

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EFL LEARNERS' USE OF READING
STRATEGIES AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF CRITICAL READING
SELF-EFFICACY**

THESIS BY
ALİ DİKİCİ

Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: Dr. Betül ALTAŞ

Member of Examining Committee: Dr. Seden TUYAN

Member of Examining Committee: Dr. Ali BIÇKI (İskenderun Technical University)

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN / FEBRUARY 2023

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY**ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY****DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

We certify that thesis under the title of “The Relationship Between EFL Learners’ Use of Reading Strategies and Their Perception of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy” which was prepared by our student Ali DİKİCİ with number 2020008016 is satisfactory consensus of votes for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the **Department of English Language Education**.

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. Inside permanent member-Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: Dr. Betül
ALTAŞ

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.) Univ. Inside - permanent
member: Dr. Seden UYAN

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.) Univ. Outside - permanent
member: Dr. Ali BIÇKI (İskenderun Technical University)

I confirm that the signatures above belong to the academics mentioned.

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

17/02/2023

Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ

Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.

DEDICATION

To Love...

ETHICS DECLARATION**Name& Surname:** Ali DİKİCİ**Number:** 2020008016**Student' s****Department:** English Language Education**Program:** Master Thesis (X) Ph. D. Thesis ()**Thesis Title:** The Relationship Between EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies and Their Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

I hereby declare that;

I prepared this master thesis in accordance with Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,

I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,

I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,

I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,

The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance.
(in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

17/02/2023

Ali DİKİCİ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first and foremost thank my lovely supervisor, Dr. Betül ALTAŞ, for her assistance, advice, guidance, and never-ending words of support as well as encouragement since she made significant contributions to complete this thesis.

I would like to express my intimate gratitude to Dr. Ali BIÇKI and Dr. Seden Tuyan for their valuable feedback as members of my examining committee.

I also want to thank my dearest friends, Mehmet Durak TÜYSÜZ for serving as my journey's initial inspiration, and Vedat KARAGÜN for all of his support and tolerance while I was writing my thesis.

Finally, I want to express my sincere gratitude and admiration to my wife Aynur DİKİCİ for her priceless support, inspiration, and patience. I am also indebted to my mother Ayşe DİKİCİ and my sister Huriye Nazlı DİKİCİ for supporting me with endless affection throughout my life.

17/02/2023

Ali DİKİCİ

ABSTRACT**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EFL LEARNERS' USE OF READING STRATEGIES AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF CRITICAL READING SELF-EFFICACY****Ali DİKİCİ****Master's Thesis, Department of English Language Education****Supervisor: Dr. Betül ALTAŞ****February 2023, 136 Pages**

Learners may have difficulties in grasping the texts written in the target language since the texts can have cultural, ideological, and contextual meanings beyond how they seem. For this reason, this study aims to explore whether a meaningful relationship exists between English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. Furthermore, the aim of the study is to determine the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and the perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. This study also aims to find out whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and the perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts and where EFL learners' family lives. The research was carried out with EFL students at foreign language schools in two state universities. 255 EFL learners participated in the study. In order to select participants at the preparatory school of two state universities, convenience sampling was used. In this quantitative survey-based research, "Demographic Information Form", "Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale" and "Reading Strategy Use Scale" were used to collect data. The collected data were analysed by Social Sciences Statistics Package (SPSS) 26.0. The results indicated that EFL learners usually utilize reading strategies and there is a meaningful relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical

reading self-efficacy. The results also revealed that EFL learners' use of reading strategy and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy do not significantly differ by gender. Moreover, EFL learners' inquiry capabilities significantly differ in terms of how often they read English texts.

Keywords: Critical Reading, Critical Reading Self-Efficacy, Reading Strategies, EFL Learners

ÖZ**İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN
OKUMA BECERİSİ STRATEJİLERİ KULLANIMI VE ELEŞTİREL
OKUMA ÖZ YETERLİLİK ALGISI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ****Ali DİKİCİ****Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı****Tez Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Betül ALTAŞ****Şubat 2023, 136 Sayfa**

Metinler görüldüğünün ötesinde kültürel, ideolojik ve bağlamsal anlamlar taşıyabileceğinden, öğrenciler hedef dilde yazılan metinleri anlamakta güçlük çekebilirler. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin kullandıkları okuma becerisi stratejileri ile eleştirel okuma öz-yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişkiyi bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca çalışmanın amacı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma stratejilerini kullanma düzeylerini ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlik algı düzeylerini belirlemektir. Çalışma ayrıca İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma stratejilerini kullanımları ile eleştirel okuma öz-yeterlik algıları arasında cinsiyet, bölüm, ne sıklıkta İngilizce metin okudukları, okudukları İngilizce metinlerin türü, aile üyelerinin okuduğu İngilizce kitap, gazete ve dergi ile ailelerinin yaşadığı yer açısından anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığını bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma, iki devlet üniversitesindeki yabancı dil yüksekokullarında İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerle gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu çalışmaya toplamda 255 İngilizce hazırlık öğrencisi katılmıştır. İki devlet üniversitesinin hazırlık okulundaki katılımcıları seçmek için kolaylı örneklem yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Bu anket tabanlı araştırmada veri toplamak için "Demografik Bilgi Formu", "Eleştirel Okuma Öz-Yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği" ve "Okuma Stratejisi Kullanım Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Veriler

Sosyal Bilimler İstatistik Paketi (SPSS) 26.0 ile analiz edilmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin genellikle okuma stratejilerini kullandıklarını ve İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma stratejileri kullanımını ile eleştirel okuma öz-yeterlik algıları arasında oldukça anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Aynı zamanda sonuçlar İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma stratejisi kullanımlarının ve eleştirel okuma öz-yeterlik algılarının cinsiyete göre anlamlı farklılaşmadığını göstermiştir. Bu çalışma ile İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin sorgulama yeteneklerinin, İngilizce metinleri ne sıklıkta okuduklarına göre önemli ölçüde farklılık gösterdiği belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eleştirel Okuma, Eleştirel Öz Yeterlilik, Okuma Stratejileri, İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Öğrenciler

CONTENTS

COVER	i
APPROVAL.....	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ETHICS DECLARATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
ÖZ.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xiv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. METHODOLOGY.....	10
3. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	29
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	54
REFERENCES	75
APPENDICES.....	99

ABBREVIATIONS

ELT	: English Language Teaching
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ESL	: English as a Second Language
L1	: Mother Language
L2	: Second Language
LLS	: Language Learning Strategy

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographic Background of Participants	21
Table 2. Reliability Analysis of Reading Strategy Use Scale	22
Table 3. Reliability Analysis of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	24
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of The Level of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies	29
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of the Level of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy.....	29
Table 6. T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Gender	31
Table 7. T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Department	33
Table 8. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy according to How Often They Read English Texts ...	35
Table 9. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale in terms of the Type of English Texts EFL Learners Read Most.....	35
Table 10. T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members	38
Table 11. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Where EFL Learners' Families Live	39
Table 12. T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies according to Gender.....	40
Table 13. T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of Department.....	42
Table 14. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of How Often They Read English Texts	43
Table 15. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of the Type of English Texts They Read Most.....	45
Table 16. T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members	47

Table 17. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of Where EFL Learners' Families Live	48
Table 18. Pearson Correlation Test of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Reading Strategies Use	50

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ethics Committee Request	99
Appendix B: Consent Form.....	103
Appendix C: Demografik Bilgi Formu.....	104
Appendix D: Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği	105
Appendix E: Eleştirel Düşünce Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeği	107
Appendix F: Ethics Committee Approval of Çağ University	109
Appendix G: Official Permission from Rectorate of Social Sciences University of Ankara.....	112
Appendix H: Official Permission from Rectorate of Harran University	113
Appendix I: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to Gender between Reading Strategies Use and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scales	115
Appendix J: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to Department between Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale .	116
Appendix K: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to How Often EFL Learners Read English Texts and Where EFL Learners' Family Lives in Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	117
Appendix L: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to How Often EFL Learners Read English Texts and Where EFL Learners' Families Live in Reading Strategy Use Scale	118
Appendix M: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to the Type of English Text EFL Learners Read Most Between Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and Reading Strategy Use Scale.....	119
Appendix N: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to The Family Members' Reading English Books, Newspapers, and Texts between Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	121
Appendix O: Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Relationship Between the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and Reading Strategy Use Scale .	122

1. INTRODUCTION

Since people live in an information society, the information presented to them includes cultural and ideological values and meanings that go beyond their meanings in written discourse. For this reason, literacy skills in the 21st century also require being critical. According to Kroskrity's (2000) critical viewpoint, language and discourse serve the interests of cultural or social groups since they both convey social experiences, which are typically associated with experiences of a particular class, gender, elites, or institutions. Members of the social system exhibit varying degrees of language awareness and worldviews. From the critical point of Foucault (cited Altaş, 2018), every text that shows the workings of a social system in which individuals live surpasses the idea of a linguistic text. In other words, analysing a text or discourse entails challenging the discursive formations pertaining to the system's structures. As long as reading a text aims to convey preconceived knowledge and predetermined skills, students cannot fully understand the texts they read (Altaş, 2018; Altaş & Şahinkarakaş, 2022). Reading is therefore one of the most important factors that feeds thought. In addition, reading increases perspective and broadens horizons if specific reading strategies are used (Miller, 2018). According to Roshandel et al. (2018), a student's attitudes, perceptions, and sense of self-efficacy are just a few of the crucial factors that affect their reading comprehension. Unrau et al. (2018) state that students' perceptions on self-efficacy, use of reading strategies, and attitudes toward language classes are important variables in their language learning success.

Critical reading is an ability that encourages one to examine and prove information's accuracy rather than to accept it at surface level (Koçak, 2020). Different from reading, critical reading, which includes thinking about the text, contemplating about the right and wrong, and interpreting the text, gives the individual the opportunity to integrate the knowledge they have gained in the past, with the reading process. It is very crucial to read foreign source in a second language and try to understand the meaning and to interpret the information correctly. Learners may have difficulties in grasping the texts written in the target language since the texts can have the cultural, ideological, and contextual meaning beyond the surface level.

Although students' reading strategies and their critical reading self-efficacy perceptions are examined disjunctively, Bandura and Locke (2003) claim that the existence of these two concepts, which are closely interrelated are evolving naturally. Therefore, the relationship between use of reading strategies and critical reading self-efficacy is highly important. There is not an elaborate study that looks into the relationship between EFL students' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy in the field. In this sense, the

reason that drives me to carry out this research is about whether a meaningful relationship exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategy and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy.

Significance of the Study

EFL learners use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy have been researched separately in a variety of contexts, and they are open to further investigation according to their relationships (Gan et al., 2020). Critical thinking, according to *Bowell and Kemp (2005)*, is a person's involvement in decision-making and responsibility for daily actions. In this respect, specific abilities such as the ability to rationally assess the arguments presented, determine critical thinking (*Mason, 2007*). *Page and Mukherjee (2007)* define critical thinking as linked to high-level cognitive reasoning that includes synthesis, analysis, and evaluation. Additionally, according to *Facione and Facione (1994)*, critical thinking encompasses assessment, inference, making analysis, inductive reasoning, and deductive reasoning. Some studies found that a number of contextual and personal elements such as socio-environmental skills, personal attributes, and motivational beliefs, like self-efficacy perceptions, influence the development of critical reading skills (*Hoffman & Schraw, 2009*). In this regard, self-efficacy perceptions of individuals have a substantial impact on many aspects of modern life, including people's decision-making processes, problem-solving approaches, and thinking modes (*Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Maddux & Kleiman, 2016*).

Reading allows people to receive benefits such as dreaming, creative thinking, and expanding their horizons as well as gaining information. That is, reading is characterized as a learning environment that allows for good communication between the author and the reader, as well as the ability to perceive everything from words to punctuation marks and the development of mental skills (*Akyol et al., 2014*). Reading provides individuals with knowledge, and it allows them to expand their vocabulary, compare various cultures and civilizations, fortify their memories, improves their attention span and knowledge levels by allowing them to compare different pieces of information. (*Arıcı & Taşkın, 2019*). To understand what one reads, there is a strong trinity among reading strategies, the development of self-efficacy, and critical thinking. However, the investigation on the relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy has not been investigated in literature. In this regard, this study is significant in that the study examines the relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy.

Aims of the Study and Research Questions

The aim of this research is to determine whether a meaningful relationship exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. In this study, the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy is investigated. The study also determines whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to demographic factors such as gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, the type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers and texts, and where EFL learners' family lives.

In line with the purpose of this study, the research questions are:

1. What is the level of EFL learners':
 - a) use of reading strategies?
 - b) perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy?

2. Do EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to:
 - a) gender?
 - b) department?
 - c) how often EFL learners read English texts?
 - d) type of English texts EFL learners read most?
 - e) family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts?
 - f) where their family lives?

3. Is there a significant relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy?

The Definition of Strategy

In his study, Küçüköğlü (2013) refers to the word strategy that is derived from the Latin word "stratum". In this sense, Küçüköğlü (2013) explains strategy as one's taking an action to reach a goal. The term strategy in the Cambridge Dictionary (2022) has been defined as "A comprehensive plan for winning in circumstances such as war, business, politics, industry, or the ability to have in view for such circumstances". Strategy is an action plan that helps people achieve its goals and is used in the implementation of activities such as resource use (Şağbanşua & Bişkek, 2006). Barnett (1989) defined strategy as the mental operations readers consciously

engage in to approach a text in order to make sense of what they read. Namely, reading comprehension calls for the use and integration of a variety of skills or strategies. Memory, compensatory, cognitive, social, metacognitive, and test-taking strategies are among them (Caverly, 1997).

In the recent research, Kuijpers et al. (2021) state that individuals may face different difficulties during reading which is a mental activity. The methods used to overcome these difficulties are called reading strategies. According to Kuijpers et al. (2021), these strategies are discussed in three parts: before reading, during reading, and after reading. The use of reading strategies also has a substantial role in helping individuals acquire reading and learning habits.

Learning Strategies

Learning strategy can be explained as the behaviours and ways which facilitate learning that the individual benefits from in learning. In addition, the learning strategies are behaviours performed individually and are not identical with the act of learning, and they consist of conscious choices or unconscious adaptations for a learning goal. They have also been defined as a component of psychological behaviour where emotion is integrated with other psychological components such as cognition and motivation (Kleppin, 2007; cited in Taşçı, Altun, & Soran, 2008). The common point emphasized in the definitions of the learning strategy is that the individual chooses the behaviours and operations consciously during the learning process and displays the behaviours that increase the permanence of the knowledge. That is, learning strategies ensure that students' new learning or previously learned knowledge is permanent. Learners' educational backgrounds, experiences, intelligence factors, sociocultural positions, interests, and learning methods used during learning can be listed as factors affecting learning quality (Tok & Yiğın, 2014). For this reason, the learning process and each individual method differ from each other.

Learning techniques assist students to become conscious and aware, develop independent learning abilities, and to be successful and efficient learners. These abilities enable them to found an environment for their learning outside the classroom and encourage students to learn (Özer, 2002). The lack of agreement on how to categorise learning strategies in the field is remarkable. However, Weinstein and Mayer's (1986) taxonomy of learning techniques is the one that is most commonly utilized in the literature. Learning strategies were divided into eight categories by Weinstein and Mayer (1986), including effective strategies, basic strategies for repetition in learning, complex learning repetition strategies, basic meaning, complex interpretation, basic organising, and complex organising strategies. However, Özer (2002) made

another classification based on this classification and combined basic and complex strategies in this classification, and discussed learning strategies in five groups, on the grounds that it is more accepted in the literature. Repetition strategies, making sense strategies, monitoring comprehension strategies, organizing strategies, and affective ones are all included in this taxonomy of learning strategies (Yeşilyurt, 2021). In addition, learning strategies were classified as cognitive and metacognitive ones by O'Malley and Chamot (1990). According to O'Malley and Chamot, cognitive learning strategies include inference, elaboration, addition, symbolism, and findings; however, metacognitive learning strategies include regulation, special attention, observation, and progression. While cognitive strategies consist of practice and representation stages; metacognitive strategies consist of administrative preparation and late construction stages.

Learning approaches have been replaced by a learner-based approach, as opposed to teacher-based learning since the 70s (Faerch & Kasper, 1980; Lan & Oxford, 2003; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1986; Schmitt, 1997; Wenden & Rubin, 1987). The reason for the increase in the tendency towards learner-centred approach to learning and teaching is that every student's learning needs, learning styles and strategies are different and unique. Rubin (1987) was the first to use the term "Language Learning Strategy" (LLS) (Grenfell & Macaro, 2007; Stern, 1992). The term "LLS" has been defined by many researchers (Dörnyei, 2005; Ellis, 1994; McDonough, 1995; Segler, Pain, & Sorace, 2002; Wenden, 1991; White, 2008). Although there is no common consensus, it is seen that some terms and expressions are common in the definition of LLS. LLS definitions appear to include terms such as ideas, behaviours, techniques, plans, procedures, and processes (Chamot, 1987; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Richards & Platt, 1992; Rubin, 1987; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986; Wenden, 1987). While learning strategies are considered as conscious action according to some scientists (Chamot, 2005; Cohen, 1998; Chamot, 1987; Richards & Platt, 1992), some scholars have suggested that they can be both conscious and unconscious (Purpura, 1999; Ridley, 1997). Researchers stated that students use them to reach learning goals. The aim of learning is defined as "understanding, learning, and keeping in mind" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990); "understanding, learning, and remembering" (Richards & Platt, 1992); "obtaining, retrieving, storing and using" (Rubin, 1987; Wenden & Rubin, 1987; Yılmaz, 2021).

Considering the styles of language learning strategies, Wenden (1991) classified them into two groups as direct strategies and indirect ones. Cognitive and metacognitive methods are a part of direct learning strategies. The main components of cognitive strategies include clarification/verification, inference/inductive reasoning, deductive reasoning, practise, memorization, and monitoring, whereas metacognitive strategies include planning, prioritising,

self-management, and creating objectives (Wenden, 1991). However, in indirect strategies; participating in a conversation, getting oneself understood, and clarifying one's original intention are in the group of communicative strategies whereas questions to others, initiating conversations, and listening to L2 media are in the group of social strategies.

Moreover, Schmitt (1997) identified five vocabulary learning strategies as social, cognitive, memory, metacognitive, and determination strategies. The student's ability to judge the significance of the material to be learned on their own is referred to as a determination strategy (Schmitt, 1997). Social strategies involve the learners who make learning and knowledge permanent by asking their friends or teachers around them (Schmitt, 1997). In memory strategies, it is defined as remembering the newly learned information by relating it to the old information (Schmitt, 2000). Cognitive strategies could be defined as learning vocabulary with the help of repetition (Schmitt, 1997). Metacognitive strategies can be defined as making a learning plan by prioritizing the information to be learned and as determining the most effective learning method Schmitt (2000). On the other hand, metacognitive strategy is defined as a strategy in which the student manages the learning process, which includes planning in order to study better, and this process follows his own development in the language learning process, and testing himself at certain stages (Tok & Yiğın, 2014). Vocabulary learning strategy in language learning is one of the elements that improves the learning level of the individual (Jing, 2022). İlter (2014) emphasized that the learner's active participation in the lesson is necessary to apply the right methods so as to boost the vocabulary knowledge. Finding out the learners' learning strategies, guiding them to profit from the techniques, and teaching them how to use the strategies are effective ways to boost learning success when teaching a language. (Karatay, 2007; Tok & Yiğın, 2014).

According to Brown (2000) and Cohen (1998), internalizing how to utilize learning strategies will increase students' self-learning skills and this will increase their proficiency in foreign language. Studies have shown that learners with learning strategies training or learners who are aware of learning strategies are more successful in reading skills (Brown, 2000; Yang, 2002). Brown (2000) and Yang (2002) list the benefits of learning strategies training as students' awareness of strategies, knowing how to organize and use them in a systematic and effective manner, and knowing when and how to transfer these strategies to different learning situations. In many studies on learning strategies education, strategy education was given to students and it led to good results in foreign language reading (Thompson & Rubin, 1993). In so doing, learning strategies are important factors that ease reading comprehension in a foreign language and thereby learners' utilization of language learning strategies or awareness of

language learning strategies can enable them to be more successful in reading comprehension in a foreign language.

Reading

Reading is an ingenious guide that opens the doors of places where people cannot penetrate (Cunningham & Fitzgerald, 1996). Making sense of what is read develops language and mental skills and adds meaning to the lives of individuals. The value of the meaning of reading, which is one of the most efficient ways to reach information, has increased even more in today's information age. For this reason, reading has an important place in education programs. In addition to reaching information, effective reading provides individuals with gains such as dreaming, creative thinking, and developing their horizons and perspectives (Akyol et al., 2014). These contributions of reading are not seen in every individual at the same level since factors such as individual differences, environmental factors, past experiences, and socio-cultural backgrounds, as well as family, play a crucial role in understanding the concept of reading (Chrisman et al., 2019). The most efficient way to minimize these differences between individuals is education. For this reason, educators need to be knowledgeable to teach reading skills to students (Lyon & Weiser, 2009).

Reading was originally understood to be the analysis of written symbols; however, as the value of knowledge has increased and it has become necessary to redefine reading due to the development of technology (Akbabaoğlu & Duban, 2020). Akbabaoğlu and Duban (2020) define reading as the analysis of texts by understanding their symbols as a whole. Moreover, reading is defined as a learning area, which provides effective communication between the author and the reader, allows individuals to enhance their mental skills and perceive from words to punctuation marks (Day & Park, 2005; Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000). The aim of reading is to establish meaning through reader-text interaction (Daffurn, 2019; Spires et al., 2018). Through reading, individuals develop their vocabulary knowledge, become more aware of different cultures and civilizations, strengthen their memories, increase their attention levels, and boost their levels of knowledge by comparing various pieces of information (Arıcı & Taşkın, 2019).

In light of the circumstances in the contemporary age and the current global system, reading comprehension has gained the significance in human life among language abilities. As a result of the widespread usage of the internet, which now dominates every area of modern life, information can be quickly and easily received by people all over the world. Given the fact that how simple and easy it is to acquire information on the internet, developing genuine reading skills, such as critical reading skills, is essential in today's globalised society. To receive

meaningful and reliable information, no information that people or learners gain or acquire in the environment should be considered as true or accurate; rather, its accuracy, falsity, or validity should be questioned from a critical perspective (Koçak, 2020; Arıcı & Taşkın, 2019). Therefore, reading helps students improve their language skills and vocabulary understanding. Using interaction and engagement with written language, reading comprehension is defined by Snow (2002) as the simultaneous extraction and production of meaning. Learners need to understand, integrate, criticize, infer, analyse, and link, as well as assess ideas in texts as they read. They also must reconcile numerous meanings in their heads. Understanding a text is more than just breaking down sophisticated components of language into simple ones. However, it also comprises a procedure in which several elements work together to create a bigger picture.

Reading in a Second and Foreign Language

One of the most important abilities for success in professional, social, and urban life is reading (Kormos & Csizer, 2014; Öktem, 2020). Research on reading was a dispersed field before the advent of digital technologies (Fox & Alexander, 2017; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014; Grabe & Stoller, 2011). According to Perfetti and Stafura (2014), it isn't possible to talk about a fixed reading theory in that there are so many components of reading. Synthesizing effective theoretical reading models, Perfetti and Stafura (2014) improved the framework of reading systems. The Structure-Integration Model by Kintsch (1988) serves as the foundation for the reading systems framework. An individual gives significance to the material in the text by fusing it with his own experiences and knowledge (Kintsch, 1988; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014). As they developed Kintsch's theory to define reading in digital situations, Fox and Alexander (2017) examined extended constructive-integrative versions for reading comprehension. Extended digital reading models include both modified written reading and unparalleled digital reading activities (Li, 2020). Digital reading provides many opportunities in second language learning and plays a major role in understanding texts.

