, gender and status of the

interlocutors (Yule, 2010). Discourse competence aims to understand the context of the communication (e.g. written or oral) and how the phrases, words and cohesive devises are used in the contexts. And lastly, strategic competence deals with the strategies that enable users not to break down the communication. Especially, it is vital to know communication strategies (e.g. repetition, clarification, code-switching) to maintain the conversation. As has been noted above, knowing a language is not simply about knowing grammar or words, in fact it involves a set of competences that need to be cultivated by taking account the form, meaning and use.

What skills are required to know a language?

In all languages, four skills exist namely reading, writing, listening and speaking. These are also categorized as passive (receptive skills) and active (productive) skills. Since receptive ones are related to input from an audio or a piece of written material and no special effort is required for output, reading and listening are thought to be receptive skills. On the other hand, active ones turn the input into output by producing something oral or written, therefore writing and speaking are productive skills. In particular, writing and speaking are believed to be the hardest skill to master for foreign language learners since they require production (Bozkurt, 2019; Kayacan, 2017).

When it comes to developing and cultivating English language skills, it is seen that much of the time are allocated to master receptive skills since it is much easier for learners to reach input materials. However, productive skills particularly speaking skills are still found to be hard to master among learners as it involves not only a well combination grammar and vocabulary but also discourse and strategic competence (Balemir, 2009; Saeidi, 2015).

Reading as a Skill

Definitions of reading

Reading has been regarded as a receptive skill. Even when people first started to learn foreign languages during 1840-1940, they used to read a lot and translate the passages since there was no opportunity to speak the language and no intend to have a meaningful communication (Richard & Rogers, 2001). In those times, learning a foreign language used to mean reading a text and translating it into their target language.

From past to present, different scholars have offered different definitions regarding what reading is. A well-known definition is given by Urquhart and Weir (1988) who stated that reading is a "process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium of print" (p. 22). Also, Nation (2009, p.9) defines it as "the skill of being able to recognize written forms and to connect them with their spoken forms and their meanings". Similarly, Fry (1977) regards reading as a creation a meaning out of a written language. Furthermore, Nuttall (1996) regards it as having a piece of meaningful message out of the target text close to what the writer intends. In fact, it is basically a communicative decoding process where the reader intends to decode what the writer has coded. However, lately scholars perceive reading as a multi complex process between the reader and the target text, and interactional and communicational activity where the reader tries to get what the text intends to draw in the mind of the reader (Razı, 2011).

The objective of reading is to get a piece of information from the text. Although it was once believed that it is a passive activity, today it is regarded as an interactive activity. Now, it is believed to be a complex process occurring between the text and the mind of the reader (Ediger, 2001). Since the aim is to get something out of the text, the place of reading in the EFL classrooms is much more important than assumed.

Probably the most known pioneer in the literature who stresses the importance of reading and the role of reading in EFL settings is Krashen. He is the one who mentions the importance of comprehensible input over the years especially for the foreign language learners. Comprehensible input suggests that leaners should have input slightly beyond their level. As the input that they have mostly come from reading, it should be challenging and interesting. In this sense, for learners, it is of vital to receive a reading input that can make them challenging and interested.

Additionally, the importance of reading might be greater for FL learners since reading is the primary source of foreign language input as well as being easy to be reached. Scott and Ytreberg (1990) draw attention to reading by stating that reading increases the awareness of learners to the forms, structures and rules of the language as well as helping learners see their growth in the language itself. Therefore, reading can be seen the irreplaceable source of input.

Major issues in reading

Reading has an important role in FL development since it enables learners to acquire a variety of vocabulary, grammatical features and point of views in the selected topics (Krashen, 1984). Therefore, careful considerations can be well paid when different suggestions, reviews and studies have been made in the relevant literature to show how reading can be improved. Reading input, types of reading, reading strategies will be discussed under this headline with reference to the attributes in the relevant literature.

Reading Input

Probably the most striking factor on the development of foreign language competence is the amount of input that the learners can have. For years, the input hypothesis of Krashen has been known. There are so many advantages of reading input for learners. Reading provides

learners a context where a setting is pictured in the mind of reader, supplying vocabulary richness in its own nature. Krashen (1994) supports this idea by saying that it has a positive influence on language development in terms of vocabulary, grammar, spelling as well as literacy. Also, he states that reading is a self-driven and low anxiety evoking activity in which learners expose themselves to input without any concerns.

Without any doubt, reading input for EFL learners should be rich, diverse and meaningful as much as possible. The input that learners take should be well in line with their current interest, age and level. The more the input meets the learners' interest, the more it will be likely to contribute their language development.

Besides, one of the advantages of reading is availability. Learners can find a reading text much easier than other kinds of materials because it may not be always possible for other skills to find a printed input material. For instance, Rivers (1981) mentions the advantage of reading that EFL students have difficulty in speaking English with the native speakers, however; to find a written material is much easier for them. Therefore, this can be seen as an advantage for learners.

Types of reading

Depending upon the aim of reading, there are two types of reading: intensive reading and extensive reading. The former is usually what is generally done at educational settings to deal with the linguistic features and contents of a text while the latter is done out of schools to read for pleasure. That is to say, intensive reading deals with the details of a text like cohesive devices, vocabulary and grammar so on. On the other hand, extensive reading is mainly getting the overall comprehension of a text (Nation, 2009).

The two types of reading have significant contributions to the development of the language competence. The aim of intensive reading is to study a text with the purpose of realizing and learning cohesive devices, grammatical items, semantic features, lexicons and discourse markers etc. This type of reading is mostly carried out to see the grammatical and technical parts of the text (Rivers, 1981). By doing so, learners become aware of the textual parts of the text and learn the structure of the text. This process is generally accompanied by a teacher whose aim is to let students perceive the grammatical structures of a text through reading. Except this, effective reading strategies can also be taught by means of intensive reading so as to teach how to approach a written material for a better comprehension. On the other hand, extensive reading is done to get a general comprehension of the text, enjoyment and reading for a gist (Brown, 2007; Nation, 2009). This is often called as free or voluntary reading. Any kind of reading that is based on the self-selected material can be under this kind of reading. Rather than focusing on the grammatical parts of the text, in the extensive reading the aim is to enjoy the text and read for pleasure. This type of reading is what Krashen mostly advises for language learners because he indicates that nothing can be more rewarding than a voluntary reading since extensive reading is totally based upon the personal choice and interest.

Types of reading might be a crucial factor in enhancing EFL competence. In this respect, EFL learners should be advised to read the texts that they are interest in, like or eager to read in that nothing can be more enjoyable, motivational and rewarding coming through personal interests. This factor is closely linked to the humanistic psychology and motivational concepts.

Reading strategies

Reading strategies have an important role in enhancing the readers' speed in reading and comprehension. In spite of the fact that there is no consensus on the classification of reading strategies, it is known that effective readers benefit them a lot (Razı, 2011). A variety of strategies have been attributed in the literature; however, according to Warnick (1996), a common consensus on strategies can be listed as bottom up, top down, cognitive, metacognitive strategies and socio-affective strategies.

Bottom up and top down reading strategies are two different ways to reading. The first one is more related to the smallest units and structures of the reading text. It therefore consists of stages to comprehend the text in which the reader starts to comprehend the spelling patterns that have letters, syllables, words, phrases, sentences and meaning. It is more text-driven strategy because it involves using the technical characteristics of the text such as grammar, words etc (Razı, 2011). Learners are therefore expected to know every single element in the text. On the other hand, the latter one refers that readers try to extract the meaning from the text depending on their experience, schema or background knowledge that they have regarding the topic and their inferences about the text. This type of strategy is mostly related to the activation of schemata. By doing so, even if a reader does not know every single element that the text has, the reader might catch the general meaning of the text and so there is no need to know every structure or the meaning of the word itself. Therefore, it is a reader-driven strategy since it relies on the existing knowledge of the reader.

Cognitive, metacognitive and socio-affective strategies can also be regarded as effective strategies if efficiently used. Cognitive strategies are more related to the particular task and they are manipulation-oriented strategies by using the material itself (O'Malley, 1985). They focus on elaborating the knowledge itself from the text and bringing it to the memory in an

organizational manner. They can be listed as extracting key word, repeating, underlying the important parts, note taking, making associations related to text, context-visualizations, and mapping etc.

Efficient readers are successful in utilizing meta-cognitive strategies as well. Meta-cognitive strategies are the umbrella strategies that cover readers' planning, monitoring and self-reflection skills (Baraz, 2012; Kutlutürk, 2016). They require higher order thinking skills and need more awareness on the process of the learning and they are self-oriented strategies; therefore, it is more specifically related to the thinking of thinking on the process. This type of strategy helps learners organize and plan their own learning, observe the process of their own way of learning and lastly, let them be reflective and critical in their own way of learning skills (Baraz, 2012). Arranging the flow of the learning material and monitoring the flow of the process are called as monitoring. And self-reflection is the stage where a learner becomes critical towards the process and tries to reflect upon one's own actions in the process.

Socio-affective strategies are the ones related to the emotional states of the learners and their cooperation with other learners. This type of strategy evokes learners' motivation and creates an interaction between the knowledge and the learner. By doing so, learners start to empathize, cooperate and build a sense of social senses towards learning.

Effective readers are the ones who use these strategies efficiently (Oxford, 1995). Empowering learners with the diverse strategies and giving them chances to use these strategies not only in the classrooms but also out of school are important tasks of the teachers in that strategies provide easiness and efficiency on learning as well as letting them gain self-autonomy in learning (Belet, 2005; Özer, 2002).

In relation to the what has been noted above, it should be also known that reading strategies are not solely teacher oriented that need to be taught, rather, learners should be aware

of their own strategies that they best benefit, and improve their own strategies to foster their reading as well as diverse the strategies that they can utilize in different context with different aims.

It should also be kept in mind that Oxford (1995) warns learners that some learners might benefit from some strategies more than other learners. Therefore, in line with individual differences such as age, gender, interest, the amount and the type of these strategies may vary. For instance, adult learners may benefit metacognitive stages more than young learners.

All in all, reading strategies might be said to be the best vehicles and tools to comprehend a reading text. Thus, it could be vital for learners to have diverse and efficient reading strategies.

Writing as a Skill

Definitions of writing

Writing has been seen as a tough skill to acquire among learners since it is one of the productive skills. A well-known definition for writing given by Yule (2010, p. 212) is that writing is "the symbolic representation of language through the use of graphic signs". Similarly, Brown (2001, p. 391) defines it as "the graphic representation of spoken language". Moreover, Zamel (1982, p.195) defines writing as a "process through which meaning is created". As seen, writing refers to the written output of the spoken language, therefore it involves spelling, discourse, and a target audience. For this reason, like in the L1, in L2 or FL writing, it needs to be instructed in formal settings.

The roots of L2 writing is based on the 1960s. By feeding from the roots of constructivism and along with the rise of CLT and CEFR, todays' way of viewing EFL writing has changed. It is fair to mention that this change has resulted in emerging the process-oriented writing, which

has some distinct features and aims when compared to product-oriented writing, both of which can be seen as two different ways of writing.

Product oriented writing is not seen as a contemporary way of writing. Instead, it is more traditional pursuit whose aim is to copy or mimic the target text or model based on the same structure, grammatical choice and organization (Brown, 2001; Karaca, 2017). Organizational features of writing come first than creativity of ideas. Therefore, it is generally done with the help of control or guided writing. The importance is generally on the final product, requiring mostly one draft. On the other hand, process-oriented writing is contemporary way of writing and it generally needs cyclical writing, in which learners are required to have creativity of ideas in the process and it is conducted within multiple drafts. Therefore, it has stages such as a detailed planning, multiple draft sessions, several revisions and editions in a cyclical way (Hyland, 2003).

Lately, more process-orientedness in writing and digital writing have been in rise. However, writing is still a challenging task to deal with especially for second language writing (Ekmekçi, 2018; Fareed & Ashraf, 2006). Null (2011) stresses this challenge by indicating that the gap still exists between the theory and the practice for second or foreign language writing.

Major issues in writing

Writing in its own nature is a challenging skill since its main aim is to turn the input into the output (Kuş, 2005). When the ongoing improvements are taken into account such as the digital tools, adopting process-oriented approaches etc., it can be said that SL or FL learners still suffer from problems. There are following factors below that need careful considerations by learners.

Writing input

Like in all kinds of learning, input is an inevitable part of learning process because only if correct and proper input are provided, can the correct and desired output be reached. This is all true when learners desire to improve their writing especially in FL settings. It is well known that writing can be well developed if the integration of reading and writing are successfully provided since both of them are intertwined skills (Brown, 2001). What learners often neglect is that they often push themselves to write without reading. However, the well-organized writing mostly comes out of a thorough reading. Moreover, depending on the type of writing that a learner writes, the type of input should well match with it (Nation, 2009). In this respect, it is advised that before attempting to write something, a pre-reading must be done to see a model and analyze how it is structured. Thus, it is a must for learners to read more before writing.

Types of Writing

Depending upon the learners' aim, there are various types of writing that learners require to write in formal and informal settings. To illustrate, these types can basically be divided into two categories. The first one that learners generally do at classrooms is classroom-oriented ones. These are imitative writing, controlled writing and self-writing (Brown, 2001). The second one that learners do in the real atmosphere is called real-life writing. These are academic writing, technical writing and personal writing.

Taking into consideration the types of writing, learners need to develop different kinds of skills and practices to organize and produce the target types of writing since each type of writing requires different genres and organizations. Learners have imitative writing when they require to imitate and copy the target text in order to learn the combination of letters or the orthography under the responsibility of the teacher. The reason why learners come across this type frequently

can be explained in two ways. Either learners' level is so low that the teacher wants them to recognize and model the structure, organizations and grammar of the target texts or the teacher mainly wants to employ this type of writing since s/he prefers to product-oriented approach in the writing classes. Secondly, learners, in controlled writing, write their own writing with the same structures that the model text has under the semi-authority of target text. This means that learners have to depend on the general ideas and structures that the target text has. Therefore, this type of writing still lacks of creativity (Brown, 2001). In self-writing, called as free writing, learners write for their own way of writing with the unrestricted structures or themes that they wish to employ.

On the other hand, in terms of academic, technical and personal writing, there are significant differences between their own distinct genres and structures. Firstly, learners often come across academic writing when they use English for academic purposes in schools. A journal paper or an essay can be counted as academic writing. Secondly, learners use technical writing when they need the language for their business-relations especially, the specific purposes they are interested in. For instance, a learner who is a software developer can be more interested in the language that is used for computer and program technology and want to write about them. Lastly, personal writings can be in multiple versions such as diary, notes or letter and it is totally free kind of writing that the writer focuses on his/her own ideas.

As seen above, the types of writing are diverse and may vary according to the aim of the writer. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that as a learner, while writing or trying to develop writing skills, together with the types of writing, learners should also be familiar with the specific features of that kind of writing since each type or genre may need different organization, word choice or structure. This clearly means that while in one genre, it might be suitable to use a specific content, jargon, or word choice, in others it cannot be valid and suitable to use these kinds of features.

Writing strategies

For second and foreign language learners, writing has been thought to be the hardest skill (Evans, 2001; İlhan, 2019; Nunan, 2000). Therefore, in order to gain competency in writing, it is important to utilize effective strategies in the process of writing since they play an important role in cultivating writing skills. Learners who know their own way of learning and strategies can benefit from their learning journey (Oxford, 1990).

In this respect, there are various strategies proposed by different researchers. Er (2018) mentions chronologically three different models proposed for writing strategies. The first one is Flower and Hayes' (1981) model. This writing strategy model, proposed in 1981, covers three main classifications: "task environment, long term memory and writing process" (p.29). Task environment refers to the everything except the writer. Long term memory refers taking into account the profile of the audience, topics, style and plans before writing. Writing process includes "planning, translating and reviewing" (p. 29). Planning is where the writer plans his/her goals and procedure of writing including the audience, topic and style. Translating refers to the realizations of ideas into practice. Reviewing is where the writer evaluates and reflects what s/he has written.