One widely held belief in language learning is that reading strategies in the first language can be transferred to the second. Therefore, both print and digital media focus on the first language instead of the second language (Anderson, 2003; Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Day & Bamford, 1998; Hudson, 2009; Koda, 2005). However, L1 and L2 readers differ greatly in terms of their vocabulary and grammar knowledge, their speed, differences in word recognition processes, and previous learning experiences (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Koda (2005) also underlines that great attention must be paid to conditions such as the reader's previous literacy experience, grammar, and bilingual participation in second-language reading (Reiber-Kuijpers, Kral & Meijer, 2021).

The need for constant change and renewal makes reading and individual education compulsory. Mentioning the importance of reading, Grellet (2003) underlines the daily readings we need in many areas from recipes to novels, from weather conditions to game rules. Reading is defined as a process involving the stages of perceiving, comprehending, interpreting, reasoning, and making judgments about the messages written depending on the rules of a language with the sense organs (Odabaş, Odabaş & Polat, 2008, Göçer, 2007). As reading is a skill, it is very different from teaching vocabulary or grammar. According to Eskey (1983), teaching is defined as the transfer of knowledge from teacher to student, while this situation cannot be valid for reading. Since teaching reading is a different and difficult process, all factors affecting the process should be carefully examined by the teacher. Lucas (1990) suggests that the factors affecting reading in the mother tongue (purpose, attitude, text, and tactics) also affect reading in the second language at the same rate.

Göçer (2010: 1012) expressed an opinion as “The vocabulary of the individual is of great importance in using the language effectively, beautifully and correctly”. This means that individuals can communicate effectively in their daily lives to the extent of the richness of their active vocabulary. The words that the person uses consciously in oral and written communication constitute the active vocabulary, and the words that he cannot use while explaining but make sense when he encounters them during reading and listening constitute the 'passive vocabulary' (Güney & Aytan, 2014). It is well known that passive vocabulary outnumbers active vocabulary by four times. (Jalongo & Sobolak, 2011). The words which remain in the passive treasury of the individuals, and which do not pass into the active vocabularies restrict people's use of these words. Therefore, it is of great importance to increase active vocabulary in target language for using in all areas of life. Different activities are applied to ensure the permanence of words. Regarding dictionary reading which is one of these activities; Balaban (2014) says that “the issue of reading a dictionary has not been unfortunately handled as a separate issue up to now. However, this matter needed to be discussed long ago” (p.244). Balaban argues that reading a dictionary contributes to one's ability to understand something in target language. Reading a dictionary not only gives individuals the ability to speak in their daily lives, but also adds depth to people's thoughts because each word read by individuals has more than one meaning, and it also benefits the person's phonetics, language, and literature (Büyükkız & Hasırcı, 2013; Maskor & Baharudin, 2016; Göçer & Karadağ, 2021).

A highly customised strategy for reading development is extensive reading (Mikulecky, 2008). Students read at their own pace and choose the books or diversified texts they want to read outside the school context. The advantages of extensive reading have been described by

Day and Bamford (1998), and they also include improvement in writing in the target language, forming a favourable mindset towards reading in a second language, improved reading fluency, drive to read more, and gaining more foreign vocabulary and grammatical knowledge.

Reading Strategies

Reading skill differs from one individual to another individual. Children and adults cannot be expected to be at the same reading level. In reading; prior knowledge, readiness, motivation, and the use of reading strategies are important (Özgül & Samur, 2021). As reading is increasingly accepted as a mental process, different and more intensive studies on reading have begun in the field. As a result of these studies, the diversity in reading strategies has increased, and reading has been divided into genres. Stages have been brought to reading and various reading strategies have been developed (Pagán & Nation, 2019).

In literature, there are several definitions of reading strategies and these strategies, as defined by Carrell et al. (1998), are the approaches readers utilize to understand the text. Reading strategies were described by Brantmeier (2004) as the comprehension techniques that readers employ to make sense of what they read. Namely, reading strategies are how readers react to a task, like focusing on context cues, using prior knowledge, and looking for content hints to understand a text. According to Ahmed (2020), reading strategies are unconscious or conscious procedures, tactics, actions or behaviours that students employ to get around obstacles they face while understanding and interpreting a text.

In many studies, both motivational and cognitive variables play a critical role in the improvement of reading skills (Logan et al., 2011; Taboada et al., 2009). The willingness to select and engage in reading is referred to as reading motivation (Troyer et al., 2019). The reading engagement perspective provides a theoretical framework to explain reading motivation. This perspective explains the differences between willing and unwilling students to read. Students who are committed and willing to read are intrinsically motivated to read for personal purposes and use different strategies in the reading process. Furthermore, these students have more knowledge to construct meaning from the text and have higher social interactions in the process of understanding the text. Therefore, intrinsic motivation is an important element for reading desire and motivation (McGeown et al., 2012).

Classification of Strategies of Reading

Reading comprehension is significantly impacted by metacognitive awareness (Baker, 2008; Carrell, Gajdusek, & Wise, 1998). Researchers discovered that skilled L1 and L2 readers are conscious of metacognitive techniques like monitoring, target setting, planning, and evaluation procedures (Cohen, 1998; Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). According to Afflerbach (1998),

successful readers have a grasp of the language, as well as experience and knowledge for overcoming challenges while reading. However, less successful readers should work hard to improve their reading skills through use of a variety of strategies. Here, gender, age, years of education, language competency, style in learning, and ethnicity have an impact on learners' method preferences (Peacock & Ho, 2003; Sheu, Wang, & Hsu, 2013). Moreover, some studies have unveiled that a learner's field of concentration affects the choices of reading strategy. Several types of research have been implemented to investigate learners' metacognitive technique preferences in various disciplines such as foreign language learning, business, humanities, and science (Dabaghi & Akvan, 2014; Magogwe, 2013; Park, 2010).

Through anticipating, analysing, summarising, and using other reading strategies while reading, the learner takes an active role in creating an involvement with the text's author. On the other hand, it can be difficult to forge such a link between the reader and text, and it can also be challenging for EFL students and learners to employ different sorts of reading strategies.

Reading requires the application of numerous reading strategies, including cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies (Ali & Razali, 2019). Thus, planning and goal setting, drawing on prior information, generating predictions and inquiries, monitoring, updating meaning, and revising meaning are all components of cognitive reading strategies. Additionally, Metacognitive Reading Strategies involve problem solving reading strategies, world-wide reading strategies, and support reading strategies (Ali & Razali, 2019). Some researchers also believe that while learners may already be familiar with reading strategies, they may still not benefit from on-going practise. (Islam, 2019; Maranto & Wai, 2020).

Olshavsky (1977) separates reading strategies into three main categories; story-related strategies, clause-related strategies, and word-level ones. In the first category, there are strategies including leveraging context, substituting synonyms, and stating failure to comprehend a word. The second one involves re-reading, adding details, inference, personal identification, hypotheses, and stated failure to understand a clause. The last one comprises of using information about the story. According to Block (1986), the two basic categories of reading strategies used by English as a Second Language (ESL) readers are comprehension strategies and linguistic strategies. In the former, one can remark on behaviour or process, monitor understanding, correct behaviour, predict content, recognise text structure, challenge information in the text, interpret the text, employ knowledge and associations, and reply to and react to the text. In contrast, the latter includes rereading, paraphrasing, analysing sentences and clauses, and deciphering words. Pritchard (1990) noted processing strategies used by L2 readers employed when reading texts as developing awareness, accepting ambiguity, establishing intra-sentential linkages, establishing inter-sentential linkages, and utilizing background information.

According to Andersen (1991), reading strategies are classified as paraphrase strategies, supporting, supervising, establishing coherence in text, and test-taking ones.

Significance of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies

Students need to be able to utilize reading strategies effectively and interchangeably; thus, it is not enough for them to merely understand what they are. Accordingly, it is important to pay attention to the influencing factors in reading while considering the importance of reading comprehension in L2 accomplishment. Knowledge about the strategies of reading that is used by EFL students aids in maximising their comprehension of a material (Anderson, 2002; Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002; Oxford, 1994). In a study, Munsakorn (2012) claims that the majority of EFL Thai learners do not comprehend reading passages completely since they do not use the proper reading strategies. Using global reading strategies should lead to a worldwide analysis of the reading text (Duke & Cartwright, 2021). That is, observing the L2 text's characteristics and making educated guesses about its subject matter is an example. The learners can prepare themselves to understand the main material by using these reading strategies (Duke & Cartwright, 2021).

Li (2022) argues that the term reading problem resolution strategies is itself ambiguous. While the text becomes challenging to interpret, the reading strategies help the EFL learners in solving the issue. Re-reading the passage for clarity, pausing to concentrate on it, picking up where you left off while reading, and other strategies are just some examples of these strategies. The reader is able to read the text with ease thanks to these techniques that support students during the real act of reading a text (Li, 2022). Reading methods in L2 are extremely important because during the reading process, to generate meaning, learners should be able to blend the text's material with their own past knowledge in a top-down and bottom-up manner (Rastegar, Kermani & Khabir, 2017).

Related Studies on EFL Learners' Use of Strategies of Reading

Numerous studies have investigated the benefits of reading strategies in L2 reading such as extensive reading and graded readers on favourable learner manners and inner drive for learning, (Al-Homoud & Schmitt 2009), how graded readers affect language learning (Allen 2009; Claridge, 2005), and the authenticity of the text (Green 2005; Waring & Takaki 2003; Webb & Chang 2015). In spite of these benefits, extended reading has been critiqued for having little to no impact upon comprehension, enhancing language learning, and reading techniques. This is because it lacks pedagogical assistance and teacher control. (Renandya 2007, Hill 2008; Macalister 2014). It is commonly recognised that employing

effective reading strategies when learning a language increases learners' ability to process the target language in particular settings (Chamot 2005; Cohen 2007; Oxford 2017).

In their study, Akkakosan and Setebol (2009) assert that although knowledge of the usage of cognitive and metacognitive methods was considered in class, students most frequently utilised traditional reading strategies like the bottom-up model. Although the bottom-up tactics were not explicitly taught, the students may have picked them up through their regular practise of the comprehension problems from their previous English course books (Akkakosan & Setebol, 2009). In a study that investigates second-language reading of French-speaking students, Barnett (1988) discovered that more experienced readers were more conscious of adopting metacognitive reading strategies than less experienced readers. According to Chern's (1993) research, readers' reading comprehension process and their awareness of metacognitive reading techniques in EFL are positively correlated. Moreover, a study conducted with Japanese ESL students in Japan revealed that those with higher levels of English competence employed more metacognitive reading techniques (Upton, 1997). Additionally, high proficiency EFL students and the frequent usage of the reading techniques were found to be correlated by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001). Wen (2003) also noted that the majority of effective readers' comprehension activities took place at the metacognitive level. Students that were able to use metacognitive reading strategies outperformed their peers in their reading and learning programme (Wang et al., 2009). In a study, Sen (2009) also found a statistically significant correlation between the usage of metacognitive reading methods and successful scores in reading comprehension.

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking involves analysing arguments skills, coming to conclusions via inductive or deductive reasoning, judging or assessing, and coming to decisions or finding solutions (Lai, 2011). Critical thinking requires not only cognitive but behavioural skills. These characteristics, which can be thought of as mental attitudes or behaviours, comprise of openness and fairness of mind, adaptability, curiosity, an inclination to seek reason, a thirst for information, and respect for and openness to diverse points of view (Lai, 2011). Critical thinking has both universal and domain-specific components.

As educators have long known, critical thinking abilities are of important benefit in student learning. According to Hirst and White (1998), national boards of education admit that the inability of various educational systems is related to developing critical reading strategies and they highlight the embracement of this important skill in curricula, while all systems of academic education agree that students must complete certain critical thinking training courses before graduating. Students cannot think critically if they do not shift their view of reality and

consider of substituted realities (Hynd, 1999). In this regard, there is no agreement on what constitutes critical thinking (Gupta & Upshur, 2012). Moreover, Lyutykh (2009) says that critical thinking is a method to think in an analytical way. Bowell and Kemp (2005) assert that critical thinking is one's involvement in decision-making and responsibility for daily actions. Critical thinking is determined by specialized abilities like the ability to rationally analyse arguments (Mason, 2007). According to Dehghani et al. (2011), critical thinking is based on what individuals do and believe. According to Facione and Facione (1994), critical thinking involves assessment, analysis, inference and deductive reasoning, as well as inductive reasoning.

Critical Reading

Understanding, analysing, and evaluating what one reads is the basic goal of reading. The person should not take something as truth when they read and learn. As a result of easy access of information in today's communication age, the probability of encountering useless, unreal, and baseless information is very probable. When all of these factors are taken into account, critical reading emerges as a necessary component for the complete realisation of reading (Din, 2020). In this sense, critical reading is a skill that enables people to examine and validate information instead of accepting it at face value.

While critical literacy has been a focus of English literacy programmes for first- or second-language learners (Comber & Nixon, 2011), the primary goal of reading activities in EFL programmes still continues to be comprehending the content of reading texts. Cox and Assis-Peterson (1999) hypothesised that the purpose of reading instruction in EFL programmes is to facilitate instrumental reading. This may be the reason why studies on EFL tend to concentrate mostly on cognitive tasks like word decoding (Lo, 2011). EFL students should be able to critically analyse the material in a text because there is an easy access to a variety of media today; thus, the EFL definition of reading comprehension should include the capacity to constantly analyse the aim, the message, and the ideology being promoted by the dominant authorities (Suarcaya & Prasasti, 2017). A learner must be able to connect the text's information with values outside of it. Therefore, through the EFL reading exercises, the students should be able to better understand how a text could challenge their own value and how important it is for them to be able to express their opinions.

In EFL context, critical reading is analogically similar to critical thinking. According to Beaumont (2010), reading critically involves acting as well as understanding the text. The active component of reading is the capacity to make decisions about a specific issue that a text advocates. And, this acting is influenced by the process of interpreting, which involves reviewing, synthesising data or information and analysing. On the other hand, according to

Benesch (1993), inferencing, which includes the processes of analysing, evaluating, and synthesising, is not related to critical thinking but rather a component of cognitive operations. They revolve around text-centric tasks like extracting information from texts. Benesch (1993) defined critical thinking as making connections between a text and the reader's experience and how that text relates to the language, politics, and history of the new context. To be considered critical, the reader must connect their personal ideals to the culture that the text represents. Enright & Quinlan (2010) argued that the linguistic, social, political, and cultural facets of language should be integrated into the teaching of EFL reading to improve academic literacy. By relating the cultural, social, and political facets of the text to their own, integrating these components could improve the students' capacity to interpret texts.

In their study, Troyer et al. (2019) determine that a statistically significant correlation exists between reading habits and critical reading skills. In a study conducted by Karademir (2013), it is asserted that while the critical reading skills of pre-service teachers do not significantly differ by gender and the department of education, they significantly differ by the education level of the father and mother. While teacher candidates' teacher self-efficacy significantly varies according to gender and the department of education, it does not significantly differ by the education level of their parents. Based on the results of her study, Ünal (2006) claims that a highly significant correlation is found between students' attitudes towards reading and the level of their critical reading skill. Again, a moderately significant relationship is found between the reading comprehension levels of the same students and their critical reading skill levels. Recent research on critical reading has demonstrated that critical reading is necessary as a sophisticated cognitive activity for proper information acquisition. (Alfassi, 2004; Zhang, 1993).

Self-Efficacy

Chrisman et al. (2019) claim that a variety of contextual and individual factors influence the improvement of critical reading skills. The socio-environmental factor is one set of these elements (Lassig, 2009), while the personal attributes and motivational beliefs, which include self-efficacy beliefs, are the others. (Hoffman & Schraw, 2009). Self-efficacy beliefs have a significant influence on various facets of modern life (Maddux & Kleiman, 2016). And self-efficacy beliefs have an effect on people's decision-making processes, thinking, and problem-solving techniques (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). According to Vancouver and Kendall (2006), an individual's judgement of their capacity to reach their targeted performance levels is referred to as self-efficacy. It can be characterized as a person's level of self-assurance (Jain & Dowson, 2009). Tierney and Farmer (2017) define self-efficacy as a person's belief in their own potential to produce inventive outcomes. Accordingly, it is a psychological construct that regulates human performance through decision-making, motivation, and cognitive process

(Benight & Bandura, 2004). In this sense, self-efficacy often plays a significant role in the improvement of critical thinking as a motivational construct. According to Eccles and Wigfield (2020), learners' motivations and interests are also crucial factors that shape their critical thinking. Self-efficacy beliefs are requisite for behaviour, especially behavioural change; hence, they are a reliable indicator of critical thinking skills. (Sang et al., 2010).

Self-efficacy, according to Wang and Wu (2008), is a great predictor of using advanced learning techniques like critical thinking. Thus, self-efficacy motivates people and increases their performance (Bandura & Locke, 2003). The development of critical reading skills occurs as a result of such self-imposed motivation. Self-efficacy, as a motivator and a driving force, has a strong influence on critical reading; therefore, a lack of motivation is a barrier to the growth of critical thinking.

Addressing the learners' sense of self-efficacy, Schunk (2000) gives examples of two types of learners: one with a low sense of self-efficacy and the other with a high sense. From the perspective of Schunk, the first student may try to avoid the assignment given by the teacher, but the second student, who is confident in his ability to complete the assignment, accepts it without hesitation. In this sense, Schunk argues that students who are confident in their abilities can work harder and persevere longer than those who are doubtful, especially when faced with difficulties. Students evaluate their self-efficacy through their performances, observational interactions, persuasion strategies, and physiological reactions. Learners' self-efficacy can be evaluated using their own results as a benchmark.

Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

What is essential in critical reading is to make that the reader reads the text in depth rather than superficially because what is meant to be told in a text does not reveal itself in a neutral way and the thoughts in the text should be evaluated in detail in order to understand them. Günay (2001) defines reading as an intellectual activity performed by the receiver and says that reading is decoding a written text, and a graphically coded statement. According to Günay (2001), reading also means interpreting a literary text. In this part of the work, the issues of deciphering the meaning of the text in itself, discovering the meanings of unknown words, and re-meaning the text come to the forefront. Critical reading is the first and most important step of critical thinking and has an important place in helping people gain a critical perspective because people acquire most of their knowledge by reading. From this aspect, reading is not just a tool we use to gain knowledge or find answers to questions that occur in our minds, but it also improves our behaviour patterns and our thinking ability. When someone reads critically, they analyse, question, and explain the texts they come across and draw conclusions based on these

abilities and their prior knowledge. Flemming (2011) says that critical reading is not something entirely different from understanding; that is, for critical reading, first of all, the text must be understood in a healthy way. According to Flemming (2011) critical reading requires understanding the main idea, evaluating the conclusions reached, understanding the supported ideas, and assessing the logical conclusions. According to Darch and Kammenui (1987), critical reading entails evaluating and drawing conclusions about readers, distinguishing between truth and thought, and determining the author's intention and point of view.

Self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1994), refers to learners' confidence in their ability to succeed and learn new material or finish a task or activity to the required standard of performance. When faced with problems, this emotive variable influences our choices, actions, and endeavours. Later, Zeldin and Pajares (2000) added to Bandura's definition by including elements that relate to how students assess their academic competency. Zeldin and Pajares thought that people's self-efficacy beliefs have an impact on every part of their lives, including how driven they are to work hard and be productive, how self-defeating they are, how gloomy or optimistic they are, and how much effort they put into a task. According to Wallace and Wray (2021), individual approaches to reading have a very critical role. Bandura (1977) claims that there are differences between students who have high self-efficacy and those who have low self-efficacy. High self-efficacious learners are more confident in their ability to solve problems since they have developed a problem-solving strategy that has been successful in the past. Reading is frequently a self-guided habit, so in order for learners to read more extensively and efficiently, learners need self-efficacy as a fundamental motivator for reading. According to Bandura's social cognitive theory (1977), those who are self-efficacious are very confident in their ability to carry out a task or effectively maintain a behaviour. Thus, these people are more likely to start coping practises, put more efforts, and get things done. In an authoritative study, Bandura (1994) claims that, self-efficacy, which is characterised as a person's conviction that they are competent to carry out specified behaviours in order to create specific results; thus, it is one of the most important aspects behind motivation and perseverance in diversified contexts and areas.

Significance of EFL Learners' Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

According to Judge, Erez, and Bono (1998), there are two main measurements of self-efficacy. The perception of one's general self-efficacy refers to one's perception of one's capacity to perform in a wide range of circumstances (Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998). Specific self-efficacy, on the other hand, is described as beliefs in one's capacities to urge the motivation, cognitive processes, and course of action needed to satisfy certain circumstance demands (Wood & Bandura, 1989). A measure of a particular self-efficacy created by Burrows is called

L2 English reading self-efficacy. (2013). Burrows agrees with Wood and Bandura (1989) that specific self-efficacy assessments are useful predictors and indicators of human functioning in connection to foreign language education. Reading comprehension and reading self-efficacy appear to interact frequently. As students become more skilled at reading, their reading self-efficacy increases, which in turn encourages them to read more. Burrows (2013) researched how four elements connected to reading comprehension and reading self-efficacy. Specifically, in his study, Burrows focused on the relationship between reading self-efficacy and extensive reading, grammar translation, reading strategies, and integrated reading strategies with extensive reading. Over the course of the academic year, participants in the extensive reading group considerably increased their reading self-efficacy and students' reading self-efficacy grew and the degree of their reading comprehension increased.

According to Mohammed (2022), confidence and self-regulation were the two self-efficacy factors that the learners exhibited with the greatest frequency. The results also showed a significant positive relationship between students' critical reading self-efficacy and the reading strategies. Moreover, it is discovered that reading strategies have a notable impact on all of the reading self-efficacy characteristics. Setiawan and Ena (2019) assert that EFL learners have positive self-efficacy perceptions in what they read, analyse, and summarize without the help of their teachers. However, taking notes and putting up with reading are two things that students find difficult. Additionally, Setiawan and Ena (2019) discover that learners' mastery experiences, emotional and psychological states, vicarious experiences, and verbal persuasion are all sources of self-efficacy.

Related Studies on EFL Learners' Perception of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

According to Maddux and Stanley (1986), the term self-efficacy has been as one of the most discussed subjects in the field of social, clinical, and counselling psychology since the publication of Bandura's work in 1977. Self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1977), is the conviction that one is capable of taking the appropriate actions to handle potential problems. These self-efficacy definitions serve as the foundation for people's judgments of their ability to successfully take actions necessary to achieve a certain goal. Moreover, according to Zimmerman (1995), self-efficacy is a person's judgement of their ability to implement and succeed at a task. Naturally, people's ability to perform difficult tasks that they have never done before is largely determined by their level of self-efficacy. Considering how crucial self-efficacy is for students to receive the education they require, both students and teachers must critically think how to improve the learners' self-efficacy. Critical reading is an important ability that must be acquired from an early age (Koçak, 2020). As a consequence of using the reading skill, human beings can develop the aspects of comprehension and thinking. Reading

also increases analysis or analytical and synthesis skills, and interpretation and judgment skills. In short, societies that make reading consist of individuals who can think and express themselves freely (Lai, 2011).