The second model is Lavelle and Bushrow's (2007) model. This writing strategy model, proposed in 2007, has seven factors related to writing strategies. These are "elaborative, low efficacy, no revision, intuitive, scientist, task-oriented and sculptor" (Er, 2018, p.31). Here the different ones that need to be clarified are scientist, task-oriented and sculptor factors. Scientist refers to the writing of ideas clearly and having a detailed plan. Task-orientedness simply means the obedience of rules and ideas to the task and avoiding free expressions of writer. Sculptor refers to the inclination towards getting feedback and making editions on it.

The third model is Peñuelas' (1990) model. It was firstly mentioned in 2012. In fact, it is based upon Oxfords' 1990 model. It basically divides writing strategies into two: direct and indirect strategies. The first one covers cognitive, memory and compensation strategies, whereas the second one includes affective, metacognitive and social writing strategies. These strategies have already been mentioned in the reading strategies section above.

Except the strategies, the phrases in writing are vital in terms of learners for the development of writing because the strategies are applied in the phrases of well-planned phrases. The first phrase is the selection of the topic that basically covers the following units such as the purpose, role, and audience (Nation, 2009). At the very beginning of writing, the purpose should be known and it should be questioned whether it aims to give information or convince audience to do something or enjoy the writing itself.

In the second phrase, the writer should choose his or her role by indicating that it is written for himself/ herself or some other people. In this respect, it would be better to choose his audience by displaying that to whom he/she would refer to. Therefore, for every kinds of writing, it should be well known the purpose of writing, the role of the writer and the audience that would be addressed because these are the starting points of writing, which is a key strategy that raises confusion among learners if not known.

In the third phrase, after choosing the topic and the role, the pre-writing (also called as brainstorming) can begin in which learners brainstorm regarding the format, content and organization of the writing process.

Fourthly, in the drafting sections, the writer organizes the text and develop ideas related to the topic in a coherent way by arranging the ideas or arguments from the importance level. The drafting process may show variation depending upon the type of writing.

Fifthly, revision sessions are put into practice. Revisions are regarded as the strongest part of writing that requires the writer look back and check what has been written, how the relationship of ideas is built and correlated and how errors can be corrected. The revision section goes on and on until the final stage of writing.

Lastly, proofreading is the vital part of writing where a peer reads writing for the purpose of checking the formats, style, fluency, and organization so as to give the writer a chance to see the editions. Here giving and getting feedback are of important part of writing since they play a vital role in cultivating students' writing. Harmer (2001) stresses that the main aim of giving feedback is to cultivate learners' writing development and see how the use of language they had in the past.

As has been noted above, writing is a skill that needs systematicity and ordering. That is why putting it into stages and phrases as scholars suggest (e.g. Harmer, 2000; Hayes & Flower,1980) can help learners see how they can benefit and develop it in the process. This clearly shows that division of stages may be an indicator of where effective strategies begin.

Listening as a Skill

Definitions of listening

Listening and speaking are two intertwined skills that individuals are born with innate. Witkin (1990) points out that no theory explains exactly how listening is constituted. Therefore, it is quite hard to give a precise definition as it involves a complex and hard process (Ulum, 2015). As long as there is a recognition of speech and perception of speech as well as understanding of speech and communication, it can be regarded as listening (Huei-Chun, 1998). Additionally, Rost (1994) regards listening as an ability that is used to infer the meaning of a speaker by means of his/her grammar, accent, word choice, and intonation.

Listening is a process whereby listeners go through some stages. In this regard, Tyagi (2013) proposes 5 stages to listening: 1) hearing in which hearing waves are perceived, 2) understanding where the message is understood, 3) remembering where input is stored and retrieved, 4) evaluation where judgement and assessment of input is done and 5) responding refers to the giving or getting feedback either oral or nonverbal. Therefore, listening is not a linear process; rather, it is reciprocal activity.

Listening might be difficult for learners because of the four important factors (Brown, 2001; Ceylan, 2016; Yule, 1983). The first one is the speaker characteristics which might be speed, accent, dialect, or the language type that the speaker has. The second one is the listener characteristics which might show variations on the role, position or interest of listener. The third one is the content which might be related to grammar, word choice, discourse, background, linguistic devices etc. The last one is the support which help the listener or speaker help gain the understanding with the help of tools. Therefore, when the factors stated above taken into account, learners need to develop these factors by making use of effective techniques, strategies or methods.

From past to present, the development of reading and listening in FL have been regarded as the most important skills since they are the primary source of information as input. However, for years, listening has been neglected because of two common misunderstandings: The first misunderstanding is that it has been thought to be a passive skill whose aim is just to get the input from the outside (Vandergrift, 2004); however now, it is seen as an active skill not a fixed skill through which individuals interpret and create the meaning between the interlocutors depending upon the context (Brown, 2007; Lynch & Mendelsohn, 2002; Nation & Newton, 2009). The second misconcetion is that speaking comes first. Listening has been seen as Cinderella skill given that speaking is the step sisters who are dominant at home and listening is Cinderalla who got neglected and tortured (Jalongo, 2008; Jalongo, 2010; Nunan, 1997;

Yıldırım &Yıldırım, 2016). In this respect, Nunan (1997) claims that not only in the theory but also in the practice there is a gap in the relevant literature.

The gap between theory and practice has generally been the result of the neglection of the elements that are involved in listening. Just like in speaking, in listening there are necessary elements such as interlocutors, context and process (Nation, 2009). These are the ones that constitute listening itself. Interlocutors are surrounded within a context in listening. If one thinks listening is as a process, there are a couple of elements that make this process hard. These elements are generally as follows: the speaker's accent, fluency, word choice, grammar, intonation, speed, rhythm and stress. In this aspect, listening might be regarded as a process whereby listeners are aware of these elements and develop their audio skills by making use of effectives techniques and strategies.

Major issues in Listening

When the history and journey of language teaching and learning have been investigated, it can be clearly seen that both listening and speaking have always been behind reading and writing skills in terms of the given importance. However, there have been some attempts that reframe the foreign language aspect into a different view. Particularly, after the emergence of communicative language teaching in 1970s, listening and speaking have gained importance (Akdemir, 2013; Yıldırım &Yıldırım, 2016).

Additionally, several researchers have declared that listening in EFL contexts have been underlooked and neglected because of the belief that foreign language listening develops just like L1 listening without instruction (Ceylan, 2016). This common mistake made listening be neglected. Today, the importance of listening has been in rise and language learning is not seen only a set of grammatical rules, there are still problems with listening, though (Hamouda, 2013).

Listening input

Listening is carried out to get information, learn new knowledge, understand an event or for pleasure. Since listening is a sort of getting input, it is of vital when learning a foreign language (Rost, 1990). On the other hand, listening is generally perceived to be a hard skill in that different characteristics and variations are involved in the listening process such as intonation, stress, redundancy, reduced forms, type of language etc (Brown, 2001).

Together with the difficulties in its own nature, listening can be seen as an input source. Like reading, listening presents new knowledge, information and experiences. Besides, it lets learners be familiar with sounds, intonation and stress etc. Therefore, especially for foreign language learners, listening is a vital key factor for the improvement of speaking skills (Rost, 2002).

Additionally, from the perspective of a learner, listening offers so many linguistic benefits. For instance, while listening, learners can have different contexts in which different lexicons, type of language, clustering, speech events are utilized. Hence, learners need to listen to different listening materials given that each context has something different that offers listeners. The more ranged contexts mean the more varied inputs and linguistics benefits.

Types of listening

Lucas (2011) proposes four types of listening namely appreciative, empathetic, comprehensive and critical listening. Lucas' first categorization is appreciative, which refers to the listening done for pleasure. Since the aim is to enjoy the listening itself, it can be a song that the listener likes, or a speech that the listener is interested in. Empathetic listening is self-explanatory, which seeks mutual understanding by taking into account the speaker's emotional state and feelings so that the speaker could speak without being judged or criticized.

Comprehensive listening is carried out so as to comprehend a speaker, more specifically to get the message. By focusing on the message what the teacher is saying, students listen to it in order to understand him/her. Lastly, the aim of critical listening is to asses, evaluate and judge what the speaker says in order to accept or refuse it.

Brown (2001), on the other hand, categorizes six types of listening that can be utilized in the classroom atmosphere such as reactive, intensive, responsive, selective, extensive and interactive listening. The first one is related to listening a word and repeating it afterwards. This is a kind of individual drill. Intensive listening is carried out by taking out a phrase, word or a grammatical point from the listening and scrutinize its rhythm, stress or grammatical structure. Responsive listening is generally done at schools by asking questions related to the listened material so as to check the understandings. Selective listening is carried out to scan a piece of information from the listening material such as the date, the name of a place etc. Extensive listening is done for pleasure such as listening a song without any purpose to deal with a word or a phrase for grammatical purposes. Interactive listening covers all of the aforementioned ones and also it is carried out in the authentic environment for the purpose of raising questions and answers, discussions and debates.

As has been mentioned above, different scholars have approached listening to classify the types. Employing various types of listening offers learners different kinds of contexts, varied inputs and linguistic awareness on how they are used.

Listening strategies

Strategies are powerful tools that facilitate learning. Therefore, like in all other types of learning, there are also strategies that help learners master in listening. In other words, empowering yourself with effective strategies is of vital in the journey of developing listening.

There are numerous scholars who propose listening strategies. Nation (2009) points out communication strategies and learning strategies. The first one refers to the strategies which aim to help understanding the conversation such as making guessing or interrupting the conversation properly etc. The second one is that learners focus on listening so as to learn a pattern or language form.

Brown (2007), on the other hand, mentions micro and macro strategies. The first ones are sentence level strategies whereas macro strategies are mostly at discourse level. For instance, recognizing of patterns, rules or grammatical functions of a word, discrimination of sounds, finding out the stressed word, pattern or intoned patterns or words, distinguishing the word classes etc. can be regarded as micro strategies. Macro ones are generally discourse level strategies such as finding out the goal of the communication, the relationship between the speakers, the literal and implied meaning and pragmatic events of the situation etc.

From the perspective of Nunan (1991), the strategies in listening can be classified as bottom up, top down and metacognitive strategies. Bottom up strategies are generally based on the text itself, which require learners to focus on the language and linguistic items in the listening material. Therefore, structures and forms of the language are paid more attention to understand the spoken language. The main purpose of bottom up strategies is to benefit from the grammar, sounds and linguistic items that create the whole meaning in the text. In order to do so, learners can recognize the sound patterns, differentiate similar sounds and phonemes, pay attention on cognates, choose the details from the spoken language and identify the

important knowledge. On the other hand, top down strategies are more associated with the existing background knowledge of the listener (Morley, 1991). When listeners manage to bring their own relevant background and global knowledge to the listening, they can understand and interpret listening better. Thus, this means that the more learners bring the harmony between the discourse they listen and their background activation, the more successful listening and understanding they will have. Lastly, metacognitive strategies are the ones related to one's awareness on the process of listening and monitoring himself/herself resulting in tackling with the proper strategies and assessing them in a critical manner (Zheng, 2018). Therefore, it can be understood that metacognitive strategies basically consist of planning stage where listeners plan what could be the best strategies to apply in specific situations; monitoring stage in which listeners develop a sense of observer eye which seek the answer whether the selected strategies are useful in the listening material; and evaluation stage of which aim is to assess the whole process and propose solutions to the occurring problems. In the planning section, learners plan and organize their listening process by avoiding distractors and choosing where to pay attention more. In the monitoring stage, learners require observing his/ her way of listening and check whether the applied strategies work or not. In the evaluation, listeners come to conclusion in determining the efficacy of the strategies.

As has been noticed, strategies in listening may vary depending upon the aim of the listener. What a learner needs to discover is that which type of strategies is suitable for his / her own purpose and how best this type of strategy can be applied. In fact, what makes listening hard is the listeners who do not apply these strategies.

Speaking as a Skill

Definitions of speaking

Speaking can be defined as the process whereby participants exchange information within a context by taking roles. To put it a clear definition, Chaney (1998) defines speaking as "the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts" (p.13). Burns and Joyce (1997) further state that it is a context-bound activity where the meaning is constructed. That is to say, within a context, participants take part in an interactional process where the meaning is mutually created and the form of speaking is shaped.

The importance of speaking given by Nunan (1991, p.9) is "the art of speaking is the single most important of aspect of learning a second or foreign language". Together with its importance, it is also accepted that speaking is one of the challenging productive skills of a language (Littlewood, 1992). Therefore, dealing with the language itself as a speaker has a difficulty in its own nature and it is the most difficult skill for foreign language learners as well.

Speaking is not so simple and smooth process. It covers important elements that naturally occur within speaking. Solak (2016) categorizes speaking process by stating three areas and these are "mechanics, functions and pragmatic, social, cultural rules and norms" (p.46). The first one refers to the basic skeleton of a language. It covers the correct use of grammar, word choice and pronunciation. The second one is related to getting what the purpose of the message is. And the last one is related to the understanding of the context and the ability to change the language according to the criteria such as when to speak, what for to speak, with whom to speak. Learners need to develop Solak's aforementioned three areas in the foreign language development.

In fact, here it is worthwhile to mention communicative competence. It basically means "what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community" (Richards & Rogers, p.159). This concept includes grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. The first one is related to the knowledge of the linguistic and grammatic rules of a language, which is similar to Saussure' language notion. The second one is knowing the contextual factors and accommodating the speech depending on the participants, relationships etc. Discourse competence is the understanding of the textual devices such as turn taking, speech events, cohesive devices etc. and the ability to interpret them within the context. Strategic competence is the ability to apply effective strategies that hinder the breakdown of the speaking and the ability to continue the interaction.

The nature of speaking cannot be limited to just communicative competence. Uztosun (2013) confirms that speaking is more complicated than assumed in its own nature. The roles, the goal of the speaking and the types of speaking have an effect on the speaking. That is why, learners need to be aware of different elements of speaking and should develop competencies accordingly. Speaking of elements, it is fair to indicate that these elements are the crucial parts of spoken language. These various elements are intertwined in the nature of speaking.

Major issues in Speaking

From past to present, there has been a growing interest towards English around the world since it is a lingua Franca. This has enabled the language to be the language of media, education, technology and science etc. This popularity has also evoked the emphasis on the productive parts of English such as writing and speaking because it is used as a tool for communication. In this respect, it can be said that speaking is a sort of demanding part of language learning for learners since it is a complex process whereby learners need to turn the received input into

output as well as a competence through which they apply necessary skills and various elements such as accuracy, fluency, intelligibility, intonation etc. In line with these, the major issues in speaking are below stated and clarified.

Speaking output

In all languages, the main aim is to create communication between people, share ideas and opinions by using oral and audial skills. In this sense, among EFL learners, speaking is especially regarded as the hardest skill to master since it requires not only inputs but also the ability to turn input into output (Zwang, 2009). In this process where learners make efforts to produce output, there are vital things that need to be done. First of all, the most important one is the listening input, which can be associated with the input coming through speaking. In all types of learning, it is impossible to produce output without an input. Therefore, learners need an environment where they can listen and speak. By listening they can have input and then they can have a chance to practice the language in which they can use the language.

Today, learners can have a chance to speak the foreign language in many ways. Related to this, Brown (2000) proposes authenticity, which implies that learners expose themselves the language where it is used as commonly or putting themselves in an environment that reflects the authentic environment of the language. What has been deduced is that speaking output is here related to the native speakers, native like speakers or advanced learners of that language. When learners expose themselves to them, they can perceive their way of pronunciation and then they can have real life speaking.

Besides authenticity, learners can internalize what is learnt rather than memorizing it so they can practise and use the language itself and these are of highly importance in the development of language (Riddell, 2003; Stryker & Leaver, 1997). This can be achieved through tasks such as presentation, groups or pair works, interactive tools etc.

Types of Speaking

In all sorts of communication, the way people speak changes depending upon the type, style and context of the communication. These are generally resulted from the different attributes such as roles, genders, educational backgrounds etc. of the speakers. These are also the factors that change the vocabulary choice, grammar within a context.

A competent speaker is thus supposed to have correctness on grammar as well as awareness on the proper use of language within a specific context. Therefore, learners should be equipped with the knowledge of different contexts and how these contexts are different from each other. By doing this, learners can adapt themselves to the target type of speaking and modify their speaking in line with the types of context.

In the development of speaking skill, the more different speaking types learners are exposed to, the more they will have the awareness of different contexts and different genres. (Goh & Burns, 2012). In doing so, they become aware of the fact that components of speaking may vary depending on the context and use those components when they are in that sort of context. The main types of speaking are categorized as imitative, intensive, responsive, and dialogue by Brown (2001). These are the categorizations similar to the listening types mentioned above. On the other hand, informative, persuasive, prepared speaking exist as well. The first one is self-explanatory. It is used to give factual information or to give information about the given topic. The second one is to make the audience convinced to do something or persuade to believe something. For instance, advertisements try to convince or motivate customers to sell the product. Prepared speaking is the planned speech that has specific topic, audience and place to realize it. For example, conferences or symposiums are such cases.

To be a competent speaker in a foreign language, learners need to be aware of the various types of speaking and they should involve in each kind of type so as to be familiar with the context, accordingly use the correct grammar, word choice, fluency, intonation etc.

Communication strategies

Strategies are useful tools that learners can benefit in maintaining the communication. In particular, for speaking, it might be crucial to make use of effective strategies to be able to sustain the continuum of conversation. One of the most important things that needs to be done in speaking is to hinder the breakdown of the communication between participants because the success of the effective communication is mostly based upon the mutual effort of speakers. In this sense, as Hymes (1972) suggests, learners should develop strategic competence to achieve this aim.

Strategic competence, a sub-category of communicative competence, was added as a component in Hymes' communicative competence by Canale and Swain later (Uztosun & Erten, 2014). Since strategic competence does not have a fixed description, it is generally divided into different sections by numerous researchers by approaching from a different perspective.

Sayar (2018) and Uztosun (2014) state that although the first scholar who mentioned communication strategy was Selinker (1972), he did not give a detailed description of it. There are now various researchers and scholars proposing different kinds of taxonomies to conceptualize the communication strategies (e.g Bialystok, 1990; Bialystok and Kellerman, 1987; Dörnyei and Scott, 1997; Tarone and Yule, 1989; Willems 1987; Yule and Tarone, 1991).

To illustrate one of the updated one, Sayar (2018, p.29) presents a taxonomy (adapted from Tarone,1980; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997) for communication strategies.

Table 1

Savar's adapted taxonomy for communication strategies

Taxonomy for Analysis of Communication Strategies	
1. Avoidance strategies	**1.1 Topic avoidance** **1.2 Message abandonment**
2. Compensatory strategies	**2.1 Intra-actional strategies** 2.1.1 Word coinage 2.1.2 Code-switching 2.1.3 Foreignizing 2.1.4 Use of non-linguistic means 2.1.5 Self repair 2.1.6 Mumbling 2.1.7 Use of all-purpose words 2.1.8 Approximation 2.1.9 Circumlocution 2.1.10 Literal translation 2.1.11 Use of fillers/hesitation devices 2.1.12 Self- repetition 2.1.13 Other –repetition 2.1.14 Omission **2.2 Interactional strategies** 2.2.1 Asking for repetition 2.2.2 Appeal for help 2.2.3 Clarification request 2.2.4 Asking for confirmation 2.2.5 Comprehension check 2.2.6 Expressing non-understanding

As shown in the table, Tarone's adapted taxonomy is mainly divided into two parts: avoidance strategies and compensatory strategies. The 'avoidance strategies' is the result of

negative approach of the speakers towards the target message or topic. When they do not want to participate in the interaction, they apply these kinds of strategies. This section is the adapted version of Faerch and Kasper's taxonomy (1983). On the other hand, the second part 'compensatory strategies' is divided into two as 'Intra-actional strategies' and 'Interactional strategies'. This part is adapted version of Dörnyei and Scott's taxonomy (1997). When the participants as individuals have difficulty in maintaining the interaction, they may apply intra-actional strategies such as word coinage, code-switching, foreignizing, use of non-linguistic etc. It is also worth mentioning that speakers might apply interactional strategies reciprocally in the interaction process. Asking for repetition, appeal for help, and clarification request are some of them.

The importance of these strategies cannot be ignored in terms of English language learners in that these strategies provide them fluency, flow of interaction and motivation to convey the ideas reciprocally especially in the speaking skills. Therefore, learners are suggested to be aware of their efficacy in maintaining the successful interactions and inclined towards applying them without hesitation.

Critical Thinking

CT can be an indispensable goal of the 21st century education just like in the other disciplines such as psychology, philology, philosophy etc (Butler, 2012; Karadüz, 2010; Kökdemir, 2003; Petek & Bedir, 2018). Especially, the reflections of CT skills might be expected to contribute to the development of the foreign language competence since thinking and language learning are intertwined (Karadüz, 2010). Therefore, incorporating the CT and empowering students with its benefits in the language classes can also make them gain both critical eyes in their daily lives and in their foreign language learning experience.

CT has been aroused as a necessity to compel with the overloaded, viral and uncredited knowledge of today by letting students use intellectual standards such as analyzing, synthesizing, evaluating and reflecting when it is time to decide, assess or judge a piece of knowledge (Masduqi, 2011). Although CT dates back to ancient Socratic times, the importance of it has been in rise to meet the needs of today's world. Therefore, there has been a transition around the world from the traditional schooling system where teachers are fully responsible for lecturing and being the authority in the class to a modern schooling system in which students fulfill the needs of 21st century by being responsible for actively getting the knowledge by themselves not only utilizing the higher order thinking skills but also adopting a critical manner.

CT brings a new understanding of learning where learners are regarded as the ones who pursuit of information and make an effort to choose and adopt the information after evaluating its credibility in terms of its reason, logicality and reliability (Schafersman, 1991). All around the world where the modern schooling system adopted, the students are regarded as the active participants of learning and the ones who can have a choice on what to believe, select and take an action by using a set of intellectual standards. To achieve these, as Innabi and Sheikh (2007) state, CT requires learners apply skills such as asking questions for deep understanding, analyzing the arguments, checking the credibility of the evidence and assumptions, judging the quality of observations, source and reports, making inferences.

Throughout the journey of CT, various scholars and researchers have approached it differently, namely dividing it into two: skill profile and dispositional profile (Altıntaş, 2019; McBride et al., 2002). Skill profile is also called as cognitive (rationalist) paradigm and dispositional profile is also called as affective paradigm (Papastephanou & Angeli, 2007). Skill profile has still been associated with the cognition and cognitive skills. It is claimed that it requires a multi complex process where higher order thinking skills are needed and applied. Therefore, Bloom's taxonomy is often attributed while explicating the skill profile (Choy &

Cheah, 2009). In particular, the analysis, synthesis and evaluation part of the taxonomy have long associated with the CT since individuals need to apply metacognitive skills and also, gather data for the relevant questions resulting in assessing and evaluating the information critically and reflectively based on the validated evidence. Moreover, Facione et al. (1995) declare that skills profile involves "analysis, interpretation, inference, explanation, evaluation and self-regulation" (p.3). Furthermore, Harpern (2003) stresses the skill profile of CT as the application of cognitive strategies and skills. Here what he implied is that CT involves drawing inferences, calculating possibilities, and producing solutions hence it needs thoughtful strategies and skills.

With the words of Innabi and Sheikh (2007), the skill dimension of CT can therefore be shortly summarized under the elements of "purpose, question at issue, assumptions, inferences, implications, points of view, concepts and evidence" (p. 47). Together with these stated elements, Paul (1999) stresses that learners gain standards in the process of CT and these intellectual standards are sought in the deciding, believing and taking an action processes. These intellectual standards, the backbone of CT, are based on clarity, accuracy, logic, depth and breadth (Scriven & Paul, 1987). Therefore, a critical thinker questions and assesses a piece of knowledge to what extent it is clear, accurate, logical, elaborated and wide (Facione, 1990).

CT has also a dimension related to disposition. The dispositional profile was first declared in 1990 by 47 experts from 7 fields and critical spirit was regarded as disposition (Altıntaş, 2019, Bür, 2014). Not only do learners need skills but also the dispositions towards CT. Disposition of CT is seen as being inclined or having tendency to being a critical thinker (Facione & Facione, 1992; Facione et al. 2000). In fact, it is having as a sort of spirit of inquiry. Elder and Paul (1994) declare that disposition can be seen as the desire and willingness to push himself/herself in the way of questioning his/her way of thinking, thinking process and being aware his/her own prejudices, misunderstandings, biases and misconceptions. Therefore, it can be claimed that the harmony of one's ability and tendency towards CT can well define the true

critical thinker (Zin & Eng, 2014). This can also be regarded as the integration of cognitive skills and affection.

Dispositional profile mostly deals with both the proneness or inclination given by birth to have tendency in being critical thinker and nurturing this tendency in time by being taught by others (Facione, 1989; Özmen, 2006). According to Beyer (1987) and Facione et al. (1995), dispositional profile is more vital than skill profile since being proneness towards CT is more necessary and involving than cognitive skills. CT disposition is therefore referred as the intellectual willingness in a sustained period of time towards CT.

Upon the APA Delphi report, having an aim to empirically depict what CT elements are and how it constructs, Facione and Facione (1992) develop an inventory for dispositions of CT and thus proposes seven characteristics namely inquisitiveness, open mindedness, systematicity, analyticity, truth seeking, self-confidence and maturity. What has been deduced up until here is that if the two dimensions of CT has been succeeded by learners, they will be not only the active participants of their learning but also active critical thinkers who can reflect their criticality into their daily lives.

Speaking of daily life, Crossley and Wilson (1979) declare that language is something powerful and has a potential to be misused. For this reason, it is vital to have CT in daily life since CT might make individuals or citizens the ones who can challenge the deceptive thoughts and assertions as well as several biased arguments among people. These skills are generally defined by Duron et al. (2006) as being able to raise important problems and questions, getting reasonable and clear evidence, seeing the beyond of the ideologies and sharing opinions with others. These characteristics make critical thinkers more sceptic, self-aware on the thinking process and suppositions (Pontius & McIntosh, 2019).

More specifically, the present assumption that learners gain CT skills through the development of language has led CT gain a place in foreign language classroom. This type thinking might evoke both the inquiry learning which results in reasonable, evaluative, reflective manner in the process of gathering information and learning and also self-thinking and thought development on the language competency. The aforementioned reasons thus make CT skills can be vital in the development of language and language learning.

Definitions of Critical Thinking

There is no consensus among educators, academics, and researchers in terms of a clear, precise definition of CT. While some definitions referred to skill aspect of CT, others focused on the disposition aspect of it. For example, the basic definitions referred to skill aspect given by Facione (2007) for CT is "purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference" (p.14). In addition, Külekçi and Kumlu (2015) state that CT is mainly about having inferences, awareness of assumptions, interpreting the conclusions, and assessing arguments. Lipman (2003) defines CT as a multi-functional concept that leads individuals to have different perspectives about a particular issue therefore it is not limited to events, people, subjects or means. In addition, Özmen (2008) defines CT as a skill related to the cognitive habits of mind and personal attitudes.

There are also definitions approaching CT from the 'disposition' view. Brookfield (1987) gives it a definition as "a process of identification and questioning of certain assumptions, being skeptical of one's own ideas, striving to find new alternatives and debating the given concept" (as cited Ordem, 2017, p.50). A known researcher, Facione (2007) mentions seven indicators of CT disposition. These are truth-seeking, open mindness, analyticity, systematicity, self-confidence, inquisitiveness and maturity (p.12). Truth-seeking is related to the observation and collection of data in the pursuit of truth while open mindedness is being

aware the other alternatives and they can be acceptable if they are reasonable and reliable. Analyticity refers to the type of deep thinking, which necessities seeing the beyond of ideologies and separation of thoughts. Systematicity is the consistent application of CT in pursuit of information and being consistent in evaluation of that information in the process of 'believing or not'. Self-confidence is being aware of what you do and trust yourself, while inquisitiveness is lifelong questioning and inquiry. Maturity trait refers to the characteristics of individuals who accept when they are wrong.

On the other hand, as a skill, CT consists of interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation and self-regulation (Facione, 2007, p.9). Interpretation needs understanding the information and the ability to clarify and express it logically. Analysis is about the inferential analysis of concepts, ideas, events and identifying reasons, questions, beliefs. Evaluation is the assessment of the consistency and credibility of ideas, solutions, expressions, judgments and opinions etc (Bür, 2014; Facione, 2007). What can be deduced based on evidences, ideas or thoughts is called as inference. Explanation is showing the results of what has been found in a coherent away. Self-regulation is the last stage where an individual monitors his/her process and come to conclusion that s/he accepts, confirms, refuses changes his/her attitude or behavior (Facione, 2007). From the various definitions have been noted above, it can be deduced that CT is a set of intellectual skills, which are accompanied by dispositions.

CT is an active and systematic intellectual process where individuals are aware of their thinking and others' thinking process by using metacognitive skills (Cüceloğlu,1995). Therefore, it can be deduced that it has an effect on shaping the learning process.

In the pursuit of CT, some studies focus on the dispositional dimension of it while others try to explore the skill dimension of it. Both dimensions reveal that it can be developed through

education. Particularly, in foreign language classes, the awareness towards CT is a more important and evoking concept since language and thinking are bound to each other. Therefore, it is claimed that the more learners develop their critical and reflective thinking, the more they might develop their foreign language competency. That is why CT can be more important in language learning process.

In particular, the research focus in the current study is on the dispositional profile of CT. The reason of giving specific attention to this profile is to see to what extent preparatory students have inclination towards CT and its possible relationship with English language competence.

History of Critical Thinking

The word *critic* originally comes from Greek language and later it has been translated into Latin language as *criticus* (Şenşekerci & Bilgin, 2008). Nowadays, it continues its journey being called as "the art of judgment". Although it is getting more and more trend topic these days, CT is in fact not a new concept (Innabi & Sheikh, 2007).

The roots of CT dates back to Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (Altıntaş, 2019). Consecutively, Plato, Aristotle, Dewey, Wittgenstein, Piaget and Montesquieu followed Socrates and his ideas (Bür, 2014). This confirms that it is not a new concept. Greek philosophers deeply questioned that the things are not the same as they appeared (Bür, 2014). Therefore, they declared that the realities can only be seen by highly trained minds and intellectuals.

Socratic questioning was a technique for CT, which aimed to justify individuals their thoughts, opinions, ideas on any topic (Özmen, 2006). Therefore, CT required individuals to support the claims with adequate evidence, trustable sources and rational framework before

showing any attempt to accept and believe that claim (The Critical Thinking Community, 2019). It can be put forwarded that CT seeks for the clarity, depth, consistence, relevance, and accuracy on any issue (Scriven & Richard, 1987). It has thus been attributed to the scientific thinking or questioning of which main aim is to pop critical questions or problems that challenge authorities, unquestioned dogmas or doctrines of societies and conventional beliefs and attitudes (Schafersman,1991). In particular, 16th, 17th, 18th centuries are the time when the educational background of CT begins, where logic and reasoning skills were popularized. Also, Moore, Bacon, Descartes, Boyle, Newton played important roles in the criticality arena with their related books.

Popularity and importance of Critical Thinking in Language Learning

The changing nature of the world, together with its complexity and danger, CT is a must in all areas of life (Paul & Elder, 2002). In fact, CT has been in the educational field since Socrates; however, the given importance is more likely to be emphasized these days and has become an educational goal since the 1990s (Bür, 2014). The popularity of CT has gained much importance since not only is it a necessity of the 21st century but also it is a relevant aspect of education that needs to be integrated. Literacy does not solely mean knowing how to read and write like in the past; rather, illiteracy is today defined as those who cannot relearn, the one who cannot avoid their mistake and have critical eyes and reflective manners on the any information (Toffler, 1970). Therefore, illiterate people are the ones who cannot question, reflect and criticize what they have learnt. In this respect, since language and thought are intertwined (Piaget, 1971; Vygotsky, 1962), it is believed that if the language is cultivated well, the better thought process people might have or vice versa. At this point, Liaw (2007) suggests that EFL teachers are the most responsible ones who need to assist the acquisition of CT skills. Especially in EFL classrooms, it is seen much more vital as it might contribute to the improvement of

language skills by making students use meta-cognitive skills such as synthesis, analysis and evaluation. Furthermore, Renner (1996) states that the more learners benefit from higher order skills, the easier they can reach higher language skills and competency. In addition, Kabilan (2000) believes that if one wants to be a proficient language user, s/he has to be creative and critical when developing it.