Regarding valuable findings that have been reached about use of reading strategies and perception of critical reading self-efficacy, Phan (2009) discovered that achievement goals have direct and indirect impacts on learners' academic performance via self-efficacy perceptions, study processing mechanisms, and critical reading. Based on the results of a study conducted by Kim et al. (2015), self-efficacy had a positive link with critical thinking disposition, while stress had a negative relationship with critical thinking disposition and self-efficacy. Fahim and Nasrollahi-Mouziraji (2013) indicated that how students define their language learning abilities and critical reading abilities may have a substantial impact on their learning outcomes. In his study, Yoğurtçu (2013) also discovered that people with a self-efficacy perception create distinct reading methods, obtaining deeper cognitive connections and experiences, and they are also able to access an effective, interactive, strategic, rapid, prehensible reading comprehension capacity. According to Gürçay and Ferah (2018), students' metacognitive self-regulation significantly contributed to the improvement of their critical reading abilities. This shows the fact that students who take ownership of their education and actively direct will become capable critical thinkers.

The Relationship between EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies and Their Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

The relationship between use of reading strategies and perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy is crucial for EFL learners to critically evaluate and digest the texts so as to gain any knowledge. Besides, it is highly substantial to understand the disguised meanings of the lines in the text individuals read. Shang (2010) asserted that metacognitive strategy, followed by compensation strategy, and then cognitive strategy, was found to be the most frequently used reading strategy. Additionally, there was a strong correlation between self-efficacy perceptions and the use of reading strategies. On the other hand, there was no connection between reading success and reading strategies (Shang, 2010).

The students' perceived level of self-efficacy, in addition to using effective and efficient reading strategies, also have an impact on their learning outcomes (Yang, 2004; Wong, 2005). "Beliefs held by individuals regarding their abilities to achieve particular levels of performance that have an impact on the circumstances that affect their growth" is the definition of perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994: 77). High self-efficacy students, in Bandura's opinion, are more driven to overcome challenges and more self-assured to complete difficult tasks. Students having

low self-efficacy, however, tend to overestimate how difficult things are and they are lack of motivation to invest their time in difficult tasks because they do not have faith in their efforts could result in better outcomes irrespective of their reading levels. Namely, students' perception of self-efficacy has an impact on their reading attitudes, reading behaviours, and learning performance (Yang, 2004). Bandura (1994) claims that students with low self-efficacy choose easier tasks on which they will make fewer mistakes, and do not try hard since they believe that any effort will reveal their own lack of ability; however, students with high self-efficacy attribute their success to their own efforts and strategies, and they believe that their abilities will advance as they learn more and mistakes are an essential part of learning. The more a student has higher self-efficacy perception, the better they can think, read, and observe efficiently and effectively.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Introduction

The aim of the research is to determine whether a significant relationship exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. The study also aims to examine the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. Moreover, the study determines whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to demographic factors such as gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, the type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers and texts, and where EFL learners' families live. The chapter presents the context and participants, data gathering tools, research design, data collection procedures, data analysis and reliability and ethical issues.

2.2. Participants and Study Context

The convenience sampling method was applied when choosing the participants because participants were easy to reach and available, and willing to participate in this study. This study was carried out with 255 EFL learners who were students at preparatory school of Ankara Social Sciences University and Harran University. The data were gathered from learners between March and May, 2021-2022 Academic Year. Table 1 presents the demographic background of the participants.

Table 1.

Demographic Background of Participants

		N	%
Gender	Female	158	62.0
	Male	97	38.0
Department	English Language Teaching	98	38.4
	Other	157	61.6

The participants consisted of 158 (62.0%) females and 97 (38.0%) males. The students were asked in which department they studied. 98 (38.4%) students are studying in the English language teaching department while 157 (61.6%) are studying in other departments.

2.3. Research Design

The aim of this study is to find out whether a significant relationship exists between EFL learners' the use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. In addition, the study aims to investigate the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their level of critical reading self-efficacy perception. The research aims to find out whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, the type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts, and where EFL learners' families live. Therefore, quantitative survey-based research was used.

According to Watson (2015), quantitative research encompasses a variety of techniques that are used to systematically examine social problem, using statistical or numerical data. Cresswell (2012) says that quantitative research gives generalizable statistical information acquired from numerous samples in order to make inferences.

2.4. Data Collection Instruments

Demographic Information Form created by the researcher (See Appendix C), Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale developed by Karadeniz (2014) (See Appendix E), and Reading Strategy Use Scale adapted and developed by Tuncer (2011) (See Appendix D) were used to obtain data.

2.4.1. Demographic Information Form

The researcher of this study prepared a demographic information form. The form was utilized to find out whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their critical perception of reading self-efficacy vary according to demographic characteristics. There were six demographic variables in this form, such as gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts, and where EFL learners' family lives.

2.4.2. Reading Strategy Use Scale

Reading Strategy Use Scale was adapted and developed by Tuncer (2011). In order to reveal the reading strategies that readers use while reading in a foreign language, in his study, Tuncer (2011) aimed to adapt and develop Reading Strategy Use scale, which was created by Deane and Pereira-Laird (1997) and whose Confirmatory Factor Analyses were carried out. The scale was applied to a sample of EFL learners in Turkey, and the scale items were translated into Turkish. It consists of 6 factors and 28 items with a 5-point Likert-type scale as “Never”, “Seldom”, “Sometimes”, “Usually” and “Always”. The factors are categorized as Constructing Strategies ($\alpha=0,69$), Planning Strategies ($\alpha=0.71$), Management Strategies ($\alpha=0.61$), Assisting Strategies ($\alpha=0.64$), Visualization Strategies ($\alpha=0.71$), and Self-Regulation Strategies ($\alpha=0.71$). Five items made up the first factor (Constructing Strategies), which conceptually reflected how readers create their strategies within particular cognitive processes. Five items in the second factor, "Planning Methods," appeared to provide precise information about readers' usage of pre-reading strategies. The third factor (Management Strategies) had five questions and was a collection of items reflecting the reading strategies that readers either do not use or disregard. The fourth factor, (Assisting Strategies) had five categories, most of which were methods readers use to get around obstacles they encounter when reading. The fifth factor (Visualization Strategies) is made up of four items that illustrate how readers apply strategies related to their creative faculties when reading. The last factor (Self-Regulation Strategies) has three items that seemed to be focused on ways to regulate or control when reading becomes challenging. The reason why this scale was used in my study is that the scale was also used to measure EFL students' use of reading strategies by Koçer (2012), Sert (2012), Koçer & Turgut (2013), and Demirbaş (2018) beforehand.

In this study, the internal consistency coefficients of the Reading Strategies Use Scale and its subscales were computed by SPSS and were shown as follows:

Table 2.*Reliability Analysis of Reading Strategy Use Scale*

Scale/Sub-Scale	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Reading Strategy Use Scale		0.87
Constructing strategies	1, 7, 13, 19, 24	0.69
Planning strategies	2, 4, 8, 14, 20, 25, 28	0.71
Management strategies	3, 9, 15, 21, 26	0.61
Assisting strategies	10, 16, 22, 27	0.64
Visualization strategies	5, 11, 17, 23	0.71
Self-regulation strategies	6, 12, 18	0.70

The Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated as .69 for the Constructing Strategies sub-scale, .71 for the Planning strategies sub-scale, .61 for the Management strategies sub-scale, .64 for the Assisting strategies sub-scale, .71 for the Visualization strategies sub-scale, and .70 for the Self-regulation strategies sub-scale as seen in Table 2. The reading strategy use scale's overall Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be .87.

2.4.3. Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

The Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Karadeniz (2014). Karadeniz (2014) aimed to develop a scale that can be used to measure the critical reading self-efficacy perceptions of university students in his study titled “The Validity and Reliability Study of the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale”. In the analysis, factor loads were determined as at least .40. According to Ebel (1972), items with an item-test correlation coefficient of .40 and higher are very good discriminating items (cited Erkuş, 2003). Confirmatory Factor Analysis was applied to test the accuracy of the five-factor and 33 observed-variable structure revealed by exploratory factor analysis. The Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale includes 5 factors and 33 items with a 5-point Likert-type scale: “Strongly Disagree (1)”, “Disagree (2)”, “Undecided (3)”, “Agree (4)” and “Strongly Agree (5)”. Scale’s factors: Inquiry sub-scale ($\alpha=0.80$), Inference sub-scale ($\alpha=0.66$), Analysis sub-scale ($\alpha=0.74$), Evaluation sub-scale ($\alpha=0.78$), and Finding Similarities and Differences sub-scale ($\alpha=0.73$). The reason why this scale was used in this present study is that this scale was also applied to measure critical reading self-efficacy perception of university students, including EFL students, studying in Faculty of Education at a university in western Turkey in Özden's (2018) study. In addition, the scale was applied to senior EFL students in the study of Öztürk, Denkci-Akkaş, and Tikiz-Ertürk (2022). The critical reading self-efficacy

perception scale and its subscales' internal consistency coefficients for this study's analysis are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.

Reliability Analysis of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Scale/Sub-Scale	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale		0.93
Inquiry	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	0.80
Inference	12, 16	0.66
Analysis	11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22	0.74
Evaluation	23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28	0.78
Finding Similarities and Differences	29, 30, 31, 32, 33	0.73

The Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated as $\alpha=.80$ for the Inquiry sub-scale, $\alpha=.66$ for the Inference sub-scale, $\alpha=.74$ for the Analysis sub-scale, $\alpha=.78$ for the Evaluation sub-scale, and $\alpha=.73$ for Finding Similarities and Differences sub-scale. The overall Cronbach's Alpha value for Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale is .93.

2.5. Data Collection Procedures

Before the implementation of the scales, required permission was obtained from the developers of both scales. Then, Research Ethics Committee Approval was obtained from Çag University (See Appendix F). Required permissions were obtained from the School of Foreign Languages at Social Sciences University of Ankara and Harran University School of Foreign Languages to conduct the research study. Data were gathered by distributing scales to participants between March and May 2022. The scales were provided with a consent form (See Appendix G, H; See Appendix B).

2.6. Data Analysis

Data obtained from demographic information form, Reading Strategies Use Scale, and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale were analysed by employing descriptive statistics, One-Way ANOVA, Independent Sample T-Test, and Pearson Correlation Test through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

To evaluate the normal distribution of the data set, the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were calculated. If the kurtosis and skewness coefficients are between +1.5 and -1.5, parametric tests are used (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Due to the data set's normal distribution in this study, parametric tests were performed to analyse the data.

Levene's Test was used to determine the homogeneity of the groups before the one-way ANOVA test. As a result of Levene's Test, it was determined that the participants' scores for the Visualization Strategies sub-scale were not homogeneous according to the type of English text EFL learners read most ($p < .05$). It was determined that the homogeneity condition of the other groups was met for the other scores ($p > .05$). If the assumption of homogeneity of the groups is not provided, it is recommended to use a stricter significance level such as 0.01 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) For this reason, 0.01 significance level was used in the comparison of Visualization Strategies sub-scale scores according to the type of English text EFL learners read most. The significance level of .05 was employed to compare other scores.

Since ANOVA test results showed a significant difference, the Scheffe test was employed as one of the post hoc tests to determine which groups have differences. In the meantime, if the ANOVA test result is significant, the effect size is calculated with Eta Square. If the eta square is between 0.01 and 0.06, it is evaluated as small; between 0.06 and 0.14 as medium; and greater than 0.14 as high effect size (Can, 2014).

To determine the level of the EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy, descriptive statistics were used in this study. To find out the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategy, the following is used to assess the learners' level of reading strategy used based upon mean scores: "1.0-1.8=never, 1.8-2.6=seldom, 2.6-3.4=sometimes, 3.4-4.2=usually, and 4.2-5.0=always". To determine the level of EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy, mean scores were calculated. The following is used to determine with: "1.0-1.8=Strongly Disagree, 1.8-2.6=Disagree, 2.6-3.4=Undecided, 3.4-4.2=Agree,

4.2-5.0=Strongly Agree". The arithmetic mean was calculated to find out the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategy and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy.

Furthermore, the Skewness and Kurtosis values of the Reading Strategies Use and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scales according to gender were calculated (See Appendix I). Skewness and Kurtosis according to gender, which range from -1.5 to +1.5, demonstrate the normal distribution; thus, Independent T-test was utilized.

In addition, the Skewness and Kurtosis values of the Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale were calculated according to the department (See Appendix J). Values of skewness and kurtosis according to the department that range between -1.5 and +1.5 show the normal distribution. Therefore, it was decided to analyse this variable by using the Independent Sample T-test.

Skewness and Kurtosis values of the Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale were also calculated according to how often EFL learners read English texts and where EFL learners' family lives (See Appendix K). The values which were found between -1.5 and +1.5 have the normal distribution; therefore, it was determined to use the One-way ANOVA.

In addition, Skewness and Kurtosis in terms of Type of English Text EFL Learners Read Most were calculated (See Appendix M). Values for Skewness and Kurtosis were between -1.5 and +1.5 and it was determined as the normal distribution. Thus, the One-way ANOVA was used.

Skewness and Kurtosis values of the Reading Strategy Use and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scales were calculated according to family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts (See Appendix N). Values for Skewness and Kurtosis were between -1.5 and +1.5 and it was determined as the normal distribution. Consequently, the Independent Sample T-test was utilized.

Additionally, for the strength of the correlation between Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Reading Strategy Use Scales, the r value was calculated through the Pearson Correlation Test. (See Appendix O). According to Büyüköztürk (2019), relationship is considered low when the r value is between 0.00 and 0.30, moderate when it ranges from 0.30 to 0.70, and strong when it is in the range of 0.70 to

1.00. The Pearson Correlation Test was used to calculate the relationship's coefficients between the values.

2.7. Reliability and Ethical Issues

The necessary approvals were obtained from the Directorates of the University, School of Foreign Languages at Ankara Social Sciences University and Harran University. Developers of each scale were contacted to ask their consent in order to use the instruments. Furthermore, before participants willingly responded to the questions on the Demographic Information Form and the scales, a consent form to participate in the study was provided for the participants.

The data which were calculated by using SPSS for each scale were accepted as reliable according to the reliability analysis. According to Adeniran (2019), a range of .80 to .90 or higher is considered highly acceptable. The overall Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the Reading Strategy Use scale in this study was .87. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha value for the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale: .93 in total. As a result, scales were acknowledged as reliable for this study.

3. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

Results of the data analysis are presented in this chapter in detail. To answer the research questions, a quantitative method was used in this study. Pearson Correlation Test, Independent Sample T-test, Descriptive statistics, and One-Way ANOVA are used to analyse the data.

Findings of the Research Question One

The first research question of the study investigates the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. Using descriptive statistics for the data obtained from each scale, levels of EFL learners' use of reading strategy and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy were analysed.

The Level of EFL Learners' Reading Strategy Use

To determine the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategy, descriptive statistics were utilised. In Table 4, the levels of learners' reading strategies use are presented.

Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics of The Level of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies

Scale/Sub-scale	N	M	SD	Level
Constructing Strategies	255	3.47	.73	4
Planning Strategies	255	3.57	.66	4
Management Strategies	255	3.87	.74	4
Assisting Strategies	255	4.08	.58	4
Visualization Strategies	255	3.51	.91	4
Self-regulation Strategies	255	3.67	.87	4
Reading Strategies Use Scale	255	3.68	.51	4

The participant's scores for each sub-scale are shown in Table 4. According to the total mean score for the Reading Strategies Use Scale, it can be concluded that the participants say, they 'usually' utilize Reading Strategies ($M = 3.68$; $SD = 0.51$).

According to the total mean score of Constructing Strategies sub-scale, EFL learners try to describe and visualize what they read in their dreams at a high rate (M Constructing

Strategies = 3.47, $SD_{Constructing\ Strategies} = 0.73$). In other words, this sub-scale is ‘usually’ used by participants. In addition, EFL learners pay attention to determining what the text will be about by previewing the text before reading, based on the Planning Strategies total score. ($M_{Planning\ Strategies} = 3.57$, $SD_{Planning\ Strategies} = 0.66$). Accordingly, Planning Strategies sub-scale is ‘usually’ used by EFL learners.

Based on the Management sub-scale scores, EFL learners try to organize their reading environment. ($M_{Management\ Strategies} = 3.87$, $SD_{Management\ Strategies} = 0.74$). Students also underline important information as they deal with making connections between the subject they are reading and their previous knowledge. In this respect, this sub-scale is also ‘usually’ used by EFL learners. Regarding the Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores, EFL learners read the text again to better understand the text when they do not understand what they have read ($M_{Assisting\ Strategies} = 4.08$, $SD_{Assisting\ Strategies} = 0.58$). Based on the scores of this sub-scale, EFL learners ‘usually’ employ assisting strategies.

Furthermore, it can be inferred that EFL learners circle the necessary information to aid in their comprehension of the content they read, underline the information, and take notes while reading the text based on the Visualization Strategies sub-scale scores ($M_{Visualization\ Strategies} = 3.51$, $SD_{Visualization\ Strategies} = 0.91$). Based on the findings, it can be said that this sub-scale is also ‘usually’ used by EFL learners. In addition, based on the Self-Regulation Strategies sub-scale score, depending on the sort of text they are reading, EFL students alter their reading pace and change their reading style if necessary ($M_{Self-Regulation\ Strategies} = 3.67$, $SD_{Self-Regulation\ Strategies} = 0.87$). That means EFL learners ‘usually’ use self-regulation strategies.

The Level of EFL Learners’ Perception of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

The levels of EFL learners’ perception of critical reading self-efficacy were determined by descriptive statistics. Results are demonstrated in Table 5.

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics of the Level of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

Scale/Sub-Scale	N	M	SD	Level
Inquiry	255	3.92	.56	4
Inference	255	3.84	.61	4
Analysis	255	4.05	.55	4
Evaluation	255	4.07	.63	4
Finding Similarities and Differences	255	4.00	.63	4
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	255	3.97	.49	4

As presented in Table 5, it can be inferred that EFL learners have a high level of critical reading self-efficacy perception based upon the total mean score of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale ($M=3.97$, $SD=0.49$). According to the total mean score of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale, EFL learners 'agree' that they have the perception of critical reading self-efficacy. In addition, the data results show that EFL learners 'agree' that they could question the information and perspective given by the author in the text; it was also seen that the learners could identify the consistent and inconsistent aspects of the texts ($M^{\text{Inquiry}}=3.92$, $SD^{\text{Inquiry}}=0.56$).

EFL learners also 'agree' that they could predict how the text they read would develop and predict the development of the plot in the text ($M^{\text{Inference}} = 3.84$, $SD^{\text{Inference}} = 0.61$). According to the total mean score of the Analysis sub-scale, EFL learners 'agree' that they could find the main idea of the text, identify the points that make the text different, and explain their thoughts about the subject or theme in the text ($M^{\text{Analysis}}=4.05$, $SD^{\text{Analysis}} =0.55$). In addition, EFL learners 'agree' that they could establish a cause-effect relationship between events and concepts, as well as between introduction, development, and conclusion sections ($M^{\text{Evaluation}} =4.07$, $SD^{\text{Evaluation}} = 0.63$). That is, they can determine the relationship between event, place, and person.

Based on the total mean score of Finding Similarities and Differences sub-scale, EFL learners also 'agree' that they could identify events, situations, or people that

support or contradict each other in the text they read and clarify the views in the text and the opposing views of these views ($M^{\text{Finding Similarities and Differences}} = 4.00$, $SD^{\text{Finding Similarities and Differences}} = 0.63$). Regarding the total score of this subscale, the ability to find similarities and differences of EFL Learners is at a high level.

Findings of the Research Question Two

The second research question of the study is to determine whether the use of reading strategies and the critical reading self-efficacy perceptions of EFL learners vary according to gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, the type of English text EFL learners read most, EFL learners' family members' reading English books, newspapers and texts, and where EFL learners' families live. One Way ANOVA and Independent Sample T-Test were utilized in this analysis.

Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Gender

The Independent Sample T-Test was utilised to find out whether EFL learners' perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy differs statistically according to gender. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6.

T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Gender

Scale/Sub-Scale	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df.	p
Inquiry	Female	158	3.89	.56	-1.10	253	.27
	Male	97	3.97	.55			
Inference	Female	158	3.85	.63	.30	253	.76
	Male	97	3.82	.60			
Analysis	Female	158	4.08	.54	1.15	253	.25
	Male	97	4.00	.57			
Evaluation	Female	158	4.12	.57	1.80	253	.07
	Male	97	3.97	.71			
Finding Similarities and Differences	Female	158	4.02	.63	.61	253	.54
	Male	97	3.97	.62			
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale	Female	158	3.99	.49	.51	253	.61
	Male	97	3.95	.50			

No statistically significant difference exists between the total scores of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perceptions of EFL learners according to gender ($M^{\text{Female}}=3.99$, $M^{\text{Male}}=3.95$, $t=0.51$; $p>.05$). As can be seen in Table 6, no significant difference is found between EFL learners' scores of Inquiry sub-scale in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}}=3.89$, $M^{\text{Male}}=3.97$, $t=-1.10$, $p>.05$). Also, no statistically significant difference exists between learners' scores of Inference sub-scale in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}}=3.85$, $M^{\text{Male}}=3.82$, $t=0.30$, $p>.05$). Additionally, no statistically significant difference was found between learners' total scores of Analysis sub-scale in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}}=4.08$, $M^{\text{Male}}=4.00$, $t=1.15$; $p>.05$). Moreover, no significant difference exists between the total scores of EFL learners' Evaluation sub-scale scores in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}}=4.12$, $M^{\text{Male}}=3.97$, $t=1.80$; $p>.05$). The data results of this study also indicate that no significant difference was found between the scores of EFL learners' Finding Similarities and Differences sub-scale in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}}=4.02$, $M^{\text{Male}}=3.97$, $t=0.61$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Department

To find out whether a statistically significant difference exists between EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy according to Department, the Independent Sample T-Test was performed. The results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7.

T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Department

Scale/Sub-Scale	Department	N	M	SD	t	df	p																																								
Inquiry	English Language Teaching	98	3.87	.53	-1.15	253	.25																																								
	Other	157	3.95	.57				Inference	English Language Teaching	98	3.84	.60	.07	253	.95	Other	157	3.84	.62	Analysis	English Language Teaching	98	4.01	.58	-.82	253	.41	Other	157	4.07	.53	Evaluation	English Language Teaching	98	4.06	.63	-.19	253	.85	Other	157	4.07	.63	Finding Similarities and Differences	English Language Teaching	98	3.96
Inference	English Language Teaching	98	3.84	.60	.07	253	.95																																								
	Other	157	3.84	.62				Analysis	English Language Teaching	98	4.01	.58	-.82	253	.41	Other	157	4.07	.53	Evaluation	English Language Teaching	98	4.06	.63	-.19	253	.85	Other	157	4.07	.63	Finding Similarities and Differences	English Language Teaching	98	3.96	.65	-.90	253	.37								
Analysis	English Language Teaching	98	4.01	.58	-.82	253	.41																																								
	Other	157	4.07	.53				Evaluation	English Language Teaching	98	4.06	.63	-.19	253	.85	Other	157	4.07	.63	Finding Similarities and Differences	English Language Teaching	98	3.96	.65	-.90	253	.37																				
Evaluation	English Language Teaching	98	4.06	.63	-.19	253	.85																																								
	Other	157	4.07	.63				Finding Similarities and Differences	English Language Teaching	98	3.96	.65	-.90	253	.37																																
Finding Similarities and Differences	English Language Teaching	98	3.96	.65	-.90	253	.37																																								

Differences	Other	157	4.03	.61		
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale	English Language Teaching	98	3.94	.49		
	Other	157	3.99	.50	-0.79	253 .43

As shown in Table 7, no statistically significant difference exists between the total scores of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception of EFL learners in terms of the department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.94$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.99$, $t=-0.79$; $p>.05$). There is no statistically significant difference between the total scores of EFL learners' Inquiry sub-scale in terms of department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.87$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.95$, $t=-1.15$; $p>.05$). No statistically significant difference exists between the total scores of the Inference sub-scale of EFL learners in terms of the department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.84$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.84$, $t=0.07$; $p>.05$). According to Table 7, there is no statistically significant difference between total scores of Analysis sub-scale of EFL learners in terms of the department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=4.01$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 4.07$, $t=-0.82$, $p>.05$). Furthermore, no statistically significant difference exists between the total scores of Evaluation sub-scale of EFL learners in terms of the department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=4.06$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 4.07$, $t=-0.19$; $p>.05$), and no significant difference is found between the total scores of Finding Similarities and Differences sub-scale of EFL learners according to department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.96$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 4.03$, $t=-0.90$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of How Often They Read English Texts

One-Way ANOVA was employed to find out whether a significant difference exists between the EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in terms of how often they read English texts. The results are presented below.

Table 8.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy according to How Often They Read English Texts

Scale/Sub-Scale	Frequency	N	M	SD	F	p	Between Group Difference	η^2
Inquiry	Never ¹	10	3.59	.49	4.23	.01	4>2	.048
	Seldom ²	54	3.76	.57				
	Sometimes ³	123	3.93	.51				
	Often ⁴	68	4.06	.58				
Inference	Never ¹	10	3.88	.65	1.74	.16		
	Seldom ²	54	3.69	.6				
	Sometimes ³	123	3.84	.61				
	Often ⁴	68	3.94	.61				
Analysis	Never ¹	10	3.87	.59	5.27	.00	4>2	.059
	Seldom ²	54	3.88	.49				
	Sometimes ³	123	4.03	.56				
	Often ⁴	68	4.25	.52				
Assessment	Never ¹	10	3.75	.86	3.5	.02	4>2	.040
	Seldom ²	54	3.9	.64				
	Sometimes ³	123	4.09	.59				
	Often ⁴	68	4.21	.6				
Finding Similarities and Differences	Never ¹	10	3.78	.88	3.7	.01	4>2	.041
	Seldom ²	54	3.79	.62				
	Sometimes ³	123	4.04	.57				
	Often ⁴	68	4.13	.65				
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale	Never ¹	10	3.75	.59	5.03	.00	4>2	.056
	Seldom ²	54	3.81	.47				
	Sometimes ³	123	3.98	.45				
	Often ⁴	68	4.12	.52				

The total scores of EFL learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy significantly differ by how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.75$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.81$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.98$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=4.12$, $F=5.03$; $p<.05$). Based on the Scheffe Test, the students

who often read had higher critical reading self-efficacy scores than the students who seldom read. In this respect, there is a small effect of the frequency of reading English Texts on the Perception of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy determined by the eta squared score ($\eta^2= 0.056$). According to Table 8, Inquiry scores of EFL learners statistically differ by how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.59$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.76$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.93$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=4.06$, $F=4.23$; $p<0.05$). According to the Scheffe Test, data results of Inquiry show that scores of the learners who often read were significantly higher than the students who seldom read. The role of how often EFL learners read English texts in Inquiry was calculated as small based on the eta squared score ($\eta^2=0.048$).

Additionally, no significant difference is found between Inference scores of EFL learners according to how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.88$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.69$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.84$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.94$, $F= 1.74$; $p>.05$). However, Analysis scores of learners significantly vary according to how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.87$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.88$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=4.03$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=4.25$, $F=5.27$; $p<.05$). Based upon the Scheffe Test, data results of Analysis reveal that scores of EFL learners who often read were significantly higher than learners who seldom read. There is a small effect of the frequency of reading English Texts on Analysis determined by the eta squared score ($\eta^2= 0.059$). Moreover, Assessment scores of EFL learners statistically and significantly differ by the frequency of reading English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.75$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.9$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=4.09$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=4.21$, $F= 3.5$; $p<.05$). Data results of Assessment indicate that scores of the students who often read were significantly higher than the students who seldom read, based on the Scheffe Test. According to the effect size, it was also found that the frequency of reading English texts had a small effect on Assessment determined by the eta squared score ($\eta^2= 0.040$).

Data results of Finding the Similarities and Differences reveal that Finding the Similarities and Differences scores of learners significantly differ by how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.78$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.79$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=4.04$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=4.13$, $F=3.7$; $p<.05$). Based on the Scheffe Test, data results of Finding the Similarities and Differences show that scores of EFL learners who often read were higher than the EFL learners that seldom read. Consequently, there is a small effect of frequency of reading English Texts on Finding the Similarities and Differences determined by the eta squared score ($\eta^2= 0.041$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the Type of English Texts They Read Most

To determine whether a significant difference exists between the EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in terms of the type of English texts they read most, One-Way ANOVA was employed and results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale in terms of the Type of English Texts EFL Learners Read Most

Scale/Sub-Scale	Texts Read	N	M	SD	F	p
Inquiry	Literary Texts	33	3.90	.54		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	4.07	.57	2.44	.09
	Social Media Texts	172	3.88	.55		
Inference	Literary Texts	33	3.81	.68		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.93	.63	.76	.47
	Social Media Texts	172	3.82	.60		
Analysis	Literary Texts	33	4.02	.62		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	4.11	.62	.43	.65
	Social Media Texts	172	4.04	.52		
Assessment	Literary Texts	33	4.15	.60		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	4.16	.63	1.31	.27
	Social Media Texts	172	4.02	.63		
Finding Similarities and Differences	Literary Texts	33	4.04	.72		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	4.10	.56	.94	.39
	Social Media Texts	172	3.97	.62		
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale	Literary Texts	33	3.98	.54		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	4.08	.51	1.55	.21
	Social Media Texts	172	3.94	.48		

No significant difference exists between the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception scores of EFL students according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.98$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=4.08$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.94$, $F=1.55$; $p>.05$). Also, Inquiry scores of learners do not significantly differ by the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.90$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=4.07$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.88$, $F=2.44$; $p>.05$).

According to the findings, no significant difference exists between Inference scores of the participants in terms of the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.81$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.93$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.82$, $F=0.76$; $p>.05$). Furthermore, no significant difference is found between Analysis scores of the participants according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=4.02$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=4.11$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=4.04$, $F=0.43$; $p>.05$).

Moreover, no significant difference exists between Assessment scores of the participants according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=4.15$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=4.16$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=4.02$, $F=1.31$; $p>.05$). According to the type of English texts EFL learners read most, no significant difference exists between Finding Similarities and Differences scores of the participants ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=4.04$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=4.10$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.97$, $F=0.94$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members

To find out whether a statistically significant difference exists between EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the texts read by their family members, the Independent Sample T-Test was employed.

Table 10.

T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members

Scale/Sub-Scale	Texts Read By Family Members'				t	df	p
	N	M	SD				
Inquiry	Yes	35	3.94	.62	.22	253	.83
	No	220	3.92	.55			

Inference	Yes	35	4.01	.59	1.80	253	.07
	No	220	3.81	.61			
Analysis	Yes	35	4.09	.62	.50	253	.62
	No	220	4.04	.54			
Assessment	Yes	35	4.10	.71	.40	253	.69
	No	220	4.06	.61			
Finding Similarities and Differences	Yes	35	4.07	.76	.68	253	.50
	No	220	3.99	.60			
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale	Yes	35	4.03	.57	.76	253	.45
	No	220	3.96	.48			

It was determined that the total scores of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perceptions of EFL learners do not differ significantly according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{\text{Yes}}=4.03$, $M^{\text{No}}=3.96$, $t=0.76$; $p>.05$). The Inquiry sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not differ statistically and significantly according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{\text{Yes}}=3.94$, $M^{\text{No}}=3.92$, $t=0.22$; $p>.05$). Inference sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not significantly vary according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{\text{Yes}}=4.01$, $M^{\text{No}}=3.81$, $t=1.80$; $p>.05$). It can be said that there is no statistically significant difference between the Analysis sub-scale scores of the EFL learners according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{\text{Yes}}=4.09$, $M^{\text{No}}=4.04$, $t=0.50$; $p>.05$). According to the type of text read by EFL learners' family members, Assessment sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not vary significantly ($M^{\text{Yes}}=4.10$, $M^{\text{No}}=4.06$, $t=0.40$; $p>.05$). As can be seen in Table 10, the Finding Similarities and Differences sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not differ statistically and significantly according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{\text{Yes}}=4.07$, $M^{\text{No}}=3.99$, $t=0.68$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Where EFL Learners' Families Live

To determine whether a significant difference exists between the EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in terms of where EFL learners' families live, One-Way ANOVA was utilised in this analysis. Table 11 presents the results.

Table 11.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Where EFL Learners' Families Live

Scale/Sub-Scale	Where Families Live	N	M	SD	F	p
Inquiry	Village	18	3.87	.6	.29	.83
	District	38	3.85	.58		
	Province	52	3.93	.5		
	Metropolitan	147	3.94	.56		
Inference	Village	18	3.73	.82	.94	.42
	District	38	3.84	.57		
	Province	52	3.96	.56		
	Metropolitan	147	3.81	.61		
Analysis	Village	18	3.89	.43	.58	.63
	District	38	4.05	.6		
	Province	52	4.08	.48		
	Metropolitan	147	4.06	.58		
Assessment	Village	18	4.13	.72	.83	.48
	District	38	4.01	.66		
	Province	52	4.18	.52		
	Metropolitan	147	4.03	.64		
Finding Similarities and Differences	Village	18	3.8	.75	1.25	.29
	District	38	3.92	.61		
	Province	52	4.1	.52		
	Metropolitan	147	4.01	.65		
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Scale	Village	18	3.89	.53	.53	.66
	District	38	3.93	.49		
	Province	52	4.03	.41		
	Metropolitan	147	3.97	.51		

No significant difference exists between the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception scores of EFL learners in terms of where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}}=3.89$, $M^{\text{District}}=3.93$, $M^{\text{Province}}=4.03$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=3.97$, $F=0.53$; $p>.05$). Inquiry scores of the learners do not significantly differ by where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}}=3.87$, $M^{\text{District}}=3.85$, $M^{\text{Province}}=3.93$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=3.94$, $F=0.29$; $p>.05$). Also, there is not a significant

difference between Inference scores of the participants in terms of the residence of EFL learners' families ($M^{\text{Village}} = 3.73$, $M^{\text{District}} = 3.84$, $M^{\text{Province}} = 3.96$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}} = 3.81$, $F = 0.42$; $p > .05$). In addition, no significant difference exists between Analysis scores of the participants according to the place where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}} = 3.89$, $M^{\text{District}} = 4.05$, $M^{\text{Province}} = 4.08$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}} = 4.06$, $F = 0.58$; $p > .05$). Assessment scores of EFL learners do not significantly vary according to where families live ($M^{\text{Village}} = 4.13$, $M^{\text{District}} = 4.01$, $M^{\text{Province}} = 4.18$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}} = 4.03$, $F = 0.83$; $p > .05$). Additionally, no significant difference exists between Finding Similarities and Differences scores of the participants according to where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}} = 3.80$, $M^{\text{District}} = 3.92$, $M^{\text{Province}} = 4.10$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}} = 4.01$, $F = 1.25$; $p > .05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of Gender in Reading Strategy Use Scale

Independent Sample T-Test was used in this analysis to determine whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies statistically differ by gender. Table 12 shows the results.

Table 12.

T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies according to Gender

Scale/Sub-Scale	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df	p
Constructing Strategies	Female	158	3.44	.77	-1.02	253	.31
	Male	97	3.53	.67			
Planning Strategies	Female	158	3.58	.60	.47	253	.64
	Male	97	3.54	.75			
Management Strategies	Female	158	3.94	.72	1.93	253	.06
	Male	97	3.75	.76			
Assisting Strategies	Female	158	4.14	.54	2.03	253	.04
	Male	97	3.99	.63			
Visualization Strategies	Female	158	3.67	.85	3.68	253	.00
	Male	97	3.25	.95			
Self-Regulation Strategies	Female	158	3.76	.83	2.13	253	.03
	Male	97	3.52	.92			
Reading Strategies Use Scale	Female	158	3.73	.48	2.04	253	.04
	Male	97	3.60	.53			

A statistically significant difference exists between the total scores of Reading Strategies Use of EFL learners in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 3.73$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.60$, $t = -1.02$; $p < .05$). However, no statistically significant difference exists between Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL Learners' according to gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 3.44$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.53$, $t = -1.10$; $p > .05$). Moreover, no statistically significant difference exists between EFL learners' scores of Planning Strategies sub-scale in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 3.58$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.54$, $t = 0.47$, $p > .05$). In addition, EFL learners' scores of Management Strategies do not significantly differ by gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 3.94$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.75$, $t = 1.93$; $p > .05$). However, a statistically significant difference exists between the scores of learners' Assisting Strategies according to gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 4.14$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.99$, $t = 2.03$; $p < .05$). The findings of this study also show that a statistically significant difference exists between the scores of EFL learners' Visualization Strategies in terms of gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 3.67$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.25$, $t = 3.68$; $p < .05$). Moreover, the scores of EFL learners' Self-Regulation Strategies significantly vary according to gender ($M^{\text{Female}} = 3.76$, $M^{\text{Male}} = 3.52$, $t = 2.13$; $p < .05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of Department in Reading Strategy Use Scale

To find out whether a statistically significant difference exists between EFL Learners' reading strategies use in terms of department, the Independent Sample T-Test was performed. Table 13 indicates the results.

Table 13.

T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of Department

Scale/Sub-Scale	Department	N	M	SD	t	df	p
Constructing Strategies	English Language Teaching	98	3.54	.72	1.18	253	.24
	Other	157	3.43	.74			
	English Language Teaching	98	3.60	.65			
Planning Strategies	English Language Teaching	98	3.60	.65	.65	253	.51
	Other	157	3.55	.66			
	English Language Teaching	98	3.87	.72			
Management Strategies	English Language Teaching	98	3.87	.72	.00	253	1.00
	Other	157	3.87	.75			
	English Language Teaching	98	3.87	.72			

Assisting Strategies	English Language Teaching	98	4.08	.54	-.10	253	.92
	Other	157	4.08	.61			
Visualization Strategies	English Language Teaching	98	3.54	.89	.38	253	.70
	Other	157	3.49	.92			
Self-Regulation Strategies	English Language Teaching	98	3.72	.87	.70	253	.48
	Other	157	3.64	.87			
Reading Strategies Use Scale	English Language Teaching	98	3.71	.47	.72	253	.47
	Other	157	3.66	.53			

As illustrated, the total scores of reading strategies use of EFL learners do not significantly differ by department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.71$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.66$, $t=-0.72$; $p>.05$). Additionally, no statistically significant difference exists between learners' Constructing Strategies scores according to department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.54$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.43$, $t=-1.18$; $p>.05$).

Based on the results, no statistically significant difference was found between learners' Planning Strategies sub-scale scores in terms of the department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.60$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.55$, $t=0.65$; $p>.05$). No statistically significant difference exists between the Management Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners in terms of the department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.87$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.87$, $t=-0.00$, $p>.05$). Furthermore, the Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores of learners do not significantly vary according to department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=4.08$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 4.08$, $t=-0.10$; $p>.05$). Besides, there is no significant difference between the Visualization Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners according to department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.54$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.49$, $t=-0.38$; $p>.05$). No statistically significant difference exists between learners' Self-Regulation Strategies sub-scale scores in terms of department ($M^{\text{English Language Teaching}}=3.72$, $M^{\text{Other}}= 3.64$, $t=0.70$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of How Often They Read English Texts

One-way ANOVA was used to investigate whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies differs by how often they read English texts. The results are illustrated in Table 14.

Table 14.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of How Often They Read English Texts

Scale/Sub-Scale	Frequency	N	M	SD	F	p	Between Group Difference	η^2
Constructing Strategies	Never ¹	10	2.92	.87	6.27	0	4>2	.069
	Seldom ²	54	3.26	.66			4>1	
	Sometimes ³	123	3.48	.74				
	Often ⁴	68	3.71	.68				
Planning Strategies	Never ¹	10	3.37	.69	2.62	.05		
	Seldom ²	54	3.39	.6				
	Sometimes ³	123	3.59	.64				
	Often ⁴	68	3.69	.7				
Management Strategies	Never ¹	10	3.24	1.04	4.51	0	4>1	.051
	Seldom ²	54	3.69	.7			3>1	
	Sometimes ³	123	3.94	.71				
	Often ⁴	68	3.98	.72				
Assisting Strategies	Never ¹	10	3.65	.76	5.3	0	4>1	.059
	Seldom ²	54	3.97	.52			4>2	
	Sometimes ³	123	4.06	.6				
	Often ⁴	68	4.28	.51				
Visualization Strategies	Never ¹	10	3.33	1.02	.95	.42		
	Seldom ²	54	3.36	.71				
	Sometimes ³	123	3.53	.95				
	Often ⁴	68	3.61	.95				
Self-Regulation Strategies	Never ¹	10	3.3	.88	2.38	.07		

		Seldom ²	54	3.49	.77		
		Sometimes ³	123	3.68	.88		
		Often ⁴	68	3.85	.91		
		Never ¹	10	3.29	.59	3>1	
Reading Strategies Use Scale		Seldom ²	54	3.51	.4	6.64 .00	.073
		Sometimes ³	123	3.7	.51		
		Often ⁴	68	3.84	.52		

The Reading Strategies Use total scores of the participants differ statistically and significantly according to how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.29$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.51$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.7$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.84$, $F=6.64$; $p<.05$). According to the Scheffe Test, it was determined that the students who sometimes read had higher Reading Strategies Use scores than the students who never read. It was determined that the frequency of reading had a small effect on the Reading Strategies Use based upon the eta squared score ($\eta^2=0.073$). The Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL learners differ significantly according to the frequency of reading in English ($M^{\text{Never}1}=2.92$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.26$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.48$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.71$, $F=6.27$; $p<.05$). Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the learners that often read were significantly higher than the students that seldom read according to Scheffe Test. Moreover, Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the learners who often read were significantly higher than the students who never read. Based upon the eta squared score ($\eta^2=0.069$), the frequency of reading had a small effect on the Constructing Strategies sub-scale.

Besides, no significant difference is found between Planning Strategies scores of the EFL learners in terms of how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.37$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.39$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.59$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.69$, $F=2.62$; $p>.05$). The Management Strategies sub-scale scores of the participants differ in a statistically significant way according to how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.24$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.69$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.94$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.98$, $F=4.51$; $p<.05$). Based on the Scheffe Test, the Management Strategies sub-scale scores of the learners who often read and of the learners who sometimes read were statistically and significantly higher than the students who never read. According to eta squared score ($\eta^2=0.051$), it was determined that the frequency of reading had a small effect on Management Strategies. Moreover, a

statistically significant difference exists between Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores of the participants in terms of the frequency of reading in English ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.65$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.97$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=4.06$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=4.28$, $F= 5.3$; $p<.05$). According to the Scheffe Test, Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores of the students who often read were statistically and significantly higher than the students who seldom and never read. In this respect, the frequency of reading had a small effect on the Assisting Strategies sub-scale ($\eta^2=0.059$).

On the other hand, Visualization Strategies scores of EFL learners do not differ significantly ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.33$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.36$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.53$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.61$, $F=0.95$; $p>.05$). Additionally, no significant difference exists between the scores of the EFL learners' Self-Regulation Strategies sub-scale according to how often they read English texts ($M^{\text{Never}1}=3.3$, $M^{\text{Seldom}2}=3.49$, $M^{\text{Sometimes}3}=3.68$, $M^{\text{Often}4}=3.85$, $F= 2.38$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of the Type of English Texts They Read Most

One-Way ANOVA was performed to find out whether a statistically significant difference exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategies in terms of the type of English texts they read most. Table 15 presents the findings.

Table 4.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of the Type of English Texts They Read Most

Scale/Sub-Scale	Texts Read	N	M	SD	F	P
Constructing Strategies	Literary Texts	33	3.54	.57		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.56	.80	.69	.50
	Social Media Texts	172	3.44	.74		
Planning Strategies	Literary Texts	33	3.63	.57		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.62	.75	.43	.65
	Social Media Texts	172	3.54	.65		
Management Strategies	Literary Texts	33	3.84	.79		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.86	.76	.05	.95

	Social Media Texts	172	3.88	.72		
Assisting Strategies	Literary Texts	33	4.11	.55		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	4.03	.67	.25	.78
	Social Media Texts	172	4.09	.57		
Visualization Strategies	Literary Texts	33	3.71	.81		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.41	1.13	1.13	.33
	Social Media Texts	172	3.50	.85		
Self-Regulation Strategies	Literary Texts	33	3.77	.90		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.65	.87	.24	.79
	Social Media Texts	172	3.66	.87		
Reading Strategies Use Scale	Literary Texts	33	3.75	.47		
	Newspaper and Magazines	50	3.68	.60	.33	.72
	Social Media Texts	172	3.67	.49		

No significant difference exists between the Reading Strategies Use scores of EFL learners in terms of the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.75$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.68$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.67$, $F=0.33$; $p>.05$). It was concluded that no significant difference exists between Constructing Strategies scores of EFL learners according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.54$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.56$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.44$, $F=0.69$; $p>.05$). Additionally, no significant difference was found between Planning Strategies scores of the participants according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.63$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.62$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.54$, $F=0.43$; $p>.05$). Additionally, EFL learners' Management Strategies scores do not significantly vary according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.84$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.86$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.88$, $F=0.05$; $p>.05$). Moreover, no significant difference exists between Assisting Strategies scores of the participants according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=4.11$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=4.03$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=4.09$, $F=0.25$; $p>.05$).

Finally, no significant difference exists between Visualization Strategies scores of participants ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.71$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.41$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.50$, $F=1.13$; $p>.05$). There was no significant difference between learners' Self-Regulation Strategies score according to the type of English texts they read most ($M^{\text{Literary Texts}}=3.77$, $M^{\text{Newspaper and Magazines}}=3.65$, $M^{\text{Social Media Texts}}=3.66$, $F=0.24$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members

Independent Sample T-Test was employed to find whether learners' use of reading strategies differ by texts read by their family members. Table 16 presents the results.

Table 16.

T-Test Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members

Scale/Sub-Scale	Family Members'						
	Reading	N	M	SD	t	df	p
Constructing strategies	Yes	35	3.57	.63	.84	253	.40
	No	220	3.46	.75			
Planning strategies	Yes	35	3.63	.68	.63	253	.53
	No	220	3.56	.65			
Management strategies	Yes	35	3.85	.80	-.19	253	.85
	No	220	3.87	.73			
Assisting strategies	Yes	35	4.04	.41	-.42	253	.67
	No	220	4.09	.61			
Visualization strategies	Yes	35	3.46	.86	-.33	253	.75
	No	220	3.52	.92			
Self-regulation strategies	Yes	35	3.75	.84	.61	253	.54
	No	220	3.66	.88			
Reading Strategies Use Scale	Yes	35	3.71	.45	.33	253	.74
	No	220	3.68	.52			

Total scores of Reading Strategies Use of EFL learners do not differ significantly according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{\text{Yes}}=3.71$, $M^{\text{No}}=3.68$, $t=0.33$; $p>.05$). The Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not

differ statistically and significantly according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{Yes}=3.57$, $M^{No}=3.46$, $t=0.84$; $p>.05$). No statistically significant difference was found between Planning Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{Yes}=3.63$, $M^{No}=3.56$, $t=0.63$; $p>.05$). Table 16 demonstrates that no statistically significant difference exists between the EFL students' scores of Management Strategies sub-scale according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{Yes}=3.85$, $M^{No}=3.87$, $t=-0.19$; $p>.05$). No statistically significant difference exists between Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners ($M^{Yes}=4.04$, $M^{No}=4.09$, $t=-0.42$; $p>.05$). Finally, Visualization Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not differ significantly according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{Yes}=3.46$, $M^{No}=3.52$, $t=-0.33$; $p>.05$). Self-Regulation Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners do not vary according to the type of text read by their family members ($M^{Yes}=3.75$, $M^{No}=3.66$, $t=0.61$; $p>.05$).

Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of Where EFL Learners' Families Live

One-Way ANOVA was employed to determine EFL learners' use of reading strategies vary according to where their families live.

Table 17.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of Where EFL Learners' Families Live

Scale/Sub-Scale	Where Families Live	N	M	SD	F	p
Constructing strategies	Village	18	3.5	.9	.4	.75
	District	38	3.4	.7		
	Province	52	3.56	.62		
	Metropolitan	147	3.46	.76		
Planning strategies	Village	18	3.52	.59	.19	.9
	District	38	3.51	.72		
	Province	52	3.6	.58		
	Metropolitan	147	3.58	.68		
Management strategies	Village	18	3.88	.86	.15	.93
	District	38	3.87	.73		
	Province	52	3.92	.73		

	Metropolitan	147	3.84	.73		
Assisting strategies	Village	18	4	.56		
	District	38	4.01	.56	.37	.78
	Province	52	4.1	.57		
	Metropolitan	147	4.1	.6		
Village	18	3.75	.99			
Visualization strategies	District	38	3.35	1.07	.9	.44
	Province	52	3.57	.74		
	Metropolitan	147	3.5	.91		
	Village	18	3.65	.8		
Self-regulation strategies	District	38	3.62	.93	.11	.95
	Province	52	3.63	.93		
	Metropolitan	147	3.7	.85		
	Village	18	3.7	.6		
Reading Strategies Use Scale	District	38	3.62	.56	.33	.8
	Province	52	3.72	.41		
	Metropolitan	147	3.68	.52		
	Village	18	3.7	.6		

No significant difference exists between the total scores of Reading Strategies Use of EFL learners according to where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}}=3.7$, $M^{\text{District}}=3.62$, $M^{\text{Province}}=3.72$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=3.68$, $F=0.33$; $p>.05$). Moreover, no significant difference exists between Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL learners according to where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}}=3.5$, $M^{\text{District}}=3.4$, $M^{\text{Province}}=3.56$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=3.46$, $F=0.4$; $p>.05$). Additionally, no significant difference exists between Planning Strategies sub-scale scores of the participants according to the residence of EFL learners' families ($M^{\text{Village}}=3.52$, $M^{\text{District}}=3.51$, $M^{\text{Province}}=3.6$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=3.58$, $F=0.19$; $p>.05$).

In addition, no significant difference exists between Management Strategies sub-scale scores of the participants according to the place where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}}=3.88$, $M^{\text{District}}=3.87$, $M^{\text{Province}}=3.92$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=3.84$, $F=0.15$; $p>.05$). EFL learners' Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores do not significantly differ according to where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}}=4$, $M^{\text{District}}=4.01$, $M^{\text{Province}}=4.1$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}}=4.1$, $F=0.37$; $p>.05$). No significant difference exists between Visualization Strategies scores of the

participants according to the residence of their families ($M^{\text{Village}} = 3.75$, $M^{\text{District}} = 3.35$, $M^{\text{Province}} = 3.57$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}} = 3.5$, $F = 0.9$; $p > .05$). Moreover, no significant difference exists between Self-Regulation Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL learners according to where their families live ($M^{\text{Village}} = 3.65$, $M^{\text{District}} = 3.62$, $M^{\text{Province}} = 3.63$, $M^{\text{Metropolitan}} = 3.7$, $F = 0.11$; $p > .05$).

Findings of the Research Question Three

A correlational analysis was used to find out whether there is a meaningful relationship between EFL learners' perception of critical reading self-efficacy and their use of reading strategies. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed in this analysis and results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18.

Pearson Correlation Test of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Reading Strategies Use

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Inquiry (1)	1												
Inference (2)	.56**	1											
Analysis (3)	.66**	.56**	1										
Assessment (4)	.63**	.58**	.73**	1									
Finding Similarities and Differences (5)	.60**	.57**	.62**	.71**	1								
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy (6)	.87**	.76**	.86**	.87**	.82**	1							
Constructing Strategies (7)	.36**	.30**	.29**	.27**	.32**	.37**	1						
Planning Strategies (8)	.28**	.28**	.20**	.18**	.21**	.28**	.47**	1					
Management Strategies (9)	.35**	.35**	.36**	.33**	.34**	.42**	.36**	.38**	1				

Assisting Strategies (10)	.41**	.30**	.36**	.36**	.35**	.43**	.30**	.46**	.35**	1			
Visualization Strategies (11)	.15*	.256**	.17**	.14*	.15*	.20**	.30**	.47**	.39**	.36**	1		
Self-Regulation Strategies (12)	.24**	.20**	.24**	.23**	.23**	.28**	.28**	.34**	.25**	.33**	.36**		
Reading Strategies Use (13)	.42**	.41**	.38**	.35**	.38**	.47**	.68**	.80**	.68**	.63**	.71**	.57**	1

*p<0.05; **p<0.01

It was determined that a statistically significant and positive relationship exists between the sub-scales of Critical Reading Self-efficacy and sub-scales of Reading Strategies Use. Additionally, there is a statistically significant and positive relationship between the sub-scales of Critical Reading Self-efficacy, and a statistically significant and positive relationship between the sub-scales of Reading Strategies Use. It was also found that a statistically significant, moderate and positive relationship exists between EFL learners' perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and use of Reading Strategies ($r=.47$; $p<.01$). There is a significant, high and positive relationship between the scores of EFL learners' perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and Inquiry ($r=.87$; $p<.01$). Among the variables, the highest relationship exists between perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and Inquiry. In addition, there is a high, positive, and significant relationship between the scores of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Analysis ($r=.86$; $p<.01$). Another high level, positive and significant relationship exists between the Reading Strategy Use and Planning ($r=.80$; $p<.01$).

In this study, a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between Reading Strategies Use and Constructing Strategies was found ($r=.68$; $p<.01$). In addition, there is a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between Inquiry and Analysis ($r=.66$; $p<.01$). Another moderate, positive and significant relationship exists between the scores of Reading Strategies Use and Inquiry ($r=.42$; $p<.01$). Furthermore, there is a low, positive, and significant relationship between Analysis and Planning Strategies ($r=.20$; $p<.01$). Moreover, a low, positive, and significant relationship between the scores of EFL learners' Inquiry and Visualization Strategies was found ($r=.15$; $p<.05$).

The lowest, positive, and significant relationship exists between Assessment and Visualization Strategies in this study ($r=.14$; $p<.05$).

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The present research was executed to determine whether a significant relationship exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. The study also aims to determine the levels of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. The purpose of the study is also to find out whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts and where EFL learners' family lives. Learners studying English as a foreign language at two state universities participated in the study. There were 255 EFL students participating in this study. By using the "Demographic Information Form", "Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale" and "Reading Strategy Use Scale", data were collected. The data were analysed by employing descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation Test, One-Way ANOVA, Independent Sample T-Test on SPSS. Discussions of the research questions, the implications of the study, limitations and suggestions for future research are discussed in this chapter elaborately.

Discussion of the Research Question One

The first research question of the study examines the participants' levels of reading strategies use and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. The first research question was analysed by utilizing descriptive statistics. The findings are discussed in this section.

Discussion of the Level of EFL Learners' Reading Strategy Use

In light of findings, EFL learners 'usually' use reading strategies. Regarding reading strategies, constructing strategies are employed much by EFL learners based on the results. According to McGeown et al. (2012), students with intrinsic motivation have more information to construct meaning from the text and they engage in more social interactions while reading. Afflerbach and Cho (2009) claim that significant differences exist between the readers' use of reading strategies, particularly between readers from different social and cultural backgrounds. The diverse ways that people learn to read and the various ways that they observe written texts used in their own social

surroundings can be the reason of using these various strategies. In this study, EFL learners think that constructing strategies should be usually utilized while reading because they can attempt to explain and envision what they read.

According to the findings of this research, EFL students set an excellent example on how to plan before reading. In order to warm themselves up, EFL learners indicate that they ‘usually’ use planning strategies before reading a text, and students who monitor their progress and persevere at tasks set realistic goals while reading. Sen (2009) asserts that the thinking process prior to reading necessitates the use of metacognitive strategies which can enhance strategic reading skills and learners think about the reading process. According to Çakıcı (2017), the success of EFL readers is promoted by alternative efficient metacognitive reading strategies and planning strategy-based models.

The present research also indicates that learners try to organize their reading environment which shows that they ‘usually’ employ management strategies. Students who create a suitable environment for reading can receive both statistically and significantly higher marks on their examinations (Dreyer & Nel, 2003). Zhang (2001) found that the Chinese EFL readers' use of management strategies in reading had close bonds to their EFL proficiency. Considering findings of the present research learners also highlight important information as they work to connect the subject to their prior knowledge in reading. O'Reilly and McNamara (2017) revealed that lower secondary students' reading comprehension scores dramatically increased after being activated to the background knowledge reading strategy.

In this study, EFL learners ‘usually’ use assisting strategies by reading the text again, to comprehend better the text when they do not understand what they have read. Küçükoğlu (2013) indicates that the students had an improvement to a great extent on condition that they make re-reading. Hayashi (1999) asserts that using assisting strategies promotes context-based guessing skill, and provides learners with a wealth of knowledge, vocabulary recognition, strong drive for further reading, and self-discovery of reading strategies.

Based upon the results, EFL learners ‘usually’ employ visualization strategies: circling the necessary information to help them comprehend the text, underlining the information and taking notes while reading the text. Yang (2006) concludes that the use of visualization strategies is a cognitive step by which readers solve problems that are

caused by the inadequacy of using reading strategies in understanding textual information. According to De Koning and Schoot (2013), it is critical to visualize the events described in a text to construct a rich and coherent visual-spatial mental representation of the text.

The findings of the research reveal that EFL learners also ‘usually’ utilize self-regulation strategies like modifying their reading pace according to the type of text they read and changing their reading style if necessary. According to Nash-Ditzel (2010), students' ability to self-regulate in reading was impacted by their increasing knowledge of reading strategies, their capability to successfully employ those techniques to change their overall reading behaviour and their perception of the importance of such methods. Schunk and Zimmerman (2007) mention that modeling is an effective method for developing self-regulation and academic skills, as well as increasing self-efficacy. In Souvignier and Mokhlesgerami's opinion (2006), self-regulated learning has the potential to be an effective framework for optimizing impacts upon reading comprehension.

Discussion of the Level of EFL Learners' Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception

Based upon the results, learners assert that they have perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. First, EFL learners state that they can inquire about the given text by using their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. EFL learners accept that they may be sceptical about the facts and viewpoints presented by the author in the text. Chu et al. (2011) claim that learners' reading skills and interests may be improved through inquiry learning. Chu et al. analysed the impact of a group project inquiry approach on the reading skills of primary school kids and it was observed that the students could identify the texts' consistent and inconsistent elements. This can also be related to EFL learners' metacognitive awareness and perceived reading techniques while reading school-related or academic materials.

In this study, EFL learners also assert that they could utilize inference strategies. They predict how the text they read would develop and foretell the development of the plot in the text. Significant differences between grade levels and treatment conditions were seen in the direct and indirect impacts of prior knowledge, vocabulary, word reading, techniques, and deducing on comprehension. (Ahmed et al., 2022). In addition,

the findings of Attaprechakul (2013) revealed that learners typically hinged on bottom-up processing and they left out the difficult information, especially the technical specifics and graphic images and sought guidance from their peers to clarify their knowledge. Overall, they were successful at determining the definitions of the analysed terms and phrases, the section's primary idea, and the thesis statement. The underlying concept, other people's perceptions of the research findings, and the article's tone were however more challenging for learners to infer. Additionally, a substantial number of learners did not use the information in section titles and the structure of research papers to direct their reading assignments (Attaprechakul 2013). It has been discovered that reading comprehension is significantly and directly influenced by reading strategies that promote inference from the text, such as summarising material, self-questioning, and relating new knowledge to prior learning (Cromley & Azevedo, 2007).

In light of the findings, EFL learners also state making analyses while reading. Indeed, the EFL learners could determine the main idea of any text and point out its unique features and provide their opinions regarding the subject or theme of the text. According to Cross and Paris (1988), EFL learners made significant gains in metacognition by making analyses. It was possible to pinpoint subgroups of learners who reacted differently to the metacognitive teaching with the use of the multivariate profiles of reading skills established from developmental analyses. Additionally, considering the results of this present study, learners have the ability to grasp the main point and articulate their opinions on a subject or theme from a text that they read. EFL learners can also foresee the character traits of the people in a book or narrative.

Additionally, EFL learners could establish a cause-effect relationship between concepts and events, as well as between the introduction, development, and conclusion sections; therefore, they assert that they could make evaluations while reading. Namely, they are able to establish the connection between an event, a location, and a person. Chevalier et al. (2017) claim that students who can evaluate the text have the awareness and they can monitor the relationship between cognitive resources and task requirements.

EFL learners also state that they could find similarities and differences while reading. The learners are able to identify events, situations, or people that support or contradict each other in the text they read. Considering finding similarities and

differences in a reading text at a university level, higher levels of academic success could result from the usage of reading techniques that encourage complex reading comprehension (Taraban & Rynearson, 2004). Based upon the findings of the present research, EFL learners identify the views in the text and the opposing views of these views. Moreover, they can identify what is fictional and what is not in the text. Proctor et al., (2006) note that students, who can find the differences and similarities in a given text faster, can easily acquire, integrate, and store new knowledge and skills in memory.

The Second Research Question: Discussion of the Analysis of EFL Learners' Reading Strategies Use and Their Perceptions of Their Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Vary according to Demographic Features

The second research question investigates whether EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy vary according to gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, the type of English text EFL learners read most, EFL learners' family members' reading English books, newspapers and texts, and where EFL learners' families live. In order to determine whether the reading strategies use and the critical reading self-efficacy perceptions of EFL learners vary according to demographic variables, One-Way ANOVA tests and Independent Sample T-Test were used in this study.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Gender

Based on the findings from EFL participants of this study, no statistically significant difference exists between EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in terms of gender. As a result, this study reveals that EFL learners can equally have perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy regardless of their gender. Likewise, in the research conducted by Karadeniz (2015), there is not a statistically significant difference in the learners' perception of critical reading self-efficacy according to their gender. According to Öztürk, Denkci-Akkaş and Tikiz-Ertürk (2022), there is no meaningful difference between EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in terms of gender. In a similar vein, Yüzer (2022) claims that the EFL learners' perceptions of self-efficacy competencies do not vary significantly in terms of their gender.

According to the research findings of a study conducted by Schunk and Pajares (2002), female students' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy vary significantly according to gender. In the majority of studies examining the relationship between gender and self-efficacy, although female students are more successful in language arts, male and female students show similar confidence in this area (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Dilek, Karabay, and Kayran (2015) also investigated learners' perceptions of self-efficacy in critical reading and the results showed that EFL students felt above-intermediate levels of competence in critical reading, and that their opinions of their self-efficacy differed by gender.

In this study, regarding inquiry aspects, gender does not have a role in learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. The study further reveals that no significant difference exists between inference skills of male and female learners. Additionally, regarding making analyses and evaluations and regarding finding similarities and differences, there is not a statistically significant difference between EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy according to their gender.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Department

In light of findings of this study, no statistically significant difference exists between EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy according to their department. As a result of this, EFL learners have almost equal perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy irrespective of their departments. In this study, learners, who will study in different departments after preparatory school education, have almost the same perceptions as those who will study ELT. This might be related to the students' reading habits. Generally, the EFL learners read texts only to solve questions about the texts in order to attend a university department; thus, their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy may not develop enough to differ from the students in other departments. In a similar vein, according to Yüzer (2022), perceptions of self-efficacy competencies among EFL learners do not significantly differ by their department. On the other hand, a study by Dilek, Karabay, and Kayran (2015) investigated learners' perceptions of their self-efficacy in critical reading to both determine the depth of the sense of self-efficacy and find out if this sense of self-efficacy indicated a substantial change according to department. The results showed that learners felt above-intermediate levels of

competence in critical reading and that their opinions of their own efficacy differed by department.

Regarding inquiry aspects, EFL learners' department does not have a role in their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in this present study. This study also reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the inference skills of EFL learners in terms of their departments. Consequently, learners' making analyses and evaluations, and finding similarities and differences do not vary according to their departments significantly.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of How Often They Read English Texts

According to results of the study, learners who often read had higher critical reading self-efficacy scores than the students who seldom read. Based on the results of this study, a statistically significant difference exists between Inquiry scores of EFL learners in terms of how often they read English texts. Therefore, the more EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy increase, the more they predict the development of the plot they read, and the more they can complete the gaps left in a sentence or text properly. Moreover, data results of Inquiry show that scores of the learners who often read were significantly higher than the students who seldom read. However, no significant difference is found between Inference scores of EFL learners according to how often they read English texts.

A statistically significant difference also exists between Analysis scores of learners according to how often they read English texts. Data results of Analysis show that scores of EFL learners who often read were significantly higher than learners who seldom read. As a result, it can be concluded that as the EFL learners read often, they can guess the purpose of the author. Assessment scores of EFL learners in this study also statistically and significantly differ by the frequency of reading English texts. Data results of Assessment indicate that scores of the students who often read were significantly higher than the students who seldom read. As a result, the more EFL learners read, the better they can determine the relationship between event, place, and person in a text.

In light of findings, a significant difference exists between Finding the Similarities and Differences scores of learners in terms of how often they read English texts. Data

results of Finding the Similarities and Differences show that scores of EFL learners who often read were higher than the EFL learners that seldom read. As the EFL learners' reading increases, they can easily determine what is fictitious and not fictitious. However, in another study, Yüzer (2022) claims that the impression of self-efficacy competencies among EFL learners does not significantly differ by how frequently they read texts in English.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the Type of English Texts They Read Most

The data results of this study reveal that learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy do not significantly vary according to type of English texts they read most.

In this study, regarding inquiry aspects, the type of English texts EFL learners read most does not have a role in their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. This study also reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the inference skills of EFL learners in terms of the type of English texts they read most. No significant difference exists between learners' making analyses and evaluations and finding similarities and differences according to the type of English texts EFL learners read most. When it comes to other studies, there is no study that investigates whether EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy differ by the type of English texts they read most. In this present study, it was however investigated to shed light on future studies.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members

Data results of the present study reveal that no significant difference exists between the scores of learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy in terms of the texts read by their family members. This result may be related to lack of dialogue or discussion between learners and their family in their social life. That means, family members of the learners in this study may read a lot but if there is no intellectual exchange of ideas among the family members about the information they get from the reading texts, learners' critical reading self-efficacy may not be affected by their family members' reading texts and habits. Koç and Arslan (2017) examined students' critical reading self-efficacy perceptions and consciousness of reading strategies in terms of

grade level, gender, and parental attitudes to reading. Koç and Arslan (2017) found a significant and positive relationship between the sub-dimensions of awareness of reading strategies used by parents and the perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. In this study, texts read by EFL learners' family members do not have a role in EFL learners' inquiry. This study also reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the inference skills of EFL learners in terms of the texts read by their family members. Besides, there is not a significant difference between learners' making analyses and evaluations and finding similarities and differences according to the texts read by their family members.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy in terms of Where Their Families Live

Findings indicate that scores of EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy do not significantly vary according to where their families live. In this study, where EFL learners' families live does not have a role in EFL learners' inquiry aspects. Moreover, this study brings out that no statistically significant difference exists between the inference skills of EFL learners in terms of where their families live. EFL learners' making analyses and evaluations and finding similarities and differences do not vary according to where their families live. Therefore, it can be expected that there would be a difference in the reading habits of the participants in Ankara, where there is a significant difference in literacy and schooling levels compared to other regions of Turkey, and this can also be reflected in the EFL students' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. However, the present study did not reveal any statistical difference. This in turn may be grounds for further study in itself.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of Gender

Data results reveal that a significant difference exists in the total scores of Reading Strategies Use of EFL learners in terms of gender in this study. In a similar vein, a significant difference was found between students' use of metacognitive strategies in favour of female students (Evrans & Yurdabakan, 2013; Koç & Karabağ, 2013). Similar results were found in research studies conducted with EFL students (Ateş, 2013; Tunca & Alkın-Şahin, 2014). However, in this study, no statistically significant difference exists between Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL Learners' according to gender. Moreover, no statistically significant difference exists between learners'

scores of Planning Strategies sub-scale according to gender. In addition, EFL learners' scores of Management Strategies do not vary according to gender. However, according to the study conducted by Karatay (2010), it was determined that there was a significant difference in favour of female students in the sub-dimensions of planning, organizing and evaluating reading strategies and metacognitive awareness. In different studies, metacognitive awareness levels of female students differed significantly from male students (Akın & Çeçen, 2014; Bağçeci, Döş & Sarıca, 2011; Kana, 2014; Kaya & Fırat, 2011). However, in a study conducted by Yükselir (2014), there were no significant differences between EFL learners' use of reading strategies in terms of gender. In other words, gender differences have no effect on the learners' reading strategy use.

According to the research findings of the study conducted by Gökşen (2019), female EFL learners use analytical reading strategies less than male EFL learners. For this reason, teachers need to take the necessary precautions so that female students can use analytical reading strategies effectively as well as pragmatic strategies (Gökşen, 2019). In a study conducted by Gömleksiz and Elaldı (2011), it has been concluded that both female and male students are at a good level for A1-A2 (beginner) level reading skills when the opinions of the EFL preparatory class students as to their English reading skills are evaluated in general in terms of gender. In a study conducted in China, Wei Wei (2009) stated that female learners are better at reading skills than male learners in foreign language learning at the intermediate level, which is due to the fact that female learners can be motivated quickly with encouragement and the sense of achievement is more important for female students. In another study, it was stated that reading comprehension skill, especially at the beginner level, could be related to the subject of the text and evaluation criteria (Brantmeier, 2004).

In this study, a significant difference exists between the scores of learners' Assisting Strategies in terms of gender. Findings further show that a significant difference exists between the scores of EFL learners' Visualization Strategies according to gender. Moreover, EFL learners' Self-Regulation Strategies statistically do not vary according to gender.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of Department

In this research, findings reveal that there is not a statistical difference in the total scores of Reading Strategies Use of EFL learners in terms of department. In a similar

vein, according to a study conducted by Yaylı (2010), learners in an ELT programme are anticipated to own nearly equal and very proficient reading skills; nevertheless, students who will study in different departments in preparation classes are at the same reading levels as those who will study ELT. The reason might be related to their reading habits. Since the students read only to solve questions before attending to a university, their use of reading strategies may not vary according to their departments. Only after the learners attend a university, their use of reading strategies could vary.

Conversely, Bedir and Dursun (2019) conclude that metacognitive strategies of reading use play role in increasing learners' metacognitive awareness at different departments. According to Yükselir (2014), EFL learners' use of reading strategies vary according to departments; that is, learners' use of reading strategies is impacted by departmental differences. Although ten cognitive reading strategies were identified in Anderson's (1991) study, some learners were able to incorporate more reading strategies in their verbal responses because they were more verbose than others who study in different departments.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of How Often They Read English Texts

Data results of the study reveal that the use of reading strategies of the participants differ statistically and significantly according to how often they read English texts. Based on the results of this present study, the students who sometimes read had higher reading strategies use scores than the students who never read.

The Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL learners differ significantly by the frequency of reading in English. As a consequence of this, Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of EFL learners who often read were significantly higher than the students who seldom read. Moreover, Constructing Strategies sub-scale scores of the EFL learners who often read were significantly higher than the students who never read. However, no significant difference is found between Planning Strategies scores of the EFL learners in terms of how often they read English texts.

Based on the findings of this study, the Management Strategies sub-scale scores of the participants differ in a statistically significant way according to how often they read English texts. In so doing, Management Strategies sub-scale scores of the learners who often read and of the learners who sometimes read were statistically and significantly

higher than the students who never read. Moreover, a statistically significant difference exists between Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores of the participants in terms of the frequency of reading in English. As a result of this, Assisting Strategies sub-scale scores of the students who often read were statistically and significantly higher than the students who seldom and never read. However, visualization Strategies scores of EFL learners do not differ significantly. Additionally, no significant difference exists between the scores of the EFL learners' Self-Regulation Strategies sub-scale according to how often they read English texts.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of the Type of English Texts They Read Most

Findings of the present study reveal that there is not a significant difference between the scores of EFL learners' use of reading strategies according to the type of English texts they read most. To improve critical reading skills, teachers necessitate finding and presenting qualified text types to EFL learners and asking questions about these text types that students can do in-depth understanding and discuss (Çelik et.al, 2017). In support of the results of Moraru and LeBoutillier (2009), Hall and Piazza (2008), and Okeke (2010), this study concluded that critical reading skills of EFL pre-service teachers can be improved with the help of effective reading text types and effective questions. A study conducted by Coşkun, Köksal, and Tuğlu (2014) found that the pre-service teachers got close comprehension scores, although the effects of reading types on their reading comprehension levels varied. According to the results of the research, Turkish teacher candidates got the highest comprehension score, followed by English and German teacher candidates respectively; and it is seen that Turkish, English, and German teacher candidates' reading tendencies according to texts they read most are concentrated on novel-newspaper and novel-newspaper-other genres. This result of the study coincides with the research conducted by Pekkanlı and Kartal (2010) on the reading habits of foreign language teacher candidates in their mother tongue and foreign language. Pekkanlı and Kartal (2010) found that both the genres and reading habits of prospective teachers studying in the 4th grade of English, French, and German Language Education departments varied.

In this study, regarding Constructing Strategies, the type of English texts EFL learners read most does not have a role in their use of reading strategies. Planning

Strategies of learners do not vary according to type of English texts they read most. Additionally, Management Strategies and Assisting Strategies of learners do not vary according to type of English texts EFL learners read most. In a similar vein, in terms of Visualization Strategies and Self-Regulation Strategies, no significant difference exists between learners and their use of reading strategies.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of the Texts Read by Their Family Members

The study further reveals that total scores of Reading Strategies Use of EFL learners do not differ by the texts read by their family members. To ascertain the relationship between critical reading self-efficacy perception and reading strategies awareness levels, Koç and Arslan (2017) examined students' perceptions of their critical reading self-efficacy and awareness of reading strategies according to some variables, such as parental attitudes toward reading. The more the parents read in a family, the more the students in the same family use reading strategies (Bedir & Dursun, 2019). According to the research findings conducted by Koç and Arslan (2017), EFL students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies does not differ significantly according to their parents' educational reading status. This result is inconsistent with some studies' results. For instance, in the study conducted by Kaya and Firat (2011) it was concluded that as the reading levels of the parents increased, the use of reading strategies by the learners increased. In the study conducted by Kana (2014), it was determined that students who have the habit of reading every day in their families are more strategic while reading. This finding in the study is unexpected, because it is thought that as parents' reading levels increase, they will be able to offer their children richer learning environments.

Regarding Constructing Strategies, the texts read by EFL learners' family members in this present study play no role in their use of reading strategies. Planning Strategies of EFL learners do not vary according to texts read by their family members. Additionally, regarding Management Strategies and Assisting Strategies, no statistically significant difference is found between learners according to the texts read by their family members. Finally, no significant difference exists between EFL learners' Visualization Strategies as well as Self-Regulation Strategies in terms of the texts read by EFL learners' family members.

Discussion of EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies in terms of Where Their Families Live

Data results reveal that there is not a statistical difference between the total scores of learners' Reading Strategies Use in terms of where their families live. In this study, students' reading habits in Ankara, where literacy and schooling levels could differ significantly from those in other regions of Turkey, would have reflected on EFL learners' use of reading strategies. However, in this study, where EFL learners' families live had no effect on their use of reading strategies. According to the research findings of the study conducted by Gökşen (2019), EFL students living in the city centre or metropolitan use metacognitive reading strategies well, but the students living in the village and town settlements have lower scores in using these strategies. For this reason, teachers should take into account where those students come from: such small settlements as villages and towns (Gökşen, 2019). Likewise, in a study conducted by Köseoğlu (2011), according to the place of residence variable, a significant difference was found in terms of learners living in the city centre. The place of residence is a distinguishing and differentiating factor for learners' reading comprehension.

In this study, regarding Constructing Strategies, where EFL learners' families live does not have a role in their use of reading strategies. This study also reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the Planning Strategies of EFL learners in terms of where their family members live. Additionally, Management Strategies and Assisting Strategies of learners do not differ according to where their families live. Similarly, Visualization Strategies and Self-Regulation Strategies do not vary significantly according to where EFL learners' families live and their use of reading strategies.

Discussion of the Research Question Three

Research question three investigates whether there is a meaningful relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. Discussion of the research question three, based on findings, is provided in this section.

Discussion of the Relationship between EFL Learners' Use of Reading Strategies and Their Perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy

Data analysis of the correlation test show that a significant and positive relationship exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. Similarly, Karadeniz (2015) found a significant relationship between self-efficacy and critical reading in a study with Faculty of Education learners in Turkey, as well as a positive correlation between the learners' perceptions of self-efficacy for critical reading and their manners toward reading habits. The metacognitive strategy, compensatory strategy, and cognitive strategy were shown to be the most often used reading strategies in a study conducted by Li and Wang (2010). Additionally, Li and Wang (2010) found that there was a strong correlation between beliefs of self-efficacy and the usage of reading strategies; on the other hand, there was no connection between reading success and reading strategies.

Furthermore, Shell and Murphy (1989) investigated the relationship between students' perceived levels of English reading proficiency and their learning outcomes. The study's conclusions show a strong relationship between students' perceived self-efficacy and their reading proficiency. Self-efficacy has the potential to predict more accurately school reading success than another aspect of outcome expectance (Shell & Murphy, 1989). According to Shell and Colvin's (1995) study, self-efficacy is the greatest variable in reading to distinguish exceptional performers from average achievers. In a study, Chamot (1993) also looked at the effects of cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategy usage in L2 reading received by Japanese, Russian, and Spanish learners. Students answered questions about their frequency of using reading strategies and questions about self-efficacy based on their perceptions of their ability to complete the tasks. The study's findings show that most groups have positive correlations between the application of learning strategies often and their perceptions of their own efficacy. According to research, self-efficacy is linked to learning motivation and a higher utilisation of learning strategies. (Wong, 2005; Yang, 2004).

In addition to this, a significant and positive relationship exists between the sub-scales of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and a statistically significant and positive relationship exists between the sub-scales of Reading Strategies Use in the study. There is a significant, high, and positive relationship between the scores of EFL learners'

Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Inquiry. The highest relationship exists between Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Inquiry; therefore, it can be concluded that the more learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy rise, the more their questioning abilities could develop. Namely, from the text they read, EFL learners can challenge the author's point of view and debate the validity of the auxiliary concepts that supplement the core ideas. In addition, they can determine whether the ideas put forward by the author in the instructional texts can be applied today. In addition to this, there is a high, positive, and significant relationship between the scores of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception and Analysis. EFL learners of this study are able to efficiently specify what makes the text they read different and can guess the personality traits of people in the novel or story they read. They can also find the main idea of a text they read. Another high level, positive, and significant relationship exists between the Reading Strategy Use and Planning. In relation to each other, EFL students read the text quickly to get the general idea before reading the whole text and while reading, they return to the point where they broke off. Before reading the text, they also preview it to see what the text is about and they set goals before starting to read.

Moreover, a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between The Reading Strategies Use and Constructing Strategies was found. It can be stated that learners could compare the information presented in the text with the information they have in my mind. That is, EFL learners can stop occasionally and ask themselves questions about the text to check how well they understand the text. In addition, there is a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between Inquiry and Analysis. This shows that as EFL students question the elements in the text they read, their capacity to analyse the text is also increasing. Another moderate, positive, and significant relationship in this study exists between the scores of Reading Strategies Use and Inquiry. As a result of this, it can be said that the more learners' use of reading strategies rises, the more their questioning abilities could increase. In other words, EFL learners could check whether the thoughts in the text they read are reliable and they could further find out the inconsistencies in a text. Furthermore, there is a low, positive, and significant relationship between Analysis and Planning Strategies. Besides, a low, positive, and significant relationship between the scores of EFL learners' Inquiry and Visualization Strategies was found. Finally, the lowest, positive, and significant relationship is found between Assessment and Visualization Strategies in this study.

Conclusion

In order to find out whether a significant relationship exists between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy, two questionnaires were used in a quantitative research study. In this regard, levels of EFL learners' use of reading strategy and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy were investigated and this study also scrutinized if the results differed by gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, type of English texts EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts and where their family lives.

Data results demonstrate that EFL learners 'usually' use reading strategies. Regarding learners' Constructing Strategies, EFL learners in this study attempt to explain and envision what they read in their dreams at a high rate. In other words, the fact that EFL students can visualize the information they read shows that the strategies they use are helpful in understanding what they read. Considering EFL learners' Planning Strategies, it can be concluded that EFL students pay attention to determining what the text will be about by previewing the text before reading. This is the indication of the preparation of EFL students before reading. Regarding EFL learners' Management Strategies, EFL learners 'usually' set up a favourable environment for reading. As a result of this, it can be said that preparing the reading environment before reading allows them to concentrate on the reading text to a large extent. As EFL learners work to draw connections between the material they read and their prior knowledge, they also underscore significant findings. Underlining some noteworthy places while reading and then just browsing there, ensures that the knowledge in the reading text is permanent. Regarding the Assisting Strategies, when EFL learners do not grasp what they have read, they reread the text in order to better understand because it can be an application that is very useful for not missing any details in a text. Based upon results of the Visualization Strategies, it can be concluded that EFL students underline the material that will assist them to grasp the text they read, circle the information, and take notes while reading the text. Note-taking contributes not only to the aftermath of the idea and knowledge process but also to the time it takes place. The learner is more alert and more attentive while taking notes. In this way, learning and perception skills can be higher. Moreover, if a learner has a habit of taking notes, his/her criticism and evaluation skills will improve, and as a result, h/she has a

character that thinks and aims for the better. Regarding EFL learners' Self-Regulation Strategies, when they are reading different types of texts, they 'usually' alter their reading style and speed as appropriate. Being able to adjust the reading speed helps the human brain perform better and appropriately (Mitsea et.al, 2022).

Regarding the level of EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy, EFL learners assert that the learners could detect consistent and inconsistent elements in the text. Additionally, EFL learners can challenge the author's content and point of view in the text. It can be concluded that EFL students could foresee the course of the text they are reading and the unfolding of the storyline. That means the indication of their inference capabilities. Regarding EFL learners' Analysis capabilities, they could easily determine the main idea of the text, pick out its unique features, and briefly discuss the subject or theme in the text. Moreover, a cause-and-effect connection between concepts and events, as well as between the introduction, development, and conclusion sections, is something that EFL students state they can do. Being able to predict the outcome of any action is an indication that learners can question and evaluate the text they read. Based on EFL learners' Finding Similarities and Differences capacities, they could point out instances in the text where individuals, places, or things support or contradict one another as well as the points of view expressed therein and their opposing points of view.

As a consequence of this study, EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy do not significantly differ by gender. It means that gender does not have a role in learners' use of reading strategies and their perception of critical reading self-efficacy. Based on the findings, it was further specified that the students who often read had higher critical reading self-efficacy scores than the students who seldom read. The more the learners read, the higher their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy are. Moreover, EFL learners' inquiry capabilities significantly differ in terms of how often they read English texts. Herein, data results show that the learners who read English texts more have a higher level of inquiry. Furthermore, it was found that reading English texts more has a role in making analyses, and it can be claimed that reading broadens the mind. Scores of EFL learners who read often are higher than those of EFL learners who read seldom. As learners read about a subject, it helps to increase the scores they will get on the exam. It can be concluded that EFL learners' assessment talents increase when their reading time

increases, because the more EFL learners read, the more they feel complete in reading. In the context of this research, learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy do not differ by the type of English texts they read most. As a consequence of this, it can also be said that the type of English texts the EFL learners read most is not a determiner to possess critical reading self-efficacy perception and a determiner of learners' use of reading strategies.

In conclusion, it was determined that a statistically significant and positive relationship exists between Critical Reading Self-efficacy and Reading Strategies Use. In this study, a significant, high, and positive relationship exists between the scores of EFL learners' perceptions of Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and their Inquiry skills. In addition, a high, positive, and significant relationship exists between EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy and their making analysis levels. The use of reading strategies and Planning Strategies are found to have another high, positive, and significant relationship. A moderate, significant, and positive relationship also exists between Reading Strategies Use and Constructing Strategies. In addition, a moderate, positive, and significant relationship exists between Inquiry and Analysis. There is also another moderately and significant and positive relationship between the Reading Strategies Use and Inquiry. However, a low, positive, and significant relationship exists between Analysis and Planning Strategies. Moreover, a low, positive, and significant relationship exists between EFL learners' Inquiry and Visualization Strategies. In addition, a low, positive, and significant relationship exists between Assessment and Visualization Strategies.

EFL learners' utilization of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy are fed equally by effective and adequate reading. Effective and adequate reading must be done first in order to construct qualified knowledge and experience. Reading should be done critically, consciously, and purposefully. As a result of this research, it can be concluded that for effective reading; curiosity, questioning, doubt, awareness, attention, and continuity should not be lost. A reader who does not have doubts about the subject s/he is reading, cannot be not conscious and can have the dogmatic prejudice to accept or reject ideas; thus, it cannot be expected from a reader to make an effective reading and comprehension as h/she cannot grasp the integrity of the text and have a grasp of the meaning of the words in the text and the

semantic integrity of the sentences. It should be imperative for higher education learners to be more careful and sceptical in critical and effective reading.

In conclusion, this research demonstrates the relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. Consequently, it can be indicated that when the degree of EFL learners' use of reading strategies increases, their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy also increase. According to Karadeniz (2015), in today's information culture, the rapid production, and dissemination of knowledge force people to filter out irrelevant information and make a selection between trustworthy and unreliable sources. Learners who can comprehend and interpret what they read, in turn are able to make solid judgments in a healthy way. Hence, developing the use of EFL learners' reading strategies will have a positive effect on and contribution to their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy.

Implications of the Study

This study finds out the level of EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. This study also investigates whether the results differ by gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, type of English texts EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers, and texts, and where their family lives. Moreover, the study investigates the relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. The way in which EFL learners practice reading strategies and the way in which they perceive critical reading self-efficacy are related in this study. The relationship between EFL learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy should be taken into account not just by learners but also by instructors, school administrators, and curriculum designers in order to effectively contribute to learners' reading in Turkey. Learners' own perceptions while reading and their own choices in the use of reading strategies begin to develop when they also think critically. Therefore, reading activities such as reflective practices, distinguishing text types, determining the main idea of the text, identifying auxiliary ideas in the text, interpreting the content of the text, making inferences about what they read, and discussing the hidden ideas behind the text, encourage the formation and development of learners' perception of critical reading and reading strategies use. Extensive reading performed outside the classroom setting for

fun and pleasure could have a positive impact on the learners' use of reading strategies and their perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy. In these types of student-centered reading activities, the main focus is on getting information and general understanding rather than testing to grade the learners. In doing so, extensive reading activities can also improve students' pragmatic competence. Therefore, curriculum designers, educators and teachers should take into account the use of diversified reading materials inside and outside the EFL classrooms.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Studies

The study was limited to the data collected from the EFL students studying at the English preparatory school at the two state universities. In so doing, the results of this study are not possible to generalize to EFL learners studying English at foreign languages school and preparatory school of various universities. Another limitation of the study is that in this study, qualitative data collection tools like interviews as well as classroom observations were not used to collect data.

This research aims to determine whether EFL learners' perceptions of critical reading self-efficacy and their use of reading strategies vary according to demographic factors such as gender, department, how often EFL learners read English texts, the type of English text EFL learners read most, family members' reading English books, newspapers and texts, and where EFL learners' family lives. For further studies, investigations on different variables can be considered. Additionally, not only the students but also the educators' opinions on Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and Use of Reading Strategies might be investigated in order to have a better understanding of learners' perceptions.

REFERENCES

- Adeniran, A. O. (2019). Application of Likert scale's type and Cronbach's alpha analysis in an airport perception study. *Scholar Journal of Applied Sciences and Research*, 2(4), 1-5.
- Afflerbach, P. (1998). Reading assessment and learning to read. In J. Osborn & F. Lehr (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning* (239–263). New York: Guilford Press.
- Afflerbach, P., & Cho, B. (2009). Determining and describing reading strategies. *Metacognition, strategy use, and instruction*, 201.
- Ahmed, R. M. (2020). Investigating EFL Learners' Awareness of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Students in Different Disciplines. *Arab World English Journal*, 11 (3) 294-304. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no3.18>
- Ahmed, Y., Miciak, J., Taylor, W. P., & Francis, D. J. (2022). Structure Altering Effects of a Multicomponent Reading Intervention: An Application of the Direct and Inferential Mediation (DIME) Model of Reading Comprehension in Upper Elementary Grades. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 55(1), 58-78.
- Akbabaoğlu, M., & Duban, N. Y. (2020). Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Üst Bilişsel Okuma Stratejileri, Okuma Motivasyonları Ve Kitap Okuma Alışkanlığına İlişkin Tutumları. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 9(4), 1720–1740.
- Akın, E., Çeçen, M. A. (2014). Öğrencilerin okuma stratejileri üstbilişsel farkındalık düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Studies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*. 9/8, 91-110.
- Akkakoson, S., & Setobol, B. (2009). Thai EFL students' use of strategies in reading English texts. *The Journal of KMUTNB*, 19(3), 329-342.
- Akyol, H., Çakiroğlu, A., & Kuruyer, H. G. (2014). A study on the development of reading skills of the students having difficulty in reading: Enrichment reading program. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(2), 199–212

- Alfassi, M. (2004). Reading to learn: Effects of combined strategy instruction on high school students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 97(4), 171-184.
- Al-Homoud, F., & N. Schmitt. (2009). "Extensive Reading in a Challenging Environment: A Comparison of Extensive and Intensive Reading Approaches in Saudi Arabia." *Language Teaching Research* 13: 383-401. doi:10.1177/1362168809341508
- Ali, A. M., & Razali, A. B. (2019). A Review of Studies on Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in Teaching Reading Comprehension for ESL/EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(6), 94-111.
- Allen, D., (2009). "A Study of the Role of Relative Clauses in the Simplification of News Texts for Learners of English." *System* 37: 585-599. doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.09.004.
- Altaş, B. (2018). *Creating a Dialogic Space in an EFL Classroom Environment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Çağ, Turkey.
- Altaş, B., & Şahinkarakaş, Ş. (2022). Investigating how learners respect alien voices in a foreign language classroom. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 37(1), 76-91. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2020063456
- Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 464-472.
- Anderson, N. J. (2002). *The Role of Metacognition in Second/Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*. ERIC Digest. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Anderson, N. J. (2003). Kaydırma, tıklama ve İngilizce okuma: İkinci/yabancı dilde çevrimiçi okuma stratejileri. *Okuma Matrisi*, 3(3), 1-33.
- Arıcı, A. F., & Taşkın, Y. (2019). Okuma Becerisinin Diğer Dil Becerileriyle İlişkisi. *Uluslararası Alan Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5(2), 185-194. <https://doi.org/10.32570/ijofe.650240>
- Ateş, A. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin okuma stratejileri üstbilişsel farkındalık düzeyleri (İnönü Üniversitesi Örneği). *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 2/4, 258-273.

- Attaprechakul, D. (2013). Inference Strategies to Improve Reading Comprehension of Challenging Texts. *English Language Teaching*, 6(3), 82-91.
- Bağçeci, B., Döş, B., Sarıca, R., (2011). Öğrencilerin üstbilişsel farkındalık düzeyleri ile akademik başarısı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 8(16), 551-566.
- Baker, L. (2008). Metacognitive development in reading: Contributors and consequences. In K. Mokhtari & R. Sheorey (Eds.), *Reading strategies of first- and second- language learners: See how they read* (25- 42). Norwood, MA:Christopher-Gordon
- Balaban, A. (2014). Sözlükler okunur mu? Sözlüklere bakılır mı? *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 24, 237-250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS2189>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215. doi:10.1016/0146-6402(78)90009-7
- Bandura, A. (1994), “Self-efficacy”, Ramachaudran, V. S. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, Academic Press, New York, NY, pp.71–81
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.87>
- Barnett, M. A. (1988). Reading through Context: How Real and Perceived Strategies Use Affects L2 Comprehension. *Modern Language Journal*, 72, 150-162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1988.tb04177.x>
- Barnett, M.A. (1989). *More than meets the eye*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Beaumont, J. (2010). A sequence of critical thinking tasks. *tesol Journal*, 1(4), 427-448.
- Bedir, S. B., & Dursun, F. (2019). Üstbilişsel Okuma Stratejileri Öğretiminin Öğrencilerin Üstbilişsel Farkındalığı, İngilizce Okuma Başarısı ve Öz Yeterliklerine Etkisi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 48(222), 185-211.)
- Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL quarterly*, 27(4), 705-717.

- Benight, C. C., & Bandura, A. (2004). Social cognitive theory of posttraumatic recovery: The role of perceived self-efficacy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 42(10), 1129–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2003.08.008>
- Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(3), 463-494.
- Bowell, T., & Kemp, G. (2005). Critical Thinking. A Concise Guide. *Tijdschrift Voor Filosofie*, 65(4), 788–789. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203482889>
- Brantmeier, C., (2004). “Gender, Violence- Oriented Passage Content and Second Language Reading Comprehension”, *The Reading Matrix*, C. 4, S. 2, s.1- 19.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Burrows, L. (2013). The effects of extensive reading and reading strategies on reading selfefficacy [e-book]. US: ProQuest Information & Learning; 2013. Retrieved from: PsycINFO, Ipswich, MA
- Büyükikiz, K. K. ve Hasırcı, S. (2013). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçenin öğretiminde sözcük öğretimi üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10(21), 145-155.
- Büyüköztürk Ö. (2019). The use of polychoric and Pearson correlation matrices in the determination of construct validity of Likert type scales. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 8(3), 180-195.
- Cambridge Dictionary (2022). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Can A. (2014). *SPSS ile nicel veri analizi* (3rd Press). Ankara: Pegem.
- Carrell, P. L., Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (1998). Metacognition and EFL/ESL reading. *Instructional science*, 26, 97-112.
- Carrell, P. L., Pharis, B. & Liberto, J. (1989). ‘Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading’, *TESOL Quarterly* 23 (4), 647–678.
- Caverly, D. (1997). Teaching reading in a learning assistance center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 478 373)

- Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. Wenden, & J. Rubin (Eds.) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp. 71-83). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Chamot, A. U. (1993). Student responses to learning strategy instruction in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26(3), 308-320.
- Chamot, A. U. (2005). "Language Learning Strategy Instruction: Current Issues and Research." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 25: 112–130. doi:10.1017/S0267190505000061
- Chern, C. L. (1993). Chinese Students' Word-Solving Strategies in Reading in English. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes, & C. Coady (Eds.), *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning* (pp. 67-85). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Chevalier, T. M., Parrila, R., Ritchie, K. C., & Deacon, S. H. (2017). The role of metacognitive reading strategies, metacognitive study and learning strategies, and behavioral study and learning strategies in predicting academic success in students with and without a history of reading difficulties. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 50(1), 34-48.
- Chrisman, S.P.D., Harmon, K.G., Schmidt, J.D. *et al.* Impact of Factors that Affect Reading Skill Level on King–Devick Baseline Performance Time. *Ann Biomed Eng* 47, 2122–2127 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-018-02150-8>
- Chu, S. K. W., Tse, S. K., Loh, E. K. Y., & Chow, K. (2011). Collaborative inquiry project-based learning: Effects on reading ability and interests. *Library & Information Science Research*, 33(3), 236-243.
- Claridge, G. (2005). "Simplification in Graded Readers: Measuring the Authenticity of Graded Texts." *Reading in a Foreign Language* 17: 144–158
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Harlow, England: Investigating EFL Learners' Awareness of Cognitive
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Harlow: Longman.