CT has gained importance among English language classes. Ghanizadeh and Mirzaee (2012) state that what we need to do is to integrate criticality into the main objectives of education. Also, Meyer (1986 as cited in Alper, 2010) indicates that learners can use their potential only when they gain critical eye that needs reasoning. As seen clearly, the need and application of CT have been accepted by scholars as the indispensable need of the 21st century. Hence, CT has become a central issue among EFL classes as well as in other disciplines.

Perceived Competence

Definitions of perceived competence

There are some factors such as age, attitude, aptitude, anxiety, motivation level, perceived competence, which have been attributed to be affecting the language use (Şener, 2014). These factors might show either positive or negative contribution on foreign language competence and performance. In particular, perceived competence can be more related to actual language use and willingness to use it. It is generally defined as the perception of one's own language competence and how s/he perceives himself/herself in the target language (Cengizhan, 2019; Şener, 2014). It is the judgments of learners regarding their language abilities and competences. Therefore, when learners perceive themselves competent in the target language, their willingness is more likely to increase on the use of language (Bektaş, 2005, Cengizhan, 2018; Şener, 2014). In this sense, it is worthwhile to indicate that this is one of the strongest indicators of learners regarding the desire to use the language with communicative purposes. This is

important because when learners perceive that they are competent in the language, they also feel that they need to use it. However, when they believe that they lack competence, they may not show any desire to use the language in the real contexts.

Using productive skills in a foreign language atmosphere is said to be quite hard in that there are several variances that have an effect on it. One of them is basically self-perceived competence, which is related to the perceptions and views of one's own language competence. The importance of it can be shown wth the idea that the higher perceived competence is, the more likely students have a desire to communicate and use the target language (Barraclough et al.,1988). In this respect, it is vital to know that it is an important construct that English language learners need to develop.

Self-efficacy is another concept that needs to be worth mentioned here since it is closely related to the perceived competence. Self-efficacy is mostly defined as one's own views and opinions regarding his/her own abilities or capabilities on a certain task, particular assignment or behavior (McCombs, 2001; Schunk, 2001). It is thought be a self-system that has particular impact on one's emotions, feelings, behaviors, aims even success regarding language skills. (Bandura, 1997; Dörnyei, 2001). Therefore, if learners see their self-efficacy high to do an activity, outcome or task, they are likely to perceive their competence high and this may lead them to increase their success. The aforementioned situation is also valid when it comes to language success. When learners have high level of self-efficacy and perceived competence, this are likely to increase their motivation to use the language. There are also studies that confirm the positive relationship between self-efficacy and academic achievement (e.g. Mone et al., 1995; Ching, 2002).

Previous Studies

    International Studies

    CT has been investigated with different purposes, especially the focus of the relevant studies is on the possible correlations with various variances. For instance, Stapleton (2001) conducted a research to investigate whether Japanese university students lack CT or not after he had seen from the previous studies indicating that Asian learners have difficulty in raising their critical voice and thoughts. For this inquiry, he applied a questionnaire having 9 items in 5 different universities among 70 sophomore students and also, he utilized follow up interviews. He declares that the results are not like as indicated in the relevant literature. He points out that in Japan students have high tendency to show CT elements in their writing and also display critical voice and thoughts in the interviews. He links this result with the emergence and spread of Internet. He indicates that the reasoning and rhetorical forms of students are affected from the web sites that they use especially in writing classes. Therefore, he claims that there is a change in relation to CT and the biases towards Asian cultures should be broken down since this is not true anymore. On the other hand, Zare et al. (2013) investigated the relationship between CT and listening ability of 78 senior students whose departments were ELT and English translations in Iran. Quantitative research is conducted by using a questionnaire, having 30 items, and a test, having 70 multiple questions. CT beliefs of students are found to be high and listening performances found to be fairly well. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation were utilized afterwards. It was found that there is a significant correlation between the CT and listening performances of students. In this sense, they advocate that the higher CT beliefs of students, the better listening performances are.

    Some studies aimed to see whether the implementation of CT has any contribution to the language development. To illustrate, Yang and Gamble (2013) investigated whether CT

applied EFL instruction would contribute to the development of overall language proficiency namely reading and listening of students as well as their academic achievement. In order to assess the effectiveness of CT embedded classes, they created 2 groups where experimental group consisted of 31 students, and control group consisted of 37 students. The same lecturer used the same content and books in both groups. In the experimental group, the possible ways to enhance CT, shown in the literature, were implemented such as CT principles, strategies, argumentative essays, debating and peer critics and rubrics for critique are utilized whereas in the control group process writing, group presentations and collaboration-oriented tasks are utilized. To find out whether CT embedded classroom fosters language proficiency or not, the General English Proficiency Test, assessing overall reading and listening skills, is used as tool. Quantitative findings indicate that experimental group outperforms in language proficiency than the control group. Also, the essays are evaluated in terms of CT components with the Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric, and it shows that there is a significant difference between groups. Furthermore, through a content-oriented exam, experimental group is superior in contrast to control group in terms of academic achievement. Open-ended questions the interviews result that students were satisfied with the activities and regard CT as important and reflect CT skills. Similarly, Liaw (2007) followed a content-based approach in which CT skills were implemented in reading and writing classes so as to see whether incorporating CT skills into English lessons would have any contribution on the English language proficiency. The study was carried out in a high school (*n=32*). 5 different EFL syllabus were integrated in the experimental group and data collection tools were pre and post CT tests, proficiency tests, assignments and a questionnaire. Results displayed that CT skills of students did not show statistically significant differences, however in writing assignments CT components were observed. Also, language proficiency of students significantly developed. Therefore, it is

suggested that thinking and language are intertwined each other, and CT skills pursue the development of English language proficiency.

A group of researchers also investigated the relationship of CT with different variances. For example, Grosser and Nel (2013) sought the relationship of CT skills and academic language proficiency of 89 freshmen students who were prospective teachers. Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal test and the Test of Academic literacy were used as data collection tools. Results show that they lack both language proficiency and CT skills. They conclude that since language is a barrier that they didn't excel in, they have low cognitive and metacognitive skills, which result in difficulties in both producing ideas and interpretation of information. In a similar vein, Zin and Eng (2014) conducted a research to see the relationship between CT dispositions of Malaysian ESL learners and their critical reading skills. To achieve this goal, they measured the level of CT dispositions of 374 students and compared the dispositions level in relation to the results of their critical reading skills. California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory was applied to determine the levels of dispositions and Critical Reading Comprehension Test was also utilized to measure their critical reading skills. The total levels of dispositions were found to be merely average and among the sub-skills, truth-seeking, open mindedness and maturity were the lowest ones. In line with the results, critical reading results were also low, indicating that 86% participants could not justify their opinions and beliefs. Together with these results, researchers concluded that the dominance of teachers in education prevented learners from demonstrating critical reading skills and Asian culture obstructed learners to have the tendency towards CT in nature.

As seen above, the research body of CT in international contexts lack in terms of the correlation between the CT disposition and English language competency of learners. This study is therefore claimed to be filling a gap in the literature.

Turkish Studies

In the Turkish context, a bulk of research was carried out to see students' levels of CT and whether it changes depending upon several variances or not. To exemplify, Zayif (2008) conducted a research to see the critical dispositions of 502 teacher candidates, 292 females and 210 males, whose departments ranged from elementary school teaching, elementary mathematic teaching, elementary social sciences teaching to science teaching. The aim was to find out the general CT dispositions of the candidates and determine whether it changes depending on gender, school type, type of B.A program, GPA and class. The Turkish version of California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory was employed and descriptive statistics were carried out. The results showed that in general, the CT dispositions of the candidates were low; however, in the sub category of the inventory scale, analyticity and open-mindedness were positive in general, while inquisitiveness, self-confidence, truth seeking and systematicity were low. Moreover, junior students were found to be statistically more critical than freshmen students. Female students were found to be statistically better in terms of the CT dispositions. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between high school types and academic achievements. She therefore concluded that the reason why overall disposition was low was that candidates' society, background and learning culture did not foster CT, thus suggested that there should be a practical course where the candidates had a chance to put into practice what they learn in the theory. Similarly, Alagözlü and Saraç (2010) conducted a study to reveal the CT levels of prospective teachers of English (N=30) on writing. The participants wrote essays in both English and Turkish. Both languages were required because they wanted to see whether the possible lackness of CT was because of the linguistic difference or because of the ethnicity. In 45 minutes, they were told to write responds the given arguments taken by Ennis and Weir essay test. Then, 2 raters graded the essays. They found that their CT levels were low in both languages and the reason why they had low CT was not low English proficiency or the poor

writing skills of the students. Therefore, this study confirms the assumption that Asian learners lack CT since it is a culture-dependent skill and disposition that is not fostered and cultivated in the Asian and middle east cultures. They thus suggest that the only way to develop CT is to instruct CT, practice it and instruction the related strategies because it is a learnable concept. In addition, Alagözlü (2007) carried out a research to understand how ELT students perceive their CT levels and how they reflect CT in their writing. Participations, 76 ELT students, were required to write argumentative essays in the final exam of the English literature course and she applied two instruments in the data analysis process: Stapleton's criteria for the assessment of the argumentative essays which consisted of argument, reason, claims, refutation, conclusion and fallacies and also a Likert scale questionnaire. After essays were assessed by 2 raters, she applied a questionnaire which sought for the perceptions of students about their CT skills. The findings displayed that the essays lacked CT elements such as supported assertions, drawing logical conclusions and they were far from originality and students were eager to copy the thoughts and highly depended on the given material rather than creating new arguments and bringing new claims to the given scenery or drawing logical inferences. However, to her surprise, the results of the questionnaire showed that students had a high level of CT and they perceived themselves as critical. Thus, she concludes that the reason why students cannot raise their critical voice during the process of writing is the memorization-based curriculum of the programs. Students only learn how to memorize what they are given at schools, rather than how to be creative and original with the help of using critical elements of education.

Implementation of CT was also investigated to reveal whether there were significant differences or not. For instance, Bedir (2013) run a reading class to see whether CT strategies-based reading lessons contribute to the development of CT dispositions of 22 ELT freshmen. Lesson plans based on critical reading, interviews, observations, rubrics and assignments were utilized to gather data. Qualitative research design was used and behavioral changes of students

related to CT dispositions such as open mindness, systematicity, truth seeking etc. Results of interviews showed that students had CT dispositions after 10 weeks implementation. He concluded that lecturing style lessons are found easy and comfortable by students; however, this does not end up with effective results for CT. He therefore suggested CT be fostered and activities be used in classes by accepting the idea that it needs hard effort and work for teachers.

As has been noted above, although there have been studies both descriptive and experimental, to the best my knowledge, no study aimed to discover the relationship between CT dispositions and four language skills in the Turkish context. In this respect, this study aimed at contributing the literature by focusing on all four skills.

Summary

To conclude the literature chapter, this chapter of the dissertation was mainly an attempt to review and picture the framework of the theoretical backbone and background of the study. Firstly, each skill and their related concepts were clarified by indicating the major issues of them. Secondly, CT and its historical journey in relation with its popularity were demonstrated. Thirdly, perceived competence was emphasized since it is one of the variances that the study seeks. And lastly, relevant studies in both national and international contexts were also mentioned.

Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, the methodological basis of the study is presented. The procedures of the pilot and main study are clearly explained by mentioning the context involving the setting, the profile of the participants, data collection tools and how the analysis method. The chapter lastly ends with the summary part.

Research Methodology

This present study adopts a mixed-method research design since it integrates different methodologies that results in elaboration, clarification and enrichment of data (Creswell & Plano, 2007). Moreover, this methodological diversity enables researchers to compare and contrast the validated results in a more comprehensive and richer environment and this leads to the correspondence of the data results (Fırat et al., 2014).

Quantitative data deals with the numerical data whereas the qualitative data focuses on data through the verbal interaction (Taylor & Trumbull, 2005). Quantitative data is a matter of objectivity, reliability and generalization, on the other hand, qualitative data is rich in its own nature involving a detailed manner (Bryman,1988; Creswell, 2005, 2012). The advantage of using both research approaches in a study is that researchers can see the reality of the problem better (Creswell, 2005). Furthermore, the application of mixed-methods research designs has been in rise (Dörnyei, 2007) and it is appreciated in the social sciences and helps the restrictions obviate from the study (Creswell, 2005; Creswell, 2012; Dörnyei, 2007; Maxwell, 2005). A single method might be an important restriction and causes data not to be comprehensive and

meaningful. It might further be sensitive to understanding perceptions and experiences of samples and a barrier for the correspondence of results. In particular, it is thought that the unification of the methods can help research questions or hypotheses identify the realities, events or perceptions better.

The pilot study

The pilot study is a sort of first inquiry that reflects the process of the research. It is therefore a preliminary study that aims at checking the procedure of the study in terms of feasibility (In, 2017). It minimizes the possible barriers, problems or handicaps that can occur in the main study. Taking into this, to see whether the research procedure works or not, a pilot study was done.

The pilot study was carried out in the spring term of 2018-2019 academic year with the preparatory ELT-ELL students. The number of the participants was 75. California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTD-I) developed by Facione, Facione and Giancarlon (1992) and translated into Turkish by Kökdemir (2003), was applied. It consisted of 51 Likert-scale items. Secondly, to see the possible correlation between the CT disposition levels of students and their mid-term English speaking results, students' speaking mid-term results were gathered from the lecturers. To back up the quantitative data, qualitative data were collected as well. In the questionnaire, students were asked whether they were voluntary to participate the interviews or not. 5 voluntary students wrote their names and all of them attended the semi structured interviews. Interviews were done face to face in Turkish by recording interviewees' responses. They were firstly given a short briefing about CT, its history, its dimensions and its relation with language development. Then, they were asked about their CT dispositions levels, its relation with language development.

Implications for the main study

There were three main implications that have led the researcher to renovate the study. The first one is that the Turkish version of CCTD-I turned out to be sold to another institution and when the factor analysis results of the inventory were required from the receiver institution, the scale was not available for free. Therefore, the results of the pilot study could not be verified since the factors analysis of the items and permission were not given. For this reason, the researcher decided to find another scale for the purpose of determining CT dispositions scale. The second implication was the idea that the scope of the research was limited since the research aimed at determining the correlation between the CT and speaking exam results. Therefore, the scope of the study was extended to the other language skills. In addition, perceived competence was added as another variance since it is thought that it might have an effect on language use. Conclusively, the main study focused on the possible impact of CT dispositions of preparatory students and its role in English language competence and perceived English competence.

Main Study

By taking into account the implications of the pilot study and making the relevant changes, the main study was conducted in the fall term of 2019-2020 academic year at the School of Foreign Languages in a state university after getting the permission for study (See Appendix C).

Setting and participants

The participants of the study were 40 ELT and 45 ELL (N=87) preparatory students studying in a state university at the fall term of 2019-2020 academic year. The total number of the participants was 87. The ages of the students ranged from 17 to 31 (M = 19.18). 38 of them were male whereas 49 were female participants.

Table 2 below depicts the students' high school types. As seen, 69 participants were graduates of Anatolian high school, which included the highest frequency in the table. Science and religious high schools had the least frequencies.

Table 2

Participants' high school type

	Frequency	Percent
Science High School	1	1.1
Anatolian High School	69	79.3
Religious High School	1	1.1
Private High School	6	6.9
Vocational High School	3	3.4
Others	7	8.0
Total	87	100.0

18 participants volunteered for the interview session, however, because of their student related task-loads, 12 students participated in the qualitative data collection process voluntarily. All the volunteer students were called for the interview. They were first given 10 minutes mini informative sessions about CT by the researcher. In these informative sessions, students were informed about CT, its pathways in time, the prerequisites for CT, thoughts and language development. The sessions lasted 20 minutes. The semi structured questions were chosen for the interview because these kinds of questions are thought to easily elaborate the answers and it leads researchers to remodify the questions depending on the responses.