- Cohen, A. D. (2007). "Coming to Terms with Language Learner Strategies: Surveying the Experts." In *Language Learner Strategies*, edited by A. D. Cohen, and E. Macaro, 29–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Comber, B., & Nixon, H. (2011). Critical reading comprehension in an era of accountability. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 38, 167-179.
- Coşkun, İ., Köksal, H., & Tuğlu, Y. (2014). Türkçe, İngilizce ve Almanca Öğretmen Adaylarının Türkçe Bilgilendirici Metinleri Anlama Becerilerinin İncelenmesi. *Turkish Studies (Elektronik)*, 9(3), 375-396.
- Cox, M. I. P., & DE ASSIS-PETERSON, A. A. (1999). Critical pedagogy in ELT: Images of Brazilian teachers of English. *Tesol Quarterly*, 33(3), 433-452.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Cromley J. G., Azevedo R. (2007). Self-report of reading comprehension strategies: What are we measuring? *Metacognition and Learning*, 1(3), 229–247
- Cross, D. R., & Paris, S. G. (1988). Developmental and instructional analyses of children's metacognition and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(2), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.2.131>
- Cunningham, J. W., & Fitzgerald, J. (1996). Epistemology and reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(1), 36–60. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.31.1.3>
- Çakıcı, D. (2017). An overview of metacognitive strategies in reading comprehension skill. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, (57), 67-82.
- Çelik, T., Gökçe, S., Yenmez, A. A., & Özpınar, İ. (2017). Online argümantasyon: Eleştirel okuma özyeterlik algısı. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 3(2), 117-134.)
- Dabaghi, A., & Akvan, M. (2014). Explore the Relationship between Strategy Use and ESP Reading Test Performance of Two University Majors (Humanities vs. Science). *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 4(1).
- Daffurn, N. (2019). Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach (3rd ed.). *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years*, 27(2), 60–63.

- Darch, C. and Kammenui, E. J. (1987). *Teaching LD Students Critical Reading Skills: A Systematic Replication. Learning Disability Quarterly. 10(2)*, 82-91.
- Day, R. & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Day, R. R., & Park, J. (2005). Developing Reading Comprehension Questions. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 17(1)*, 60–73.
- De Koning, B. B., & van der Schoot, M. (2013). Becoming part of the story! Refueling the interest in visualization strategies for reading comprehension. *Educational Psychology Review, 25(2)*, 261-287.
- Dehghani, M., Sani, H. J., Pakmehr, H., & Malekzadeh, A. (2011). Relationship between students' critical thinking and self-efficacy beliefs in Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 2952–2955. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.221>
- Demirbaş, B. (2018). *İçerik temelli öğretime dayalı okuma stratejileri eğitiminin öğrencilerin okuma stratejileri kullanımına etkisi ve eğitim hakkında öğrenci görüşleri* (Master's thesis, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- Din, M. (2020). Evaluating university students' critical thinking ability as reflected in their critical reading skill: A study at bachelor level in Pakistan. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 35*, 100627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TSC.2020.100627>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688070110040802>
- Dreyer, C., & Nel, C. (2003). Teaching reading strategies and reading comprehension within a technology-enhanced learning environment. *System, 31(3)*, 349-365.
- Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly, 56*, S25-S44.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A Social-Cognitive Approach to Motivation and Personality. *Psychological Review, 95(2)*, 256–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256>

- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancyvalue theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859>
- Erkuş, A. (2003). *Psikometri Üzerine Yazılar*. Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları, No: 24, Ankara.
- Evran, S., Yurdabakan (2013). Öğrencilerin bilişüstü farkındalık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 213-220.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Enright, M. K., & Quinlan, T. (2010). Complementing human judgment of essays written by English language learners with e-rater® scoring. *Language Testing*, 27(3), 317-334.
- Eskey, D. E. (1983). Learning to read versus reading to learn: Resolving the instructional paradox. *English Teaching Forum*, 21(3), 2-4.
- Facione, N. C., & Facione, P. A. (1994). *The "California Critical Thinking Skills Test" and the National League for Nursing Accreditation* (p. 14). California Academic Press, 217 La Cruz Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1980). Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht*, 5(1), 47-118.
- Fahim, M., & Nasrollahi-Mouziraji, A. (2013). The relationship between Iranian EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs and critical thinking ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(3), 538–543. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.3.538-543>
- Fitzgerald, J., & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3501_5
- Flemming, L. E. (2011). *Reading for Thinking*. (seventh edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Fox, E. ve Alexander, PA (2017). Metin anlama: Retrospektif, perspektif ve prospektif. Güneydoğu İsrail'de (Ed.), Okuma üzerine araştırma el kitabı anlama (s. 335–352). New York: Guilford Press, 2.
- Gan Z., Hu G., Wang W., Nang H., An Z. (2020). Feedback behaviour and preference in university academic English courses: associations with English language selfefficacy. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1810628>
- Göçer, A. & Karadağ, B. F. (2021). Türkçenin İkinci Dil Olarak Öğretiminde Söz Varlığının Sözlük Okuma Yoluyla Geliştirilmesi Üzerine Öğrenci Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi . *Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi* , 10 (4) , 1672-1695 . DOI: 10.30703/cije.897062
- Göçer, A. (2007). Bir öğrenme alanı olarak anlama eğitimi ve Türkçe öğretimindeki yeri. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23(2), 17-39.
- Göçer, A. (2010). Türkçe eğitiminde öğrencilerin söz varlığını geliştirme etkinlikleri ve sözlük kullanımı. *Turkish Studies*, 5(1), 1007-1036. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.1318>
- Gökşen, M. E. (2019). *İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının üst bilişsel okuma stratejilerini kullanma düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Erciyes Üniversitesi örneği)* (Master's thesis, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü).
- Gömlüksiz, M. N., & Elaldi, Ş. (2011). Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin İngilizce Okuma Becerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 6(3).
- Grabe, W. ve Stoller, FL (2011). Okumayı öğretmek ve araştırmak (2. baskı). Londra: Routledge.
- Green, C. (2005). "Integrating Extensive Reading in the Task-Based Curriculum." *ELT Journal*59: 306–311. doi:10.1093/elt/cci059
- Grellet, F. (2003). *Developing reading skills*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Grenfell, M., & Macaro, E. (2007). Claims and critiques. In Cohen, A. D. & Macaro, E. (Eds.) *Language Learner Strategies* (pp. 9-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gupta, M., & Upshur, R. (2012). Critical thinking in clinical medicine: what is it? *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 18(5), 938–944. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1365-2753.2012.01897.X>
- Günay, D. (2001). *Metin Bilgisi*. İstanbul: Multilingual.
- Güney, N. ve Aytan, T. (2014). Aktif kelime hazinesini geliştirmeye yönelik bir etkinlik önerisi: Tabu. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 5, 617-628. DOI: 10.16992/ASOS.326.
- Gurcay, D., & Ferah, H. O. (2018). High School Students' Critical Thinking Related to Their Metacognitive Self-Regulation and Physics Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(4), 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i4.2980>
- Hall, L. & Piazza, S. (2008). Critically reading texts: What students do and how teachers can help. *Reading Teacher*, 62(1), 32-41.
- Hayashi, K. (1999). Reading strategies and extensive reading in EFL classes. *RELC journal*, 30(2), 114-132.
- Hill, D. R. (2008). “Graded Readers in English.” *ELT Journal*62: 184–204.doi: 10.1093/let/ccn006
- Hirst, P. H., & White, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Philosophy of education*. Routledge.
- Hoffman, B., & Schraw, G. (2009). The influence of self-efficacy and working memory capacity on problem-solving efficiency. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19(1), 91– 100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2008.08.001>
- Hudson, T. (2009). *Teaching second language reading*. Oxford, Birleşik Krallık: Oxford University Press.
- Hynd, C. R. (1999). Teaching students to think critically using multiple texts in history. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 42(6), 428–436. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40014056>
- Islam, N. (2019). Survey of literature on the relationship between learners' multiple intelligences and academic achievement. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 9(3), 353-367.

- İlter, Ğ.: 2014 —Kelime öğretiminde grafik düzenleyicileri (frayer modeli örneği) †, *Turkish Studies*, 9(3), s.755-770.
- Jain, S., & Dowson, M. (2009). Mathematics anxiety as a function of multidimensional selfregulation and self-efficacy. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34(3), 240–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CEDPSYCH.2009.05.004>
- Jalongo, M. R. and Sobolak, M. J. (2011). Supporting young children’s vocabulary growth: The challenges, the benefits, and evidence-based strategies. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38(6), 421-429. DOI 10.1007/s10643-010-0433-x
- Jing, X. (2022). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğrenen Çinli Öğrencilerin Sözcük Öğrenme Stratejileri. İstanbul, Türkiye: İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. A. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 167–187. doi:10. 1207/s15327043hup1102&3_4
- Jun Zhang, L. (2001). Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an acquisition-poor environment. *Language awareness*, 10(4), 268-288.
- Kana, F. (2014). Öğrencilerin üstbilis okuma stratejileri farkındalık düzeyleri. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16, 1, 100- 120.
- Karabay, A., Kayıran, B. K., & Dilek, I. (2015). The investigation of pre-service teachers’ perceptions about critical reading self-efficacy. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 15(59), 227-246.
- Karademir, A. (2013). *The effect of teacher candidates’ questioning and critical reading skills on teacher self-efficacy*. Adnan Menderes University.
- Karadeniz, A. (2014). Eleştirel okuma özyeterlilik algısı ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 3(1), 113-140.
- Karadeniz, A. (2015). An examination of critical reading self-efficacy perceptions among the students of the faculty of education over different variables.
- Karatay, H. (2010). Öğrencilerin okuduğunu kavrama ile ilgili bilişsel farkındalıkları. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları*, 27(27), 457-475.

- Karatay, H., (2007). Kelime Öğretimi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 27 (1), s.141-153 . Retrieved from <http://www.gefad.gazi.edu.tr/tr/pub/issue/6751/90771>
- Kaya, N. B. & Fırat, T. (2011) Öğrencilerin öğrenme-öğretme sürecinde üstbilişsel becerilerinin incelenmesi. Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (1), 56- 70.
- Kim, H., Lee, E. K., & Park, S. Y. (2015). Critical thinking disposition, self-efficacy, and stress of Korean nursing students. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 8(18), 974–6846. <https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2015/v8i18/76710>
- Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.163>
- Koç, C. ve Arslan, A. (2017). Öğrencilerin akademik öz yeterlik algıları ve okuma stratejileri bilişüstü farkındalıkları. YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14 (1), 745-78.)
- Koç, C., Karabağ, S. (2013) Öğrencilerin bilişüstü yetileri ile başarı yönelimlerinin incelenmesi. *Education Sciences*, 8(2), 308-322.
- Koçak, E. (2020). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin eleştirel okuma becerilerinin incelenmesi. *Türk Akademik Yayınlar Dergisi (TAY Journal)*, 4(1), 17-30.
- Koçer, T. & Turgut, Y. (2013). Investigating Reading Strategy Use in EFL Environment: Instructors' and Preparatory Class Students' Perspectives. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9 (1), 237-251. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/mersinefd/issue/17382/181596?publisher=mersin?publisher=mersin>
- Koçer, T. (2012). *Preparatory class students and instructors reading strategy use in English and the examination of their approaches* (Master's thesis, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü).
- Koda, K. (2005). Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach. Cambridge University Press.

- Kormos, J. & Csizér, K. (2014). Motivasyon etkileşimi, öz düzenleme stratejileri ve Farklı öğrenen gruplarında özerk öğrenme davranışı. *TESOL Üç Aylık*, 48(12), 275-299. doi: 10.1002/tesq.129
- Köseoğlu, E. (2011). *İlköğretim 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin okuduğunu anlama düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Master's thesis, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü).
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Language ideologies in the expression and representation of Arizona Tewa identity. *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*, 329-359.
- Küçüköğlü, H. (2013). Improving reading skills through effective reading strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 709-714.
- Lai, E. R. (2011). Critical thinking: A literature review. *Pearson's Research Reports*, 6(1), 40-41.
- Lan, R., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *IRAL*, 41(4), 339-380. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2003.016>
- Lassig, C. (2009). Promoting creativity in education- From policy to practice: An Australian perspective. *C and C 2009- Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGCHI Conference on Creativity and Cognition*, 229-238. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1640233.1640269>
- Li, J. (2020). İkinci dil çevrimiçi okuma stratejileri envanterinin geliştirilmesi ve geçerliliği. *Bilgisayar ve Eğitim*, 145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103733>, 103733.
- Li, R. (2022). Foreign language reading anxiety and its correlates: a meta-analysis. *Reading and Writing*, 35(4), 995-1018.
- Li, Y., & Wang, C. (2010). An empirical study of reading self-efficacy and the use of reading strategies in the Chinese EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(2), 144-162.
- Lo, Y. F. (2011). An Analysis of Effective and Less Effective EFL Writers' Processes and Products for a Reading-to-Write Task. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(2).

- Logan, S., Medford, E., & Hughes, N. (2011). The importance of intrinsic motivation for high and low ability readers' reading comprehension performance. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(1), 124–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LINDIF.2010.09.011>
- Lucas, M. A. (1990). Four important factors in reading. *English Teaching Forum*, 28(3), 26- 38.
- Lyon, G. R., & Weiser, B. (2009). Teacher Knowledge, instructional expertise, and the development of reading proficiency. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 42(5), 475–480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219409338741>
- Lyutykh, E. (2009). Practicing Critical Thinking in an Educational Psychology Classroom: Reflections from a Cultural-Historical Perspective. *Educational Studies*, 45(4), 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131940903066263>
- Macalister, J. (2014).“Teaching Reading: Research Into Practice.”*Language Teaching*47: 387–397. doi:10.1017/S026144481400007X.
- Maddux, J. E., & Stanley, M. A. (1986). Self-efficacy theory in contemporary psychology: An overview. *Journal of Social and Clinical psychology*, 4(3), 249-255.
- Maddux, J. E., & Kleiman, E. M. (2016). Self-Efficacy. In C. R. Snyder, S. J. Lopez, L. M. Edwards, & S. C. Marques (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology, 3rd Edition* (Vol. 2, pp. 443–452). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199396511.013.26>
- Magogwe, J.M.(2013). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of University of Botswana students of different academic reading proficiencies. *Reading and Writing* 4(1), 1-8. DOI: 10.4102/rw.v4i1.29
- Maranto, R., & Wai, J. (2020). Why intelligence is missing from American education policy and practice, and what can be done about it. *Journal of Intelligence*, 8(1), 2.
- Maskor, Z. M. and Baharudin, H. (2016). Receptive vocabulary knowledge or productive vocabulary knowledge in writing skill, Which one important? *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(11), 261- 271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v6-i11/2395>

- Mason, M. (2007). Critical thinking and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 39(4), 339–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00343.x>
- McDonough, S. (1995). *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. London: Arnold.
- McGeown, S. P., Norgate, R., & Warhurst, A. (2012). Exploring intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation among very good and very poor readers. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/00131881.2012.710089*, 54(3), 309–322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2012.710089>
- Mikulecky, B. S. (2008). Teaching reading in a second language. *Recuperado de <http://longmanhomeusa.com>*.
- Miller, J. M. (2018). US history state assessments, discourse demands, and English Learners' achievement: Evidence for the importance of reading and writing instruction in US history for English Learners. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 42(4), 375-392.
- Mitsea, E., Drigas, A., & Skianis, C. (2022). ICTs and Speed Learning in Special Education: High-Consciousness Training Strategies for High-Capacity Learners through Metacognition Lens. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 27, 230.
- Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL Students' Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25, 2-11.
- Moraru, A., & LeBoutillier, J. C. (2009). Enhancing undergraduate critical reading skills in neuroscience using instructor-developed study guides. *CELT (Vol. 2)*. Retrieved from <http://celt.uwindsor.ca/ojs/leddy/index.php/CELT/article/view/3215>
- Munsakorn, N. (2012). Awareness of reading strategies among EFL learners at Bangkok University. *International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences*, 6(5), 821-824.
- Nash-Ditzel, S. (2010). Metacognitive reading strategies can improve self-regulation. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 40(2), 45-63.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- O'Reilly, T., & McNamara, D. S. (2007). The impact of science knowledge, reading skill, and reading strategy knowledge on more traditional "high-stakes" measures of high school students' science achievement. *American educational research journal*, 44(1), 161-196.
- Odabaş, H., Odabaş, Z. Y., & Polat, C. (2008). Üniveriste öğrencilerinin okuma alışkanlığı: Ankara üniversitesi örneği. *Bilgi Dünyası*, 9(2), 431-465.
- Okeke, M. (2010). Improving disadvantaged adolescents' critical reading skills using direct instruction, University of Maryland. Bu yayına 12 Mayıs 2017 tarihinde ulaşılmıştır: <http://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/10724/Okeke.pdf>
- Olshavsky, J. (1977). Reading as problem-solving: An investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 12(4), 654-674.
- Oxford, R. L. (1986). Development and Psychometric Testing of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). Appendix. Alexandria, VA: Kinton Inc.
- Oxford, R. L. (1994). Language Learning Strategies: An Update. www.cal.org/resources/digest/oxford01.html
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies: Self-Regulation in Context. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.
- Öktem, A. (2020). The Effects of Pre-Reading Activities In L1 and L2 On B1 Level Efl Learners' Reading Comprehension. Master's Thesis. Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Institute School of Educational Science.
- Özden, M. (2018). *Critical Reading Perceptions of Graduate and Graduate Students*. The Journal of Social Sciences
- Özer, B. (2002). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullarının eğitim programlarında öğretim stratejileri. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama*, 1(1), 17-32.
- Özgül, A., & Samur, İ. (2021). Creating a Reading Culture in a Preschool in Collaboration with Children, Teachers and Parents. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 17(4), 405-436. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.366.25>
- Öztürk, K., Denkci-Akkaş, F., & Tikiz-Ertürk, G. (2022). Pre-service EFL Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Their Critical Reading Self-Efficacy and Cognitive Flexibility. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 22(2).

- Pagán, A., & Nation, K. (2019). Learning Words Via Reading: Contextual Diversity, Spacing, and Retrieval Effects in Adults. *Cognitive Science*, 43(1), e12705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/COGS.12705>
- Page, D., & Mukherjee, A. (2007). Promoting Critical-Thinking Skills By Using Negotiation Exercises. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(5), 251–257. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.82.5.251-257>
- Park, Y. (2010) Korean EFL college students reading strategy use to comprehend authentic expository / technical texts in English (Doctoral Thesis). University of Kansas.
- Peacock, M.& Ho, B.(2003) Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 179-198.
- Pekkanlı, İ. ve Kartal, E. (2010). Yabancı Dil Öğretmen Adaylarının Anadil ve Yabancı Dilde Okuma Alışkanlıkları Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Journal of the World of Turks*, 2 (3), 91-105.)
- Pereira-Laird, J. A., & Deane, F. P. (1997). Development and validation of a self-report measure of reading strategy use. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly*, 18(3), 185-235.
- Perfetti, C. ve Stafura, J. (2014). Okuduğunu anlama teorisinde kelime bilgisi. *Bilimsel Okuma Çalışmaları*, 18(1), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2013.827687>
- Phan, H. P. (2009). Relations between goals, self-efficacy, critical thinking and deep processing strategies: A path analysis. *Educational Psychology*, 29(7), 777–799. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410903289423>
- Pritchard, R. (1990). Cultural schemata and processing strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25(4), 273-295.
- Proctor B. E., Prevatt F. F., Adams K., Hurst A., Petscher Y. (2006). Study skills profiles of normal-achieving and academically-struggling college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 37–51
- Purpura, J. E. (1999). Learner strategy use and performance on language tests: A structural equation modelling approach (Studies in language testing 8). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Rastegar, M., Mehrabi Kermani, E., & Khabir, M. (2017). The Relationship between Metacognitive Reading Strategies Use and Reading Comprehension Achievement of EFL Learners. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 7, 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2017.72006>
- Reiber-Kuijpers, M., Kral, M., & Meijer, P. (2021). Digital reading in a second or foreign language: A systematic literature review. *Computers & Education*, 163, 104115.
- Renandya, W. A. (2007). “The Power of Extensive Reading.” *RELC Journal*38: 133–149. doi:10.1177/0033688207079578
- Richards, J., & Platt, J. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Ridley, J. (1997). *Reflection and strategies in foreign language learning*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Roshandel, J., Ghonsooly, B., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2018). L2 Motivational Self-System and Self-Efficacy: A Quantitative Survey-Based Study. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 329-344.
- Saeed Mohammed, G. M. (2022). The impact of reading strategies and self-efficacy on reading comprehension: The case of Saudi EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(S1), 627-639.
- Sang, G., Valcke, M., Braak, J. van, & Tondeur, J. (2010). Student teachers’ thinking processes and ICT integration: Predictors of prospective teaching behaviors with educational technology. *Computers & Education*, 54(1), 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2009.07.010>
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.) *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 199-228). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Schunk, D. H. (2000). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational psychologist*, 25(1), 71-86.

- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading & writing quarterly*, 23(1), 7-25.
- Schunk, D. H., Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation*. London: Academic Press.)
- Segler, T. M., Pain, H., & Sorace, A. (2002). Second language vocabulary acquisition and learning strategies in ICALL environments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 15(4), 409-422. <https://doi.org/10.1076/call.15.4.409.8272>
- Sen, H. (2009). The Relationship between the Use of Metacognitive Strategies and Reading Comprehension. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 2301-2305.
- Sert, S. (2012). *A case study on improving reading strategies of Turkish ESP learners* (Master's thesis, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü).
- Setiawan, N. A., & Ena, O. T. (2019). Montessori Junior High School Students' Perceptions on Their Self-Efficacy in Reading. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 8(2), 26-37.
- Shang, H. F. (2010). Reading strategy use, self-efficacy and EFL reading comprehension. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(2), 18-42.
- Shell, D. F., Colvin, C., & Bruning, R. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, attribution, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade-level and achievement-level differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3), 386.
- Shell, D. F., Murphy, C. C., & Bruning, R. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of educational psychology*, 81(1), 91.
- Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the Cognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies among Native and Non-Native Readers. *System*, 29, 431-449.
- Sheu, C. M., Wang, P. L., & Hsu, L. (2013). Investigating EFL learning strategy use, GEPT performance, and gender difference among non-English major sophomores at a technological university. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly March 2013 Volume 15, Issue*, 128.