Data collection tools

Two different data collection tools were applied. Firstly, a scale was applied after getting the author's consent (See Appendix D). The inventory "Emotional Intelligence Critical Thinking Disposition (EMI)" was originally in English and developed in 2005 by Ricketts and Ruds. It had 26 items and divided into 3 factors: engagement, cognitive maturity and innovativeness.

The first factor, engagement, refers to the characteristics of individuals who is willing towards CT especially for the upcoming events or decisions. Demircioğlu (2012) mentions that these sorts of individuals are able to explain events or decisions in a logical and reasonable way. Therefore, engagement is closely related to the reasons, problem-solving skills and decision-making process.

The second one, cognitive maturity, refers to being open-minded and objective in the process of rejecting or agreeing an idea or argument. These kinds of individuals become aware of their biases towards an idea, a person or an event and regulate their own ideas or thoughts accordingly (Demircioğlu, 2012). Therefore, these types of individuals know that there is no single answer or perspective and show willingness towards other opinions, perspectives or answers.

The last factor, innovativeness, is more related to individuals who have intellectual inquiries or curiosities. More specifically, these people mostly look for new knowledge and want to know more and more (Demircioğlu, 2012). They are ready to change their thinking mindset accordingly. For this purpose, they read more and show tendency to research for what they are looking for.

Later, this inventory was adapted to Turkish by Demircioğlu in 2012, so she applied it to 9th grades which consisted of 1500 students in 125 different high schools. The Turkish version has 25 items and was a 5-point Likert type items (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree or disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree) having the same factors, which was the applied version in this study. The reliability test results of the inventory were moderate ($\alpha = 89.3$). The scale was applied to English language learners in Demircioğlu's study and since our participants were English language learners, the scale was thought to be suitable.

The questionnaire used in this study has 3 parts (See Appendix A). The first part was related to the demographic information and participants were required to indicate their gender, age, department high school type etc. In the second part, participants were required to show their perceptions regarding language skills separately. The last part was the scale itself. Additionally, the researcher also wanted students to write down their own English proficiency exam results separately. In the second phase of the study, follow up interviews were done for the purpose of getting in depth data. Semi structured interview questions were asked to the voluntary participants, prepared by the researcher (See appendix B). The interviews were made in Turkish so as not to create linguistic barriers for the interviewees and participants were wanted to feel more comfortable in putting their ideas into words. The researcher firstly started the interview procedure by informing the participants about CT, its historical journey and more specifically its relation with language. This part was basically briefing session of the interview and it ended within 10 minutes.

Data analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Since the normal data distribution did not exist, under the non-parametric

analysis, Mann-Whitney U and Spearman analyses were carried out. The descriptive, correlational and frequency analysis were carried out.

The qualitative data have been analyzed via content analysis by the researcher. Content analysis is a type of data analysis in which texts or interviews are analyzed systematically, analytically and subjectively (Berg, 2017; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Kassarjian, 1977). The classifications are made through codes, themes, headlines or patterns. Taking into this, the frequencies and repetitions of certain words turned into codes. Namely, each code was prepared after determining their frequencies. Also, for the inter-rater reliability, a peer researcher from ELT department read a transcription of the interview codes and coded the data. The consistency of the codes between two raters was found to be 85%.

Summary

This methodology chapter is the framework that focuses on depiction of the study's research context by referring to research methodology, the pilot study and its implications. Then, the profile of the participants, the applied data collection tools and the data analysis method were mentioned.

Chapter Four

Findings and Discussions

Introduction

In this chapter, each research question's findings are showed and discussed by referring to the findings of previous studies. Firstly, the quantitative findings are presented and interpreted and secondly, the qualitative findings are presented and interpretations are made.

Research Question 1: The results of critical thinking dispositions of preparatory students

According to the findings, the mean score of CT disposition was 3.99 ($SD = 0.46$). This indicates that the CT disposition level of students was slightly above moderate level. This could indicate that participants moderately question, debate and discuss topics and look for reasons and tend to be open-minded.in their life. This finding is line with what Akdağ (2018) found in his study. He carried out a research in Anatolian high school with 10th grade students and found that his participants' CT disposition level was moderate. On the other hand, the present finding contrasts with the findings of several studies (e.g. Akdere, 2012; Sisay, 2019; Zayif, 2008). Akdere (2012) found that Turkish pre-service teacher candidates' disposition level was low. Sisay (2019) showed that 108 preparatory students in Ethiopia whose department ranging from social sciences to natural sciences had low and weak CT disposition levels. Zayif (2008) also found that 502 teacher candidates in a Turkish state university from 4 different departments had low level of CT disposition. These studies showed that learners in different contexts may fail to improve their CT dispositions.

These contradictory results suggest that the contexts of the study groups and participants' background, age, gender or locations might lead to the different disposition levels,

and therefore, CT could be influenced by various factors. This means that CT is not solely an individual trait or characteristics but a context-based concept (Aylin-Buran, 2016).

The study was also concerned with revealing the extent to which participants reported to be critical in the components of CT that are included in the scale.

Table 3

Critical Thinking Dispositions of Preparatory Students

	N	M	SD
Cognitive Maturity	87	4.09	0.52
Innovativeness	87	3.99	0.53
Engagement	87	3.94	0.52

As can be seen in Table 3, participants reported to be most critical in maturity (M =4.09, SD= .52), followed by innovativeness (M =3.99, SD=.53) and engagement (M =3.94, SD= .52). When the sub-factors were taken into consideration, it is seen that these sub-factors were at slightly moderate level as well. This means that participants had a moderate level of CT disposition in the sub-factors.

CT has been investigated in other studies with different sub-factors (e.g. Aylin-Buran, 2016; Alper, 2010; Grosser & Nel, 2013). Cognitive maturity is a sub-factor that may be related to open-mindness in these studies since cognitively mature individuals may be open to other ideas, sides or opinions regarding any topic as well as showing tolerance to others. To do so, individuals need mental and physical maturity. Considering that the participants of these studies were university students who were around 20 years old, they were likely to be cognitively mature, and hence, open-minded. For instance, several studies (e.g. Aylin-Buran, 2016; Çiçek-Sağlam & Büyükuysal, 2013) examined CT disposition of prospective teacher candidates from different departments ranging from Turkish, English, Primary, Science, and confirmed that the highest sub-factor was open-mindness. Çubukçu (2006) also found that the teacher candidates

studying in a state university reported open mindedness as the highest sub-factor. This similar finding can be because of maturity of participants.

Innovativeness is a sub-factor which could be related to curiosity or inquisitiveness. Curious individuals are generally defined as the ones who are willing to discover new ways or solutions when dealing with obstacles or problems and in the same way, innovative individuals are curious about news ideas or new events that will lead to further unknown facts or ideas related to any topic (Demircioğlu, 2012). Aylin-Burhan (2016) confirms that innovativeness is the highest sub-factor in her study whereas what Çiçek-Sağlam and Büyükuysal (2013) found in their study is in contrast with this finding. These contradictory findings show the complexity of CT.

Engagement was also found to be at moderate level in this study. This factor seems to be in line with the factors such as analyticity, reasoning or problem solving that are addressed in other studies in other studies (e.g. Alper, 2010; Aylin-Buran, 2016; Çiçek-Sağlam & Büyükuysal, 2013). Contrarily, these studies found reasoning at a lowel level. Although the participants of these studies were university students, they revealed contradictory findings regarding engagement. This may show that engagement may not be related to the level of education.

Research Question 2: The correlation between critical thinking dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students

In order to measure the correlations between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students, Spearman's correlation test was carried out. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Correlation between Critical Thinking Dispositions and Language Proficiency Exam Scores
(N = 87)

		L &Sp.	Reading	Writing	Use of English	CT Average	Engagement	Innovativeness	Maturity
Spearman's rho	Listening Speaking	Correlation Coefficient	1.00							
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.							
	Reading	Correlation Coefficient	.554**	1.00						
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.00							
	Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.124	.310**	1.00					
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.251	.004						
	Use of English	Correlation Coefficient	.447**	.436**	.629**	1.00				
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.				
	Criticality Average	Correlation Coefficient	.068	.099	-.046	.029	1.000			
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.534	.362	.674	.790	.			
	Engagement	Correlation Coefficient	.096	.133	-.022	.047	.879**	1.000		
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.377	.219	.840	.666	.000	.		
	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.106	.080	-.008	.117	.859**	.658**	1.000	
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.329	.461	.939	.281	.000	.000	.	
	Maturity	Correlation Coefficient	-.084	-.040	-.026	-.076	.806**	.550**	.614**	1.000
		Sig.(2-tailed)	.441	.716	.809	.484	.000	.000	000	.

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 shows that there was no statistically significant correlation between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores ($p > .05$). Also, the sub factors, namely engagement, innovativeness and maturity were not related to language proficiency exam scores ($p > .05$).

This finding was not in line with the previous studies which found correlations between CT and language skills (e.g. Grosser & Nel, 2013; Liaw, 2007; Yang & Gamble, 2014). They stated that as the CT level increased, the proficiency and competency level of participants developed in their language skills such as communication, writing, listening. However, our finding did not support this claim. This might be attributed the fact that language proficiency is very complex and it may be influenced by various factors. That's to say, there might be various factors that could promote language proficiency other than CT.

Research Question 3: The differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores

The language proficiency exam scores of participants with different levels of criticality were also compared. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Differences between participants with different language proficiency scores

		N	Mean rank	Mean Difference	Sig
Listening & Speaking	Low	29	39.24	N/A	.21
	High	58	46.38		
	Total	87			
Reading	Low	29	42.81	N/A	.75
	High	58	44.59		
	Total	87			
Writing	Low	29	43.83	N/A	.92
	High	58	44.34		
	Total	87			
Exam Average	Low	29	41.60	N/A	.53
	High	58	45.20		
	Total	87			

As displayed in Table 5, there were no statistically significant differences between participants with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores (p > .05). However, although the difference was not statistically significant, students with higher exam scores in each language area reported to be more critical. However, this was considered that the differences were not statistically significant, it may not be appropriate to state that CT improves language proficiency. On the other hand, there are studies (e.g. Davidson, 1994; Yang & Gamble, 2014) confirming that language learners who are taught CT and its dimensions improved their language skills. In particular, Yang and Gamble (2014) proved that CT contributed to the overall proficiency of reading and listening skills of Taiwan non-English major students. Davidson (1994) concluded that writing development was achieved after implementing CT in language classes in Iran. There are some studies which revealed correlations between CT and language skills. Işık (2010) found that there was a

positive correlation between CT and reading skills. Moreover, Bardakçı (2010) also found that after giving CT related treatments to ELT students, participants' critical reading ability increased as well. Zhang (2019) concluded that Chinese EFL students developed their critical writing in academic English after the experimental treatment. These studies statistically proved that participants' reading and writing skills improved. These contradictory findings show that the relationship between CT and language proficiency may be questionable.

Research Question 4: The correlation between critical thinking dispositions and perceived language competence

In order to test the correlation between CT dispositions and perceived language competence of the participants, Spearman's correlation test was carried out. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Critical Thinking Dispositions and Perceived Language Competence of Students

Spearman's rho

		Critical/average	Engagement	Innovativeness	Maturity	English	Grammar	Reading	Writing	Listening	Speaking	Vocabulary	Pronunciation
Criticalltvaverage	Correlation Coefficient	1.000											
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.											
	N	87											
Engagement	Correlation Coefficient	.879**	1.000										
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.										
	N	87	87										
Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.859**	.658**	1.000									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.									
	N	87	87	87									
Maturity	Correlation Coefficient	.806**	.550**	.614**	1.000								
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.								
	N	87	87	87	87								
English	Correlation Coefficient	.100	.169	.074	-.040	1.000							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.355	.118	.498	.712	.							
	N	87	87	87	87	87							
Grammar	Correlation Coefficient	-.046	.016	-.053	-.098	.306**	1.000						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.674	.886	.628	.367	.004	.						
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87						
Reading	Correlation Coefficient	.209	.263*	.217*	.009	.566**	.211	1.000					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.052	.014	.044	.937	.000	.050	.					
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87					
Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.209	.234*	.168	.127	.427**	.120	.267*	1.000				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.053	.029	.121	.239	.000	.268	.013	.				
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87				
Listening	Correlation Coefficient	.037	.070	-.007	-.079	.489**	.121	.430**	.271*	1.000			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.730	.519	.946	.468	.000	.262	.000	.011	.			
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87			
Speaking	Correlation Coefficient	.101	.138	.052	.003	.527**	.092	.354**	.321**	.561**	1.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.354	.202	.635	.980	.000	.399	.001	.002	.000	.		
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87		
Vocabulary	Correlation Coefficient	.128	.149	.145	.014	.499**	.193	.371**	.497**	.384**	.406**	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.239	.170	.180	.899	.000	.073	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	
Pronunciation	Correlation Coefficient	.184	.213*	.144	.146	.435**	.145	.343**	.308**	.284**	.563**	.472**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.088	.047	.183	.177	.000	.179	.001	.004	.008	.000	.000	.
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87

Table 6 depicts that there were no statistically significant correlations between criticality average and perceived language competence ($p > .05$). However, the sub-factors of CT correlated with some skills. It was found that reading had a weak correlation with engagement ($r = .26$, $p < .05$) and innovativeness ($r = .21$, $p < .05$). Also, writing has a weak correlation with engagement ($r = .23$) and pronunciation has a weak correlation with engagement ($r = .21$ $p < .05$). That is to say that perceived reading and writing competence are correlated with CT. This can be attributed to the fact that students who are inclined to innovativeness and engagement may perceive themselves better at reading and writing. This suggests that students with inquiry spirits and curious minds as well as problem solver intellectualists may be more dispositional towards perceived reading as well as writing.

Research Question 5: The differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence

Different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence were calculated and depicted in Table 7. In doing so, it was aimed at seeing whether there were differences between participants with different perceived language competence with regard to CT dispositions.

Table 7

Differences between participants with different perceived language competence

		N	Mean rank	Mean Difference	Sig
English	Low	29	41.60	N/A	.47
	High	58	45.20		
	Total	87			
Grammar	Low	29	43.19	N/A	.64
	High	58	45.62		
	Total	87			
Reading	Low	29	41.16	N/A	.41
	High	58	45.42		
	Total	87			
Writing	Low	29	38.98	N/A	.15
	High	58	46.51		
	Total	87			
Listening	Low	29	39.57	N/A	.22
	High	58	46.22		
	Total	87			
Speaking	Low	29	39.03	N/A	.17
	High	58	46.48		
	Total	87			
Vocabulary	Low	29	38.19	N/A	.16
	High	58	46.91		
	Total	87			
Pronunciation	Low	29	38.05	N/A	.10
	High	58	46.97		
	Total	87			

As shown in Table 7, there were no statistically significant differences between participants who hold different perceived competences in English and different language skills. In spite of the fact that there was not statistically significant difference, it is seen that in all skills, the higher level of perceived competences seem to indicate higher levels of criticality. The high perceived competence may help students see themselves as competent and self-confident in language and this probably makes it easy for them to use the language in especially productive skills (Cengizhan, 2019; Şener, 2014). In relation to this, when students perceive themselves competent, this also lets them pose questions, ask unknown ones freely, give them confidence to freely speak up as well as give him/ her courage to declare his/her own opinion without hesitation. All these eventually could meet the gateways of criticality.

Research Question 6: The opinions of students regarding the connection between their critical thinking dispositions and language competence

In addition to the quantitative data, to be able to answer the sixth research question, qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews to support the quantitative data and collect in-depth data. The results are presented below under sub-titles.

Participants' views about the needs of English language learners for CT

To further understand the possible connection between CT and language learning, interviewees were asked to comment whether English language learners need CT or not, and all of them agreed that they needed it. They proposed that CT is a kind of a process of ability gaining such as self-research and self-learning, having different perspectives, questioning the truth.

Participants' conceptualizations regarding CT showed that they basically perceived CT as researching something in the Internet, having different ideas about any topic and the ability to question the truth.

Because students should analyze more than what's learnt, search it and think on it by himself/herself more than what is given at school to them. (P1)

We search in the lesson and questions are asked and then I can answer it and have opinions related to them. Later, when I come across the same question, I can already have my own opinion on it. (P11)

The quotes above refer to the skill profile of CT. The skill profile confirms that CT is a way of understanding information and clarifying and expressing it logically (Facione, 2007). Moreover, related to questioning the truth, CT is regarded as the analysis, synthesis and evaluation of any information to question and verify the knowledge (Facione et al. 1995; Innabi & Sheikh, 2007). Therefore, participants in a way confirmed the skill profile of CT. In talking about the significance of developing CT, P3 stated that:

We need to be critical thinker in every aspect of life because being bigot is for animal not for us therefore our first duty as a human is to think and question. (P3)

It is clear that none of the participants mentioned the disposition profile of CT while they were talking about their CT conceptualizations. It is also known that CT is a dispositional dynamic that one has or has brought from birth. Inquisitiveness, self-confidence or maturities are some of the characteristics of dispositional profile of CT (Facione & Facione, 1992). In this sense, participants did not conceptualize CT as a dispositional concept. Therefore, they may not be aware of the fact that CT is also related to the characteristic trait and not just pertaining to skill profile.

Participants views about the role of CT on English language learning

When participants were asked to comment on the role of CT in English language learning, the most reoccurring codes indicated the development of self-research, and guessing the unknown words.

Most participants attributed the fact that they researched a lot on language and made deductions after research. By saying 'research', they meant the research done on/ about the English language itself in the Internet. They again stressed in a way that if they have CT, they will be capable of developing their research skill, and making deductions on their language skills. These were all also confirmed in the literature. It is stressed that students may improve their language and linguistic knowledge by making deductions, having multiple opinions and analyzing information (Kabila, 2000; Liaw, 2007; Renner, 1996). They are all gateways of CT. Participants in a sense stressed that they need to use skill profile of CT. Some participants justified this assumption as follows:

> What is taught at school cannot be enough. One may need to do a research by himself/herself. (P1)

> There are latin-rooted words in English. When we are aware of these words and we think about them, we then can make different deductions. (P3)

Additionally, participants added that with the help of CT, they became aware of the possibilities that there could be different perspectives about any issue. Therefore, they claimed that CT may have an impact upon the understanding of culture and cultural aspect of the target language. For example, P2 emphasized this issue as follows:

English is another culture's language. Therefore, we enter a new culture and wonder how these people think. We see that there are different opinions in different cultures. (P2)

When participants were asked to explain which language skills are more related to CT, they mostly mentioned speaking, writing, reading and vocabulary. They assumed that by reading in English, one can learn more vocabulary and information and then s/he can put these into words through writing. It seems that participants conceptualized CT as a skill that is gained through reading and put into practiced through writing. For instance, P5 and P1 stressed vocabulary as follows:

CT means the development of vocabulary, I think. To be critical thinker, one needs to do a research and read other sources and in this way, s/he will find more words. (P5)

I see the advantages mostly on vocabulary. (P1)

Writing and reading were also emphasized by the participants as follows:

I can be very creative and write better (P12)

Particularly reading and writing because the more one does a research the more   s/he will learn vocabulary and as s/he reads, s/he will be able to write more and more. (P1)

I can say reading and writing because we read passages a lot and I think on it. (P4)

Speaking was also mentioned. For example, P8 emphasized speaking as follows:

We can see in the class that the ones who have much knowledge can think more and speak better (P8)

As can be seen in the quotes above, most of the participants explained that CT has an impact on the development of speaking, writing, reading and vocabulary. These claims also confirmed by several researchers and studies showing that there is an impact of CT on language learning. There are several studies which found that CT has an impact on reading (e.g. Bardakçı, 2010; Işık, 2010; Yang & Gamble, 2014) and on writing (e.g. Davidson, 1994; Zhang, 2019). It is noteworthy to declare that participants did not mention listening. They did not believe that CT leads to the development in listening skills. This is most probably due the fact that they perceive listening as a passive skill that is nothing to do with CT.

The perception of the participants on being critical or noncritical and the reasons behind these

When asked whether they perceive themselves as a critical learner or not, most of them agreed. They said that they wanted to search and look the information up on the internet before accepting everything.

Participants insistently declared that searching in the Internet, verifying information or questioning knowledge were highly related to CT. These showed that they perceive criticality as a search-based concept. These can be true when CT is regarded as a skill. However, they did not mention the characteristic traits or inquiry spirit and minds, which is more related to the dispositional profile of CT.

I don't believe in what I hear and I think that I need to search it before accept it. (P1)

I do a research even if I am sure on a topic and accept it. (P7)

They seemed that they did not take into account the dispositional profile of CT. CT is not just about doing a research or verifying knowledge. It is also related to the inquisitive spirit or mind that is dispositional towards CT. As Brookfield (1987) indicates a skeptic mind is inclined towards inquisitiveness and this leads to analytic mind. Therefore, participants did not

take into account the characteristic trait of CT. Their understanding of CT is mainly based on researching, verifying and questioning. Therefore, their understanding of CT does not totally reflect what CT is.

Moreover, when participants were asked the reasons behind their CT, they said that they wanted to learn the realities, truths deeply to be sure and to be objective on any topic before accepting it. Participants mostly uttered the true reason of being a critical thinker is to see and reach the truth. It seemed that they perceived CT as a gateway before accepting any idea. Some of the relevant comments are as follows:

> The non-critical thinkers do not think on any topic and when they hear something, they directly pass it on others. They are not objective they are rather superficial. (P4)

> I want to be sure. I can easily check on the phone and google it. (P5)

> I don't like accepting what the society accepts and believe blindly everything. (P2)

On the other hand, there are a few participants who said that they were partly critical thinkers because of the test culture of the education and high reliance on the teacher. Some of the participants touched upon the barriers that prevent them to have criticality. Criticality requires individuals to be active and free minds which are ready to analyze and question what is learnt in a free way (Facione, 2007; Kabilan, 2000; Lipmn, 2007; Renner, 1996). Therefore, the education system that fosters CT is an indispensible necessity for CT development. However, their education system pushed them to choose one correct answer through 4 or 5 choices. Their educational background may be a big handicap for CT development because for CT, questions are more important than answers and individuals should create their own evaluations and thoughts rather than choosing a set of correct answers. Also, CT requires students to be active in the way of learning not passive learners who lean to their teachers. Therefore, the following utterances of participants are in line with what CT's principles suggest.

Sometimes I am critical thinker but most of the time I am not because we have grown up in the test and multiple choice culture so whenever I see something, I directly look for the choices. Also, in our class nobody questions the teacher. If s/he says something, that's totally true, to their opinion. (P2)

I think critically but I cannot put it into practice. In my high school, what the principal or teacher said was always true and we could not resist them. So, I am hopeless in any way. (P11)

Just two participants also added that they are critical because their character is like this and they have doubts all the time.

The things I know as true may not be true so before thinking deeply, it is not good to say this is true. (P8)

In my daily life, I am a person who likes criticizing therefore, CT comes from my character. (P1)

P1 and P8 were the only ones who attributed their being CT as something related to their characteristic traits. This showed that most of the participants perceived CT a skill rather than characteristic trait apart from P1 and P8. There were not aware that the dispositional profile of CT is also an important trait just like a set of skills.

The disadvantages of being non critical while learning English

Although participants declared that thanks to their CT, they benefitted from reading, writing development a lot, most of them mentioned that they lack speaking. They complained that they still need to improve their CT level because they felt that they were not so successful in speaking as they hoped for. It seemed that if they reached their CT level at the top, their speaking skill would be better. The participants mentioned this as follows:

I think that my speaking is not good because we have not been fostered to think critically until university. (P2)

I see myself incompetent in speaking so I cannot be critical. (P6)

I see myself incompetent in speaking. (P11)

In fact, this attribution was confirmed by several researchers (Malmir & Shoorcheh, 2012; Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014) indicating that CT makes EFL learners good English speakers and better at language skills. Therefore, since language and thought are intertwined, it is possible that when they acquire CT skills, they probably have better speaking skills.

The Suggestions of participants to overcome the lack of CT

Lastly, participants were asked what to do to overcome the lack of CT. Teaching criticality and search in the internet were the most reoccurring codes.

I think it is possible through education if our teachers teach CT to us because we then develop ourselves. (P3)

I succeed CT by searching, asking questions and thinking on it. (p7)

I would research more and get knowledge more and more. I cannot say all things I know are true, so I would do a research. (P10)

Their suggestions were in line with what Van Gelder (2005) highly recommended. He stressed that CT can be explicitly taught students and deliberate CT teaching was a must. This suggestion was also made for English language learners by several studies (e.g Malmir & Shoorcheh, 2012; Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014) confirming that language learners positively benefitted from deliberate CT teaching. Moreover, participants also claimed that self-research can be developed by students. This is actually a good advice for the ones copying every piece of information

without questioning or even searching a little bit. The nature of CT in fact requires individuals

to be inquisitive and tend to look for other alternatives and opinions.

Chapter Five

Conclusions and Implications

Introduction

The chapter mainly presents the summary of the study. First of all, the aims, methodological basis and the main findings of the study are provided. Secondly, the conclusions inferred from the findings are mentioned. Lastly, implications of the study are highlighted and then suggestions are offered.

Summary of the study

Aim. The aim of this study was to explore the possible relationship between the CT disposition and English language competence and perceived English competence. To do so, it investigated the CT dispositions of preparatory students studying in a state university (N=87) and its relationship with some variances such as perceived language competence and English exam scores. Therefore, the following research questions have been aimed to answer.

- RQ1: What are the CT dispositions of preparatory students?

- RQ2: Is there any significant correlation between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students?

- RQ3: What are the differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores?

- RQ4: Is there any significant correlation between CT dispositions and perceived language competence?

- RQ5: What are the differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence?

- RQ6: What do students think about the connection between their CT dispositions and language competence?

Summary of methodology

The present study adopts a mixed-method research design. In the first place, the inventory "Emotional Intelligence Critical Thinking Disposition (EMI)", translated into Turkish by Demircioğlu (2012) was applied to the participants who were 40 ELT and 45 ELL (*N*=87) preparatory students studying in a state university at the fall term of 2019-2020 academic year. In the second place, follow-up interviews were done with 12 volunteer participants. Participants' mid-term examination scores were used as the indicators of their English language competence

The quantitative data were analyzed via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Since the distribution of the data was non-normal, the non-parametric analysis was implemented through Mann-Whitney U and Spearman analyses. The descriptive, correlational and frequency analysis were carried out. The qualitative data have been analyzed via content analysis.

Summary of the main findings

The main findings of the study were summarized below in line with the similar headlines of the research questions.

Critical thinking dispositions of preparatory students. The first research question of the current study was to display the CT dispositions of preparatory students. The results showed that CT disposition level of students was slightly above moderate level. When the sub-factors were taken into consideration, it is seen that the sub-factors were slightly at moderate level as

well. Participants reported to be most critical in maturity followed by innovativeness and engagement.

The correlation between critical thinking dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students. The second research question aimed at testing the correlation between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students. The findings indicated that there was no statistically significant correlation between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores. Also, the sub factors, namely engagement, innovativeness and maturity were not related to language proficiency exam scores.

The differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores. The third research question investigated the differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores. Therefore, the language proficiency exam scores of participants with different levels of criticality were compared. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences between participants with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores. However, although the difference was not statistically significant, students with higher exam scores in each language area reported to be more critical.

The correlation between critical thinking dispositions and perceived language competence. The fourth question aimed to test the correlation between CT dispositions and perceived language competence of the participants. The results revealed that there were no statistically significant correlations between criticality and perceived language competence. However, the sub-factors of CT correlated with some skills: perceived reading and writing competence.

The differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence. The fifth research question attempted to reveal the differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence. The findings displayed that there were no statistically significant differences between participants who hold different perceived competences in English and different language skills. However, it is seen that in all skills, the higher level of perceived competences seem to indicate higher levels of criticality.

The opinions of students regarding the connection between their critical thinking dispositions and language competence. The last research question sought to gather the opinions of students regarding the connection between their CT dispositions and language competence. The results showed that most of the participants perceived themselves as critical thinker and all of them believed that there was a close connection between their CT dispositions and language competence. Also, it was seen that they conceptualized CT as a kind of a process of ability such as self-research and self-learning, having different perspectives, questioning the truth. In this way, they described the skills profile of CT but none of them mentioned the disposition profile of the CT while they were talking about their CT conceptualizations. Moreover, the results indicated that the participants referred to the role of CT on English language learning as the development of self-research, and guessing the unknown words. Furthermore, they mostly listed the developments language skills as speaking, writing, reading and vocabulary and believed that CT is more related to speaking, writing, reading and vocabulary. It was also seen that none of the participants mentioned listening as a relevant factor to CT. Participants also declared that they lack speaking since they cannot fully use their CT or improve CT level. It is noteworthy to indicate that a few participants who touched upon the barriers that prevent them to have criticality said the testing system in the education and high reliance on the teacher main were the barriers for them. They also made suggestions to

overcome the lack of CT. They recommended that teaching CT and searching in the Internet as useful ways to overcome the deficits of CT.

Conclusions and Implications

The conclusions of the findings are drawn in this part. The conclusions are presented below in line with the similar headlines of the research questions. After that, implications are drawn in line with the conclusions.

Critical thinking dispositions of preparatory students. The present study showed that the CT disposition level of students was slightly above moderate level. This was the same for the sub-factors as well. Although this finding may be positive, this could call for a need for improving their CT dispositions. The participants of this study were going to become teachers or philologists of English. Therefore, as necessity of 21st century skill, participants' dispositions need to be increased in the following 4 years because not only as a teacher candidate but also as a 21st century individuals, they are needed to be given courses on CT and taught CT skills as well. Teaching CT explicitly might help participants develop their CT skills.

The correlation between critical thinking dispositions and language proficiency exam scores of preparatory students. The present study revealed that there was no statistically significant correlation between CT dispositions and language proficiency exam scores. The relationship between CT and language was found questionable in this study. Therefore, an experimental study is also needed to make sure whether there is a relationship between CT and language proficiency. Also, there might be other factors affecting CT and those factors need to be investigated.

The differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences between participants with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of language proficiency scores. However, students with higher exam scores in each language area reported to be more critical. CT may not directly lead to the development of language competence. There may be other factors that may be more associated with improved language competence.

The correlation between critical thinking dispositions and perceived language competence. The study revealed that there were no statistically significant correlations between criticality average and perceived language competence. However, the sub-factors of CT correlated with some skills. That is to say, perceived reading and writing competence correlated with CT. Helping these students improve their perceptions on reading and writing might contribute their CT level. Therefore, it may be useful to offer CT integrated reading and writing courses.

The differences between students with different levels of criticality dispositions in terms of perceived competence. The findings of the study displayed that there were no statistically significant differences between participants who hold different perceived competences in English and different language skills. Despite this, it is seen that in all skills, the higher level of perceived competences seem to indicate higher levels of criticality. Although the differences were not statistically significant, this finding may suggest that if students feel themselves competent in English, their CT might improve. The implication of this finding can be interpreted that students needed to improve their language competency and their perceptions on English language.

The opinions of students regarding the connection between their critical thinking dispositions and language competence. The findings of qualitative data showed that participants thought that they were critical thinkers and believed that learners with more CT may be exposed to English more. This may help them improve their English competence. However, they seemed to complain about their CT level because they still had difficulty in speaking. Also, some of the participants complained about the testing system in the education system and high reliance on teacher. They suggested CT teaching and search in the Internet to overcome the deficits of CT.

These results have several implications. The first one is that the courses that they will take in the following years are needed to integrate more reading, writing and vocabulary-based activities and tasks. In this way, they will get a chance to develop their CT through these activities. The second one is that student-centered education is needed because students said that high reliance on teacher was a big handicap and could not develop their CT where teachers were regarded as the information distributor. Also, as mentioned by the participants, the multiple choice test and testing system in education do not let students improve their CT. To overcome this, it may be useful to change the testing system. The third one is that direct CT training or courses seem to be needed. Some participants mentioned that they could improve CT by means of explicit teaching. In the following years, CT-based courses could help them gain CT and its dimensions. Also, to foster CT, it may be effective to give tasks, homework and assignments that require them to search in the net. In this way, they develop curiosity, analytic and inquiry spirits.

Methodological implications

After the results were analyzed, three methodological implications were drawn and these are stated below.

Data context: The study investigates the CT dispositions of preparatory students studying in a state university (*N*=87) and its relationship with some variances such as gender, perceived language competence, and English exam scores. To confirm the results of this study to a broader extent, the study should be replicated in different universities with different and larger participants.

Data tools: In this study, a scale "Emotional Intelligence Critical Thinking Disposition (EMI)" translated into Turkish by Demircioğlu in 2012, has been utilized as a data collection tool. To confirm the present findings, a different scale might be used in another study. Also, the proficiency exam results of the participants were gathered from their midterm exam scores of the participants in this study. Therefore, to confirm the results of this study, another study might use the final exam scores of students to see the real English competence of the participants.

Design of the Study: The nature of the study was based on the correlational research design. In future studies, an experimental study might be needed to refute or confirm the present results of this study because an experimental study can directly show whether there is an impact of CT on participants' language competence or not.

References

Aebersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and Strategies for Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Akdemir, S., S. (2013). *A qualitative investigation of the characteristics of language learners as listeners according to the strategies they use in EFL listening*, (Doctoral dissertation), Atatürk University.

Akdağ, E. (2018). *Infusion of critical thinking skills into high school 10th grade EFL classes*., (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Çukurova University.

Akdere, N. (2012). *Turkish pre-service teachers' critical thinking levels, attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs in teaching for critical thinking,*(Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), Middle East Technical University.

Aksan, Doğan. (1999). *Anlambilim Konuları ve Türkçenin Anlambilimi [Semantic topics and Turkish semantics],* Bilgi Yayınevi.

Alagözlü, N. (2007). Critical Thinking and EFL Writing. *Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *9* (3) pp. 118-136.

Alagözlü, N. & Süzer, S. S. (2010). Language And Cognition: Is Critical Thinking A Myth In Turkish Educational System? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2(2),782-786.*

Alamargot, D., & Chanquoy, L. (Eds.). (2001). *Through the Models of Writing*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Alper, A. (2010). Critical Thinking Disposition of Pre-service Teachers. *Education and Science*, *35*(158), 14-27.

Altıntaş, E. (2019). *A comparative study of critical thinking dispositions of monolingual and bilingual children*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Ondokuz Mayıs University.

Aylin-Burhan, A. (2016). *An analysis of the critical thinking of university students enrolled in a faculty of education,* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Boğaziçi University.

Balemir, S. H. (2009). *The sources of foreign language speaking anxiety and the relationship between proficiency level and degree of foreign language speaking anxiety*, (Unpublished Master's thesis), Bilkent University.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Baraz, A. (2012). *The effect of using metacognitive strategies embedded in explicit-reflective nature of science instruction on the development of pre-service science teachers' understandings of nature of science*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Middle East Technical University.

Bardakçı, M. (2010). *The impact of raising awareness about reasoning fallacies on the development of critical reading*, (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Gazi University.

Barraclough, R. A., Christophel, D. M., & McCroskey, J. C. (1988). Willingness to communicate: A cross cultural investigation. *Communication Research Reports*, *5*(2), 187-192.

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Bedir, H. (2013). Reading and critical thinking skills in ELT classes of Turkish students, *World Applied Sciences Journal 21*(10), 1436-1439.

Belet, D. (2005). *Öğrenme stratejilerinin okuduğunu anlama ve yazma becerileri ile Türkçe dersine ilişkin tutumlara etkisi [The impact of learning strategies on reading comprehension and writing skills and its effect on attitudes regarding Turkish lesson],* (Unpublished Doctoral. dissertation), Anadolu University.

Bektaş, Ç. Y. (2005). Turkish collage students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language, (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Ohio State University.

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2017). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Beyer, B. K. (1987). *Practical Strategies for the Teaching of Thinking*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bloom B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Co Inc.

Bozkurt, S. (2019). *The effects of role-play and storytelling on the speaking performance, University, İstanbul. speaking anxiety and communication willingness of EFL students*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Marmara University.

Brown, G. A., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking.* Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.

Butler, H. A. (2012). Halpern Critical Thinking Assessment predicts real-world outcomes of critical thinking. *Applied Cognitive Psy-chology*, *25*(5), 721–729.

Bür, B. (2014). *A study on teacher questions: do they promote critical thinking?* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Gazi University.

Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*, Second Edition. New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. San Francisco, California. A Pearson Education Company.

Cengizhan, M. (2019). *The role of out-of-class activities in improving ELT students' vocabulary knowledge,* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.

Ceylan, E. (2016). *An exploratory study on the relationship between motivation types, metacognitive awareness, and EFL listening proficiency*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Dokuz Eylül University.

Chaney, A. L., & Burk, T. L. (1998). *Teaching oral communication in grades K-8*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ching, L. C. (2002). Strategy and self-regulation instruction as contributors to improving students' cognitive model in an ESL program. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*(3), 261-289.

Choy, S. C. & Cheah, P. K. (2009). Teacher perceptions of critical thinking among students and its influence on higher education, *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *2* (20),198-206.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). Understanding mixed methods research. In J. Creswell (Ed.), *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, (pp. 1-19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crossley, D. J. & Wilson, P.A. (1979). *How to argue: An Introduction to Logical Thinking.* New York: Random House Inc.

Cüceloğlu, D. (1995). *İyi Düşün Doğru Karar Ver* [*Think well and give a right decision*]. Sistem Yayıncılık.

Çiçek-Sağlam A. & Büyükuysal. E. (2013). Eğitim fakültesi son sınıf öğrencilerinin eleştirel düşünme düzeyleri ve buna yönelik engellere ilişkin görüşleri [The critical thinking disposition levels of senior students of faculty of education and their views on handicaps towads critical thinking], *International Journal of Human Sciences. 10*(1), 258-278.

Çubukçu, Z. (2006). Critical thinking dispositions of the Turkish teacher candidates. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *5*(4), 22-36.

Davidson, B. (1994). Critical thinking: A perspective and prescriptions for language teachers, *The Language Teacher*, *18*(4), 20-26.

DeCapua, A. (2008). *Grammar for Teachers: A guide to American English for Native and Non-native Speakers*. New York: Springer.

Devine, T. G. (1962). Critical thinking in the English class. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *39*(6), 359-365.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 43-59. doi: 10.1017/S0267190501000034

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language learning*, *47*, 173-210.

Duron, R., Limbach, B., & Waugh, W. (2006). Critical thinking framework for any discipline. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 17*(2), 160-166.

Ediger, A. (2001). Teaching children literacy skills in a second language. M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.) *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 153-169). Boston.

Ekmekçi, E. (2018). Transformation of Traditional Writing Classes into Digital Ones, *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, *6*(4), 122-130 doi: 10.18298/ijlet.3221

Elder, L. & Paul, R. (1994). Critical Thinking: Why we must transform our teaching, *Journal of Developmental Education*, *18*(1), 34–35.

Ennis, R. H. (1987). A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and abilities. In J.B. Baron & R.J. Sternberg (Eds), *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice* (pp. 9-26). New York: Freeman.

Er, F. (2018). *Writing strategies in Turkish- English bilingual context: A case study*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University.

Evans, J. (2001). Introduction: learning and teaching the complexities of writing. In J. Evans (Ed.), *Writing in the elementary classroom: A reconsideration*. Portsmout, NH: Heinemann.

Facione, P. A. (1990). *Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction: Research findings and recommendations (The Delphi Report).* Prepared for The Committee on Pre-College Philosophy of The American Philosophical Association.

Facione, P. A. (2007). *Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts*. Milbrae, CA: The California Academic Press.

Facione, P. A, & Facione, N. C. (1992). *The California critical thinking disposition inventory*. Millbrae, CA: The California Academic Press.

Facione, P. A., Facione, N. C. & Giancarlo, C. A. F. (2000). The disposition toward critical thinking: Its character, measurement and relationship to critical thinking skills. *Informal Logic*, *20* (1), 61-84.

Facione, P. A., Sánchez, C. A., Facione, N. C, & Gainen, J., (1995). The disposition toward critical thinking, *Journal of General Education. 1* (44), pp. 1-25

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication.* New York: Longman.

Fareed, M. and Ashraf, A. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions: *Journal of Education and Social Sciences 4*(2), 81-92.

Halpern, D. F. (2010). Creativity in college classroom. In R. A. Beghetto and J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Nurturing creativity in the classroom* (pp. 380–393). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press

Fırat, M., Kabakçı Yurdakul, I., & Ersoy, A. (2014). Mixed method research experience based on an educational technology study, *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 2(1), 65-86. Doi: 10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.2s3m

Fisher, A., & Scriven, M. (1997). *Critical thinking, its definition and assessment*. Centre for Research in Critical Thinking, Norwich, UK.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constrain. In L. W. Gregg, & E. R. Stenberg (Eds.), *Cognitive process in writing* (pp. 31-50), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Fry, E. B. (1977). *Elementary Reading Instruction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gabrielatos, C. (2002). EFL writing: product and process. https ://files. eric.ed. gov7 fulltext/ED4739.pdf

Ghanizadeh, A. & Mirzaee, S (2012). EFL learners' self-regulation, critical thinking and language achievement, *International Journal of Linguistics, 4*(3), 451-468.

Gezegin, B., B. (2016). Teaching Writing Skill. In Ekrem Solak, (Ed.), *Teaching Language Skills for Prospective English Teachers* (pp. 65-89), Ankara.

Goh, C.C.M. & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 261-297. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587625.

Grosser, M. M, & Nel, M (2013). The relationship between the critical thinking skills and the academic language proficiency of prospective teachers, *South African Journal of Education, 33* (2):246-262 DOI: 10.15700/saje.v33n2a639

Gümüş, P. (2009). *The effect of the timing of pre-reading activities on students' reading comprehension,* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Bilkent University.

Gündüz. M. (2017). *The effects of critical thinking-based instruction on Turkish EFL students' critical thinking disposition level, critical reading self-efficacy level, English writing performance and opinions on critical thinking*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Bahçeşehir University.

Halpern, D. F. (2003). *Thought and Language: An introduction to critical thinking.* Psychology Press, NY.

Hamouda, A. (2013). An Investigation of Listening Comprehension Problems Encountered by Saudi Students in the EL Listening Classroom, *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 2* (2), 113-155.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of second language writing, 12*(1), 17-29.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(15),1277-1288.

Huei-Chun, T. (1998). A Study of EFL Listening Comprehension Strategies. *Paper presented at the Annual Convention and Exposition of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages,* 1-19.

Hymes, Dell H. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B.; Holmes, J. *Sociolinguistics: selected readings*, (pp. 269–293), Harmondsworth: Penguin.

İlhan, H. (2019). *An investigation of foreign language writing anxiety of voluntary-based English preparatory class students,* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Sakarya University.

In, J. (2017). Introduction of a pilot study. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology, 70(6), 601.* doi:10.4097/kjae.2017.70.6.601

Innabi, H. & Sheikh, O.E. (2007). The change in mathematics teachers' perceptions of critical thinking after 15 years of educational reform in Jordan. *Educational Studies in Mathematics 1* (64), 45–68, DOI: 10.1007/s10649-005-9017-x

Işık, H. (2010). *High school students' critical reading levels and the relationship between critical reading level and critical thinking dispositions and reading frequency*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Anadolu University.

İşpiroğlu, Z. (1996). *Düşünmeyi Öğrenmek ve Öğretmek [Learning to think and teach*], Cem Yayınevi.

Jalongo, M. R. (2008). *Learning to listen, listen to learn: Building essential skills in young children.* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Jalongo, M. R. (2010). Listening in Early Childhood: An Interdisciplinary Review of the Literature, *The Intl. Journal of Listening, 24*(1), 1-18, DOI: 10.1080/10904010903466279

Kabilan, M. K. (2000). Creative and critical thinking in language classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 6*(6). Retrieved December, 27, 2019 from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kabilan-CriticalThinking.html

Karacan, A. (2017). *The effect of providing self and anonymous peer feedback on writing assignments in a digital environment among Turkish EFL high school learners* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.

Karadüz, A. (2010). Language skills and critical thinking. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic 3* (5), 1566-1593.

Kassarjian, H., H. (1977). Content Analysis in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 4*(1), 8–18, https://doi.org/10.1086/208674.

King, P. & Kitchener, K. (1995). *Developing Reflective Judgment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kökdemir, D. (2003). Decision making and problem solving under uncertainty, (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Ankara University.

Krashen, S. 1989. We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal, 4*(73), pp.440-464.

Krashen, S. (1994). The input hypothesis and its rivals. In N.C. Ellis (ed.). *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages,* 45-77. London: Academic Press.

Krashen, S. (2001). *The Power of Reading* (2nd Ed.) Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishing Company.

Kutlutürk, S. (2016). *An investigation on the effects of using cognitive and metacognitive strategies to enhance university students' reading skills*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Çağ University.

Kusaka, L. L., & Robertson, M. (2006). Beyond Language: Creating Opportunities for Authentic Communication and Critical Thinking. *Computer Science*, *14*(1), 21-38.

Kuş, A. (2005). *Some suggested brain-based techniques for teaching writing skills in prep-classes at Ondokuz Mayıs University*, (Unpublished Master's thesis), Ondokuz Mayıs University.

Külekçi, G., & Kumlu, E (2015). Developing critical thinking skills in English language teaching classes through novels. *International Journal of Language Academy 3*(2),76-90.

Liaw, M. L. (2007). Content-based reading and writing for critical thinking skills in an EFL Context. *English Teaching & Learning*, *31*(2), 45-87.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in Education* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Littlewood, W. (1992). *Teaching Oral Communication: A Methodological Framework*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Lucas, S. E. (2011). *The Art of Speaking*: McGraw-Hill Education (11th Ed.)

Malmir, A., & Shoorcheh, S. (2012). An investigation of the impact of teaching critical thinking on the Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 3(4), 608-617.

Masduqi, H. (2011). Critical thinking skills and meaning in English language teaching. *Teflin Journal*, *2*(2), 185-200.

Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mcbride, R. E., Xiang, P., & Wittenburg, D. (2002). Dispositions toward critical thinking: The preservice teacher's perspective. *Teachers and Teaching, 8(1), 29–40.* doi:10.1080/13540600120110556

McCombs, B.L. (2001). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B.J. Zimmerman and D.H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 67– 123). Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ.

Mone, M. A., Baker, D. D., & Jeffries, F. (1995). Predictive validity and time dependency of self-efficacy, self-esteem, personal goals, and academic performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *55*(5), 716–727.

Morley, J. (1991). Listening comprehension in second/foreign language instruction. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, pp. 81-106. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1997). Approaches to teaching listening in the language classroom. *Proceedings of the 1997 Korea TESOL Conference*, 1-17.

Nunan, T. (2000). Exploring the concept of flexibility. In V. Jakupec & J. Garrick (Eds.), *Flexible Learning, Human Resource and Organisational Development: Putting theory to work*. pp. 47-66. London: Routledge.

Nation, I.S.P (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing.* New York: Routledge.

Nation, I.S.P & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking. ESL and Applied Linguistics Professional Series.* New York: Routledge.

Null, W. (2011). *Curriculum: From theory to practice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Nunan, D. (1997). Listening in language learning. *The Language Teacher 21*(9). Retrieved from http:// www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/97/sep/nunan.html

Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Olshewsky, T. M. (1974). On competence and performance. *Linguistics, 12*(122), 47-62. doi:10.1515/ling.1974.12.122.47

Ordem, E. (2017). Developing critical-thinking dispositions in a listening/speaking class. *English Language Teaching, 10*(1), 50-55.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning, 35(1), 21–46.*

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House/Harper and Row, New Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Özer, B. (2002). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullarının eğitim programlarında öğrenme stratejileri [Learning strategies in the primary and secondary education curricula]. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama*, *1*(1), 17-32.

Özmen, K. S. (2008). Current state and understanding of critical thinking in higher education. *Gazi Eğitim Dergisi, (2)28,* 109-127.

Özmen, K. S. (2006). *A Case Study on critical thinking abilities of teacher trainees at Gazi University English Language Teaching Department,* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Gazi University, Ankara.

Papastephanou, M., & Angeli, C. (2007). Critical thinking beyond skill. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 39(6), 604–621.* doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00311.x

Paul, R. (1993). *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World.* Santa Rosa, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Paul, R. (1999). The Art of Redesigning Instruction, *Foundation for Critical Thinking*, California.

Paul, R. W. & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical Thinking: Tools for Taking Charge of Your Professional and Personal life*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle, NJ.

Petek, E., & Bedir, H. (2018). An adaptable teacher education framework for critical thinking in language teaching. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 28, 56-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2018.02.008

Piaget, J. (1971). *Genetic Epistemology*. NewYork: W. W. Norton & Company.

Pontius J., McIntosh A. (2019). *Critical Skills for Environmental Professionals*. Springer Textbooks in Earth Sciences, Geography and Environment. Springer, Cham.

Razı, S. (2011). *Advanced Reading and Writing Skills in ELT: APA style handbook.* Ankara: Nobel.

Renner, C. E. (1996). Enrich learners' language production through content-based instruction. *Paper presented at a National Conference on Lingua e Nuova Didattica, 1-7,* https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED411694

Richards, J.C. (2005). Second thoughts on teaching listening. *RELC Journal, 36*(1), 85-92.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Riddell, D. (2003). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. London: Hodder Education.

Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills* (2nd Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rost M. (1990). *Listening in Language Learning*. London: Longman.

Rost, M. (1994). *Introducing Listening.* London: Penguin book.

Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Listening*. London, UK: Longman.

Saidi, M. (2015). The impact of students' anxiety on oral performance, (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Mohamed Khider University.

Sanavi, R. V., & Tarighat, S. (2014). Critical thinking and speaking proficiency: a mixed-method study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(1), 79-87.

Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Sayar, E. (2018). *Development of strategic competence in EFL classes at secondary education,* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University.

Schafersman S. D. (1991). *An introduction to critical thinking*. Retrieved from http://www.freeinquiry.com/critical-thinking.html.

Schunk, D. H. (2001). Social cognitive theory and self-regulated learning. In B. J. Zimmerman and D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theoretical Perspectives* (2nd ed.), pp. 125-151. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scott, W. A., & Ytreberg, L. H. (1990). *Teaching English to children.* London: Longman.

Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (1987). *A statement presented at the 8th Annual International Conference on Critical Thinking and Education Reform. Retrieved from //www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/766.*

Sisay Y. (2019). Preparatory school learners' level of critical thinking proficiency and its correlation with their academic achievement in Ethiopia: The Missing Ingredient. *English Language, Literature & Culture 4*(2), 32-38. doi: 10.11648/j.ellc.20190402.11

Snyder, L. G., & Snyder, M. J. (2008). Teaching critical thinking and problem-solving skills. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 2(1), 90–99.

Solak, E. (2016). Teaching listening skill. In Ekrem Solak., (Ed.), *Teaching Language Skills for Prospective English Teachers*, pp. 29-44, Ankara.

Stapleton, P. (2001). Critical thinking in Japanese L2 writing: Rethinking tired constructs, *ELT Journal 3* (56), Oxford University Press.

Stryker, S., & B. Leaver. (1997). *Content-based Instruction in Foreign Language Education:* Models and methods. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Şener, S. (2014). Turkish ELT students' willingness to communicate in English. *ELT Research Journal, 3*(2), 91-109.

Şenşekerci, E & Bilgin, A (2008). Eleştirel düşünme ve öğretimi, *U.Ü. Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 14* (1), 15-43.

Taylor, G. R., & Trumbull, M. (2005). Developing a multi-faced design/ paradigm. In G. R. Taylor (ed.), *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research*. USA: University Press of America.

The Critical Thinking Community (2019). *A brief history of the idea of critical thinking*. Retrieved November 18, 2019 from http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/a-brief-history-of-the-idea-of-critical-thinking/408

Toffler, Alvin. (1970). *Future Shock*. New York: Random House.

Ulum, Ö. G. (2015). Listening: The Ignored skill in EFL context. *International journal of humanities social sciences and education*, 2 (5), 72-80.

Underwood, M (1989). *Teaching Listening*. Addison- Wesley Longman Ltd.

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1984). *Teaching Listening Comprehension*. Cambridge University Press.

Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a Second Language: Process, Product and Practice.* New York: Longman.

Uztosun, M. S., & Erten, İ. H. (2014). The impact of English proficiency on the use of communication strategies: An interaction-based study in Turkish EFL context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 10*(2), 169–182.

Uztosun, M. S. (2013). *The role of student negotiation in improving the speaking ability of Turkish university EFL students: An action research study,* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Exeter University.

Uzun, K. (2016). Developing EAP writing skills through genre-based instruction: An action research. *International journal of educational researchers*, *7*(2), 25-38.

Vandergrift, L. (2004). 1. Listening to learn or learning to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24* (1), 3-25.

Van Gelder, T. J. (2005). Teaching critical thinking: Some lessons from cognitive science. *College Teaching*, *53*(1), 41-46.

Ventimiglia, P., & Pullman, G. (2016). From written to digital: The new literacy. *Educause Review*, *2* (51), 36-48.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Waldman, J. (1958). *Rapid eading made simple: A comprehensive course for self-study and review* (Rev. ed.). New York: Doubleday.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Blackwell.

Warnick, J. P. (1996). *A phenomenology of reading performances: Reading Japanese as a foreign language,* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), Ohio State University.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yang, Y.-T. C., & Gamble, J. (2013). Effective and practical critical thinking-enhanced EFL instruction. *ELT Journal, 67*(4), *398–412.* doi:10.1093/elt/cct038

Yavuz, F., Değirmenci,Y., Akyuz, S., Yılmaz, H., & Celik, O. (2015). Problems and activities in listening skills in EFL classrooms; from tradition to a more comprehensible input. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 197*, 930 – 932.

Yıldırım, S., Yıldırım, Ö. (2016). The importance of listening in language learning and listening comprehension problems experienced by language learners: A literature review. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *16* (4), 2094-2110.

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *17*(2), 165–178. doi:10.2307/3586647

Zare, M., Behjat, F., Abdollrahimzadeh, S. J. (2013). Critical thinking and Iranian EFL students' listening comprehension, *International Journal of Linguistics 6*(5)*,* 12-21. doi:10.5296/ijl.v5i6.4253

Zayif, K. (2008), *Öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel düşünme eğilimleri [Teacher candidates' critical thinking disositions],* (Unpublished Master's thesis), Abant İzzet Baysal University.

Zhang, S. (2009). The role of input, interaction, and output in the development of oral fluency. *English Language Teaching*, *2* (4), 91–100.

Zhang, X. (2018). Developing college EFL writers' critical thinking skills through online resources: A case study, *International Journal of Language Studies*, 1-12

Zheng, J. (2018). The Metacognitive strategy in English listening comprehension, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(8),226-231.

Zin, Z. M. & Eng, W, B. (2014). Relationship between critical thinking dispositions and critical reading skills of Malaysian ESL learners, *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 3*(16), 41-68.

Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ELEŞTİREL DÜŞÜNME EĞİLİMLERİ VE BUNUN İNGİLİZCE DİL YETERLİLİĞİNİ GELİŞTİRMEDEKİ ROLÜ

Sevgili katılımcı,

Bu anket, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalında hazırlanan bir yüksek lisans tezine veri sağlamak amacıyla oluşturulmuştur. Sizden kişisel bilgilerinizi ve 26 maddelik anket sorularını eksiksiz bir şekilde cevaplamanız beklenmektedir. Bu araştırma kapsamında vize notlarınız kullanılarak çeşitli istatistiksel analizler yapılacaktır. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı bulunmamaktadır. Soruları cevaplarken gerçeği yansıtmanız büyük bir önem taşımaktadır. Çalışmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük esasına göredir. Vermiş olduğunuz cevaplar sadece bu çalışmanın amaçları doğrultusunda kullanılacak olup kimliğiniz saklı tutulacaktır. Lütfen çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katıldığınızı onaylamak için aşağıdaki kutucuktaki 'evet' seçeneğini işaretleyiniz. İçten katılımınız ve alakanız için teşekkür ederim.

Arş. Gör. Muhammed Kök
E-mail: muhammedkok92@gmail.com

	Evet	Hayır
Çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.		

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın ( ) Erkek ( )

2. Yaşınız: _____

3. Bölümünüz:

    a) İngilizce Öğretmenliği   ( )

    b) İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı   ( )

4. Mezun olduğunuz lise türü:

    a) Fen lisesi   ( )   e) Özel lise ( )

    b) Sosyal Bilimler Lisesi ( )   f) Meslek Lisesi ( )

    c) Anadolu Lisesi   ( )   g) Diğer: (lütfen belirtiniz) _____

    d) İmam Hatip Lisesi ( )

5. İngilizcede kendinizi ne derecede yeterli görüyorsunuz? Lütfen sizin için uygun olan sayıyı işaretleyiniz.

Çok yetersiz	Yetersiz	Orta	Yeterli	Çok yeterli
1	2	3	4	5

6. İngilizce dil alanlarında kendinizi ne derecede yeterli görüyorsunuz. Lütfen sizin için uygun olan sayıyı işaretleyiniz.

	Çok yetersiz	Yetersiz	Orta	Yeterli	Çok yeterli
Dilbilgisi	1	2	3	4	5
Okuma	1	2	3	4	5
Yazma	1	2	3	4	5
Dinleme	1	2	3	4	5
Konuşma	1	2	3	4	5
Kelime	1	2	3	4	5
Telaffuz	1	2	3	4	5

7. Aşağıdaki maddeleri lütfen dikkatli okuyunuz ve daha sonra size en uygun olan seçeneğin karşısına (X) koyunuz.

1	2	3	4	5
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

1. Benimle aynı fikirde olmadıklarında bile başkalarının fikirlerini dikkatli bir şekilde dinlerim.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Problemleri çözmek için fırsatlar ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Pek çok konuya ilgi duyarım	1	2	3	4	5
4. Pek çok konu hakkında bir şeyler öğrenmekten zevk alırım.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Çok çeşitli konular arasında bağlantı kurabilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Öğrenme ortamında birçok soru sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Zorlayıcı sorulara cevap bulmaktan zevk alırım.	1	2	3	4	5
8. İyi bir problem çözücüsüyümdür.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Mantıklı bir çözüme ulaşabileceğim konusunda kendime güvenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
10. İyi bilgilendirilmek için çabalarım.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Şu anki bilgimle çelişen yeni bilgiler sunulduğunda fikrimi değiştirebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Problem çözmekten keyif alırım	1	2	3	4	5
13. Gerçekleri göz önünde tutar ve önyargılarımın kararlarımı etkilemesine izin vermem.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Bilgimi çok çeşitli konulara uygulayabilirim	1	2	3	4	5
15. Okulda olmadığım zamanlarda bile öğrenmekten keyif alırım.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Benimle aynı görüşte olmayan insanlarla iyi geçinebilirim	1	2	3	4	5
17. Meseleleri net bir şekilde açıklayabilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Bir sorunu açıklığa kavuşturmaya çalışırken iyi sorular sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Konuları açık ve kesin bir şekilde ortaya koyarım.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Önyargılarımın fikirlerimi nasıl etkilediğini düşünürüm	1	2	3	4	5
21. Beni rahatsız etse bile gerçekleri araştırırım	1	2	3	4	5
22. Doğruları bulana kadar üzerinde çalışmaya devam ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Bir problemin doğru cevaplarını bulmak için kendi bildiğimden vazgeçebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Problemlere birden fazla çözüm bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Bir karar verirken kendime çok sayıda soru sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Problemlerin çoğunun birden fazla çözümünün olduğuna inanırım.	1	2	3	4	5

8. Lütfen birinci vizede almış olduğunuz notları 100 üzerinden aşağıdaki kutucuklardaki ilgili yerlere yazınız.

Listening / Speaking	Reading	Writing	Use of English

Değerli Katılımcı,

Anket sonrası yüz yüze görüşmeler yapılacaktır. Bu görüşmede size Eleştirel Düşünme Eğiliminiz ve İngilizce Becerilerinizle alakalı birtakım sorular sorulacaktır. Sorular sözel olarak cevaplandırılacak ve yüz yüze olacaktır. Sorular ve cevaplar Türkçe olup, vereceğiniz cevapların da herhangi doğru ya da yanlış bir cevabı olmayacaktır. Görüşmeden herhangi puan alınmayacaktır. Görüşme yaklaşık 10-15 dakika olmakla birlikte belirlediğimiz ortak gün ve saatte yapılacaktır. Bu görüşmeye gönüllü olarak katılıp araştırmamıza daha fazla katkı sağlamak isterseniz lütfen aşağıya isminizi ve iletişim adreslerinizi yazınız.

İsim:

E-mail:

Cep telefonu:

Çalışmama vermiş olduğunuz katkılardan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Appendix B: Interview Questions

- Sizce İngilizce öğrencilerinin eleştirel düşünme becerisine sahip olmaları gerekli midir?
    - Neden, neden değildir?
    - Sizce eleştirel düşünme İngilizce öğrenimini etkiler mi? Neden, neden etkilemez?
    - Etkilerse ne açıdan etkiler? Eleştirel düşünebilen bir öğrenci dil öğrenimi bakımından neleri başarabilir?
    - Sizce eleştirel düşünme hangi dil becerisinin geliştirilmesini daha çok etkiler?
        - Okuma, yazma, dinleme, konuşma, kelime, telaffuz? Neden?

- Siz eleştirel düşünen bir İngilizce öğrencisi misiniz? Neden böyle düşünüyorsunuz?
    - Eleştirel olmanızın/olmamanızın nedenleri nelerdir?
    - İngilizce öğrenirken eleştirel olmanızın herhangi bir faydasını gördünüz mü?
    - İngilizce öğrenirken eleştirel olmamanızın herhangi bir eksikliğini gördünüz mü?
    - Eğer bunun bir eksiklik olduğunu düşünüyorsanız bunu gidermek için neler yapılabilir?

Appendix C:

Permission provided by Permission Provided by School of foreign languages

T.C.
ÇANAKKALE ONSEKİZ MART ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı

Sayı : 93130991-044-E.1900149118   14/10/2019
Konu : Anket İzni (Muhammed KÖK)

REKTÖRLÜK MAKAMINA

Üniversitemiz Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Muhammed KÖK'ün "The Critical Thinking Dispositions of Preparatory ELT Students and its Role on Improving English Speaking Skills" başlıklı tez çalışması kapsamında Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda anket yapmak istediğine ilişkin Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü'nün 07.10.2019 tarih ve 33813216-044-E.1900145076 sayılı yazısını olurlarınıza arz ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Sami YILMAZ
Genel Sekreter

Ek:
1- Enstitü yazısı (1 sayfa)
2- Öğrenci dilekçe (1 sayfa)
3- Danışman dilekçe (1 sayfa)
4- Anket (2 sayfa)

OLUR
14.10.2019
e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Süha ÖZDEN
Rektör Yardımcısı

DAĞITIM LİSTESİ
Gereği: Bilgi:
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü   Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu

Appendix D:

Permission Provided by the author of the scale

Sevilay KİLMEN <sevilaykilmen@ibu.edu.tr>   28 Tem 2019 19:52
Alıcı: ben ▾

Merhaba,

Ölçeği kullanmanızdan mutluluk duyarız. Ölçekle ilgili doküman ektedir. Kolaylıklar dilerim.

Kimden: "Muhammed KÖK" <muhammedkok92@gmail.com>
Kime: sevilaykilmen@ibu.edu.tr
Gönderilenler: 25 Temmuz Perşembe 2019 17:00:32
Konu: Ölçek izni hk.

...

Re Eleştirel Düşün...