- Snow, C. (2002). Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension.
- Souvignier, E., & Mokhlesgerami, J. (2006). Using self-regulation as a framework for implementing strategy instruction to foster reading comprehension. *Learning and instruction*, 16(1), 57-71.
- Spires, H. A., Medlock Paul, C., & Kerkhoff, S. N. (2018). *Digital Literacy for the 21st Century* (pp. 12–21). P. Ed Australia. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7659-4.ch002>
- Stern, H. H. (1992). Issues and options in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suarcaya, P., & Prasasti, W. D. (2017). Investigating Students' Critical Reading: Critical Literacy in EFL Setting. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 14(2).
- Şağbanşua, L., & Bişkek, K. (2006). Strateji, rekabet ve rekabet gücü ilişkileri. *Akademik Bakış, Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi*, 9, 1-14.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics (6th editon). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Taboada, A., Tonks, S. M., Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2009). Effects of motivational and cognitive variables on reading comprehension. *Reading and Writing*, 22(1), 85–106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11145-008-9133-Y/TABLES/6>
- Taraban R., Rynearson K. (2004). Analytic and pragmatic factors in college students' metacognitive reading strategies. *Reading Psychology*, 25(2), 67–81.
- Taşçı, G., Altun, A. ve Soran, H. (2008). Biyoloji öğretmen adaylarının öğrenme stratejilerinin belirlenmesi üzerine nitel bir çalışma. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 35, 284-296.
- Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1993). *Improving listening comprehension in Russian*. Washington, DC: Department of Education, International Research and Studies Program.

- Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2017). Creative Self-Efficacy: Its Potential Antecedents and Relationship to Creative Performance. *Https://Doi.Org/10.5465/3069429*, 45(6), 1137– 1148. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069429>
- Tok, M., & Yiğın, M.: 2014 —Türkçenin İkinci Dil Olarak Öğretiminde Öğrencilerin Kullandıkları Kelime Öğrenme Stratejileri, Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences, 41, s.265–276. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/dpusbe/issue/4783/65969#article_cite
- Troyer, M., Kim, J. S., Hale, E., Wantchekon, K. A., & Armstrong, C. (2019). Relations among intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation, reading amount, and comprehension: a conceptual replication. *Reading and Writing*, 32(5), 1197–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11145-018-9907-9/TABLES/3>
- Tunca, N., Alkın-Şahin, S. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının bilişötesi (üst biliş) öğrenme stratejileri ile akademik öz yeterlik inançları arasındaki ilişki. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 4(1), 47-56.)
- Tuncer, U. (2011). *The adaptation and development of 'Metacognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaire' and 'Reading Strategy Use Scale' for Turkish learners learning english as a foreign language* (Master's thesis). Mersin University Department of English Language Teaching, Mersin.
- Unrau, N. J., Rueda, R., Son, E., Polanin, J. R., Lundeen, R. J., & Muraszewski, A. K. (2018). Can reading self-efficacy be modified? A meta-analysis of the impact of interventions on reading self-efficacy. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(2), 167-204.
- Upton, T. A. (1997). First and Second Language Use in Reading Comprehension Strategies of Japanese ESL Students. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal*, 3, 1-27.
- Ünal, E. (2006). *The relationship between primary school students' reading comprehension and reading attitudes*. Osmangazi University.
- Wallace, M., & Wray, A. (2021). *Critical reading and writing for postgraduates*. Sage.
- Wang, J., Spencer, K., Minjie, & Xing, M. (2009). Metacognitive Beliefs and Strategies in Learning Chinese as a Foreign Language. *System*, 37, 46-56.

- Wang, S. L., & Wu, P. Y. (2008). The role of feedback and self-efficacy on web-based learning: The social cognitive perspective. *Computers & Education*, 51(4), 1589–1598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2008.03.004>
- Waring, R., and M. Takaki. (2003). “At What Rate Do Learners Learn and Retain New Vocabulary from Reading a Graded Reader?” *Reading in a Foreign Language* 15: 130–163
- Watson, R. (2015). Quantitative research. *Nursing Standard (2014+)*, 29(31), 44.
- Webb, S., and A. C.-S. Chang. (2015). “How Does Prior Word Knowledge Affect Vocabulary Learning Progress in an Extensive Reading Program?” *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 37: 651–675. doi:10.1017/S0272263114000606
- Wei Wei, V., (2009). Gender Differences in Reading Comprehension for Chinese Secondary School Children. In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree Master of Science in Education (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), University of Wisconsin-Platteville, the U.S.A.
- Weinstein, C. E. and Mayer, R. E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (p.315-327). New York: Macmillan.
- Wenden, A. L. (1991). *Learner strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (Eds.). (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall International.
- White, C. (2008). Language learning strategies in independent language learning: An overview. In S. H. Lewis (Ed.) *Language Learning Strategies in Independent Setting* (pp. 3-24). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Wong, M. S. (2005). Language learning strategies and language self-efficacy. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 36(3), 245-269.
- Wood, R. E., & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 407–415. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.3.407.

- Yang, L. L. (2004). The development of a validated perceived self-efficacy scale on English reading strategies. *Journal of Education & Psychology*, 27(2), 377-398
- Yang, N. (2002). Integrating portfolios into learning strategy-based instruction for EFL college students. *IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 41(4), 293-325.
- Yang, Y. F. (2006). Reading strategies or comprehension monitoring strategies?. *Reading Psychology*, 27(4), 313-343.
- Yaylı, D. (2010). A think-aloud study: Cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies of ELT department students. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 38, 234-251.
- Yeşilyurt, E. (2021). Öğrenme stratejileri. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 18 (Eğitim Bilimleri Özel Sayısı), 5116-5139.
- Yılmaz, V. G. (2021). A Comparative Study On The Use Of Vocabulary Strategies By Turkish ESL Learners In The Uk And Efl Learners In Turkey. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.
- Yoğurtçu, K. (2013). The Impact of Self-efficacy Perception on Reading Comprehension on Academic Achievement. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 375–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.075>
- Yükselir, C. (2014). An investigation into the reading strategy use of EFL prep-class students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 65-72.
- Yüzer, Ç. (2022). Online Learning Self-Efficacy Perceptions of EFL Learners at a University Context [Master's Thesis]. Çağ University.
- Vancouver, J. B., & Kendall, L. N. (2006). When self-efficacy negatively relates to motivation and performance in a learning context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1146–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1146>
- Zhang, Z. (1993). *Literature review on reading strategy research*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, Mississippi, USA.

Zeldin, A. L., & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers. *American educational research journal*, 37(1), 215-246.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. *Self-efficacy in changing societies*, 1(1), 202-231.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ethics Committee Request

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ	
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ	
TEZ / ARAŞTIRMA / ANKET / ÇALIŞMA İZİNİ / ETİK KURULU İZİNİ TALEP FORMU VE ONAY TUTANAK FORMU	
ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ	
T.C. NOSU	
ADI VE SOYADI	ALİ DİKİCİ
ÖĞRENCİ NO	2020008016
TEL. NO.	-----
E - MAİL ADRESLERİ	-----
ANA BİLİM DALI	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
HANGİ AŞAMADA OLDUĞU (DERS / TEZ)	TEZ
İSTEKDE BULUNDUĞU DÖNEME AİT DÖNEMLİK KAYDININ YAPILIP-YAPILMADIĞI	2021 / 2022 - BAHAR DÖNEMİ KAYDINI YENİLEDİM.
ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ BİLGİLER	
TEZİN KONUSU	İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Öğrencilerin Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanımı ve Eleştirel Okuma Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Arasındaki İlişki
TEZİN AMACI	Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olup olmadığını araştırmaktır. Bu çalışma ayrıca, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanım seviyelerini ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı seviyelerini belirlemeyi amaçlar. Bununla birlikte bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımlarının ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algılarının, cinsiyete, bölüme, ders kitapları dışında hangi sıklıkta İngilizce metin okuduklarına, en çok hangi tür İngilizce metinleri okuduklarına, aile üyelerinin İngilizce kitap, gazete, metin okumalarına ve aile üyelerinin yaşadığı yerleşim birimine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini araştırmaktır.

<p>TEZİN TÜRKÇE ÖZETİ</p>	<p>Okuma metinleri görüldüklerinin ötesinde kültürel, ideolojik ve bağlamsal anlamlara sahip olabileceğinden, öğrenciler hedef dilde yazılmış metinleri kavramakta zorlanabilirler. Bu nedenle bu çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımları ile eleştirel okuma öz yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişkiyi bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Aynı zamanda bu çalışma, cinsiyet, bölüm, İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin en çok okudukları İngilizce metinler ve okuma sıklıkları, aile üyelerinin okuduğu İngilizce gazete, dergi ve yazılar ile aile üyelerinin nerede yaşadığı gibi değişkenlere göre İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı arasında önemli bir fark olup olmadığını bulmaktır. Araştırma, iki devlet üniversitesindeki yabancı dil okullarındaki İngilizce öğrenen hazırlık öğrencileri ile gerçekleştirilecektir. Ankete dayalı nicel bu çalışmada, araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan "Demografik Bilgi Formu", Karadeniz (2014) tarafından geliştirilen "Eleştirel Okuma Öz Yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği" ve Tuncer (2011) tarafından uyarlanan "Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği" kullanılacaktır. Toplanan veriler Sosyal Bilimler İstatistik Paketi (SPSS) 26.0 ile analiz edilecektir. İki devlet üniversitesinin hazırlık okulundaki katılımcılar kolaylı örneklem yoluyla seçilecektir.</p>
<p>ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OLAN SEKTÖRLER/ KURUMLARIN ADLARI</p>	<p>Harran Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu, Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu</p>
<p>İZİN ALINACAK OLAN KURUMA AİT BİLGİLER (KURUMUN ADI- ŞUBESİ/ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ - İL - İLÇESİ)</p>	<p>Harran Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu / Haliliye-ŞANLIURFA, Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi / Altındağ-ANKARA</p>

ÇALIŞMANIN İZİN ALINMAK İSTENEN KURUMUN HANGİ İLÇELERİNE/ HANGİ KURUMUNA/ HANGİ BÖLÜMÜNDE/ HANGİ ALANINA/ HANGİ KONULARDA/ HANGİ GRUBA/ KİMLERE/ NE UYGULANACAĞI GİBİ AYRINTILI BİLGİLER	Yapılmak istenen çalışma için bir demografik bilgi formu ve ekte isimleri geçen iki ölçek Şanlıurfa ili Haliliye İlçesine bağlı Harran Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu İngilizce Hazırlık Bölümü okuyan öğrenciler ile Ankara İli Altındağ ilçesine bağlı Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Bölümü okuyan öğrencilere uygulanacaktır.		
UYGULANACAK OLAN ÇALIŞMAYA AİT ANKETLERİN/ ÖLÇEKLERİN BAŞLIKLARI/ HANGİ ANKETLERİN - ÖLÇELERİN UYGULANACAĞI	Araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan "Demografik Bilgi Formu", Karadeniz (2014) tarafından geliştirilen "Eleştirel Düşünce Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeği" ve Tuncer (2011) tarafından uyarlanan "Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği"		
EKLER (ANKETLER, ÖLÇEKLER, FORMLAR, ... V.B. GİBİ EVRAKLARIN İSİMLERİYLE BİRLİKTE KAÇ ADET/SAYFA OLDUKLARINA AİT BİLGİLER İLE AYRINTILI YAZILACAKTIR)	1) Bir (1) Sayfa- Bilgi ve Kabul Formu. 2) Bir (1) Sayfa- Demografik Bilgi Formu. 3) İki (2) Sayfa- Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği. 4) İki (2) Sayfa- Eleştirel Düşünce Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeği.		
ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI - SOYADI: ALİ DİKİCİ	ÖĞRENCİNİN İMZASI: KVK kanunu kapsamına uygun olması için imzalı evrak üniversiteye tarafınca teslim edilmiştir. TARİH: 28 / 02 / 2022		
TEZ/ ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ DEĞERLENDİRME SONUCU			
1. Seçilen konu Bilim ve İş Dünyasına katkı sağlayabilecektir.			
2. Anılan konu Eğitim-Öğretim faaliyet alanı içerisine girmektedir.			
1.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI	2.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI (VARSA)	ANA BİLİM DALI BAŞKANININ ONAYI	SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRÜNÜN ONAYI

Adı - Soyadı:	Adı - Soyadı:	Adı - Soyadı:	Adı - Soyadı:
Unvanı:	Unvanı:	Unvanı:	Unvanı:
İmzası:	İmzası:	İmzası:	İmzası:
... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...

ETİK KURULU ASIL ÜYELERİNE AİT BİLGİLER

Adı - Soyadı: Şehnaz ŞAHINKARAKAŞ	Adı - Soyadı: Yücel ERTEKİN	Adı - Soyadı: Deniz Aynur GÜLER	Adı - Soyadı: Mustafa BAŞARAN	Adı - Soyadı: Mustafa Tefrik ODMAN	Adı - Soyadı: Hüseyin Mahir FİSUNOĞLU	Adı - Soyadı: Jülide İNÖZÜ
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.
İmzası :	İmzası :	İmzası :	İmzası :	İmzası :	İmzası :	İmzası :
... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...	... / ... / 20...
Etik Kurulu Jüri Başkanı - Asıl Üye	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi

OY BİRLİĞİ İLE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Çalışma yapılacak olan tez için uygulayacak olduğu Anketleri/Formları/Ölçekleri Çağ Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Asıl Jüri Üyelerince İncelenmiş olup, ..10.. / ..03.. / 2022.. - ..31.. / ..05.. / 2022.. tarihleri arasında uygulanmak üzere gerekli iznin verilmesi tarafımızca uygundur.
OY ÇOKLUĞU İLE	<input type="radio"/>	

AÇIKLAMA: BU FORM ÖĞRENCİLER TARAFINDAN HAZIRLANDIKTAN SONRA ENSTİTÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ SEKRETERLİĞİNE ONAYLAR ALINMAK ÜZERE TESLİM EDİLECEKTİR. AYRICA FORMDAKİ YAZI ON İKİ PUNTO OLACAK ŞEKİLDE YAZILACAKTIR.

Appendix B: Consent Form

Bilgi ve Kabul Formu

Bu form, Çağ Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Bölümü yüksek lisans tezime veri toplamak için hazırlanmıştır. Çalışmanın amacı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ile eleştirel okuma öz yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Araştırmacı tarafından toplanan tüm bilgiler gizli tutulacaktır. Vereceğiniz bilgiler yalnızca bu araştırma için kullanılacaktır.

Bu çalışmaya katılım tamamıyla gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışma ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz olursa araştırmacı ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız ve yardımınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

Katılımcı İmzası

Tarih

Ali DİKİCİ

Appendix C: Demografik Bilgi Formu

Demografik Bilgi Formu

Değerli Öğrenciler,

Bu çalışma, Çağ Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Bölümü yüksek lisans tezimin bir parçasıdır. Bu bağlamda, sonuçlarınız araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır. "Demografik bilgi formu", "Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği" ve "Eleştirel Okuma Öz yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeği"nde yer alan sorulara cevap vermeniz çalışmaya çok değerli katkılar sağlayacaktır. Ankete katılım sağladığınız için teşekkür ederim.

Ali Dikici

Çağ Üniversitesi, Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

1. Cinsiyet: () K () E

2. Bölüm:

3. Ders kitapları dışında hangi sıklıkta İngilizce metin okursunuz?

a) Hiçbir zaman b) Nadiren c) Ara sıra d) Sık sık

4. En çok hangi tür İngilizce metinleri okursunuz?

a) Edebi metinler b) Gazete ve dergi c) Sosyal Medya Metinleri

5. Aile üyeleriniz İngilizce kitap, gazete ve metin okurlar mı?

a) Evet b) Hayır

6. Ailenizin yaşadığı yerleşim birimi:

a) Köy b) İlçe c) İl d) Büyükşehir

Appendix D: Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği

1

Okuma Becerisi Stratejileri Kullanım Ölçeği

Değerli öğrenciler,

Bu ölçek, insanların okurken ne yaptıklarını veya kullandıkları stratejileri içeren ifadelerden oluşmaktadır. Lütfen aşağıdaki 28 ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup her ifadedeki davranışa **yabancı dilde okurken** ne kadar sıklıkta başvurduğumuzu dikkate alarak uygun olanı işaretleyiniz.

	Asla Başarı Uymaz	Genellikle Başarı Uymaz	Bazen Başarı Uyar	Genellikle Başarı Uyar	Keskinlikle Başarı Uyar
1. Okuduklarımı hayalimde canlandırarak anlamaya çalışırım.					
2. Tüm metni okumadan önce, genel bir fikir edinmek için metni hızlı bir şekilde okurum.					
3. Okuma ortamımı düzenlemeye özen göstermem.					
4. Okurken koptuğum anda, koptuğum noktaya geri dönerim.					
5. Hatırlamama yardımcı olması açısından, gerekli bilgiyi metin içerisinde daire içine alırım veya o bilginin altını çizerim.					
6. Okuma hızımı okuduğum metnin türüne göre ayarlarım.					
7. Okuduklarımı hatırlamama yardımcı olması bakımından, okuduklarımı betimlemeye ve hayalimde canlandırmaya çalışırım.					
8. Metni okumadan önce, ne hakkında olduğunu görmek için ön izleme yaparım.					
9. Okuduğum metni daha iyi anlayabilmek için farklı açılardan bakmaya gerek <u>duymam</u> .					
10. Konsantrasyonumu kaybettiğimde okuduğum konuya geri dönmeye çalışırım.					
11. Okuduğum metni anlamama yardımcı olması açısından metni okurken notlar alırım.					
12. Okuma hızımı okuduğum metne bağlı olarak ayarlarım.					
13. Öğrendiğim yeni kelimeleri bir durumun içinde resmederek öğrenirim.					

14. Okumaya başlamadan önce hedeflerimi belirlerim.					
15. Okurken önemli bilgilerin altını çizmekle <u>uğraşmam</u> .					
16. Okuduğum metin zorlaştığı zaman, metni daha iyi anlayabilmek açısından metni tekrar okurum.					
17. Tüm metnin ana düşüncesini anlamaya çalışırken, metni baştan sona okumaya ve zor kelimelerin ve sözcük gruplarının altını çizmeye çalışırım.					
18. Okuduğum metni anlamadığım zaman, okuma şeklimi değiştiririm.					
19. Metinde sunulan bilgiyi zihnimde var olan bilgiyle karşılaştırarak okurum					
20. Okuyacağım metni inceleyip, göz geçirdikten sonra ne tür metin okuyacağımı belirlemeye çalışırım.					
21. Okuduğum konu ile önceki bilgilerim arasında bağlantı kurma ile <u>uğraşmam</u> .					
22. Okuduğumu anlamadığım zaman, metni tekrar okur ve anlamaya çalışırım.					
23. Metnin içerisindeki karmaşık yapıdaki cümleleri anlayabilmek için metni cümleciklere/parçalara ayırırım.					
24. Okurken ara sıra durur ve kendime metinle ilgili sorular sorarak metni ne derece anladığımı kontrol ederim.					
25. Uzunluk ve düzen gibi özelliklere dikkat ederek metne göz geçiririm.					
26. Okuduğum parçanın ana hatlarını zihnimde tasarlama ile <u>uğraşmam</u> .					
27. Okurken, önemli olanla olmayan bilgiyi birbirinden ayırabilirim.					
28. Okuduğum metni zihnimde var olan belli amaçlar çerçevesinde okurum.					

Appendix E: Eleştirel Okuma Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeği

Eleştirel Okuma Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeği

Değerli öğrenciler,

Lütfen aşağıdaki 1'den 33'e kadar olan ifadeleri okuyarak, “hiç katılmıyorum”, “katılmıyorum”, “kararsızım”, “katılıyorum” ve “tamamen katılıyorum” açıklamalarından birini seçerek işaretleyiniz.

	Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
1. Okuduğum metinden hareketle yazarın bakış açısını sorgulayabilirim.					
2. Okuduğum metinde yazarın başarısını sorgulamakta zorlanırım.					
3. Temel düşünceleri destekleyen yardımcı düşüncelerin doğruluğunu tartışabilirim.					
4. Metnin yazılış amacına ne ölçüde ulaştığını tartışabilirim.					
5. Okuduğum metindeki düşüncelerin güvenilir olup olmadığını kontrol ederim.					
6. Anlatılan ya da okuduğum bir metinde yer alan çelişkileri bulabilirim.					
7. Okuduğum bir hikâyeye ya da romandaki karakterlerin davranışlarını sorgulamakta zorlanırım.					
8. Öğretici metinlerde yazarın verdiği bilgileri sorgulayabilirim.					
9. Öğretici metinlerin tutarlı ve tutarsız yanlarını belirleyebilirim.					
10. Öğretici metinlerde yazarın öne sürdüğü düşüncelerin günümüzde uygulanıp uygulanamayacağını belirleyebilirim.					
11. Okuduğum metinden genel bir mesaj çıkarmakta zorlanırım.					
12. Okuduğum bir metnin nasıl gelişeceğini tahmin edebilirim.					
13. Son tarafı verilmiş bir metnin önceki bölümlerini tahmin edebilirim.					
14. Bir cümle ya da metinde bırakılan boşlukları uygun şekilde tamamlayabilirim.					

15. Okuduğum metindeki olay örgüsünün gelişimini tahmin edebilirim.					
16. Bir metne farklı bakış açıları ile yaklaşmakta sıkıntı çekerim.					
17. Yazarın bir metni hangi amaçla yazdığını tahmin edebilirim.					
18. Okuduğum metni farklı kılan hususları belirleyebilirim.					
19. Okuduğum roman ya da hikâyedeki kişilerin kişilik özelliklerini tahmin edebilirim.					
20. Okuduğum bir metnin ana fikrini bulabilirim.					
21. Metinde ana fikri destekleyen yardımcı fikirleri bulmakta sıkıntı çekerim.					
22. Okuduğum bir metindeki konu ya da tema ile ilgili düşüncelerimi açıklayabilirim.					
23. Bir metinde olay, mekân ve kişi arasındaki ilişkiyi belirleyebilirim.					
24. Olaylar ve kavramlar arasındaki neden-sonuç ilişkisini açıklayabilirim.					
25. Okuduğum metinden hareketle metnin yazılış amacını belirlemekte zorlanırım.					
26. Bir metinde giriş, gelişme ve sonuç bölümleri arasında neden-sonuç ilişkisi kurabilirim.					
27. Okuduğum roman ya da hikâyedeki olayları neden-sonuç ilişkisiyle birbirine bağlamakta sıkıntı yaşarım.					
28. Bir metinden hareketle ulaşılabilecek yargıları bulabilirim.					
29. Okuduğum metinde kurmaca olanla olmayamı belirleyebilirim.					
30. Söz ve söz gruplarının metinde kazandıkları anlam değerini belirleyebilirim.					
31. Metin içindeki görüşleri ve bu görüşlerin karşıtı görüşleri belirleyebilirim.					
32. Bir metinde birbirini destekleyen ya da birbiriyle çelişen ifadeleri bulmakta zorlanırım.					
33. Okuduğum metinde birbiri ile çatışan olay, durum ya da kişileri belirleyebilirim.					

Appendix F: Ethics Committee Approval of Çağ University

T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Sayı : E-23867972-050.01.04-2200001722

03.03.2022

Konu : Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği
Kurulu Kararı Alınması Hk.

REKTÖRLÜK MAKAMINA

İlgi: 09.03.2021 tarih ve E-81570533-050.01.01-2100001828 sayılı Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu konulu yazınız.

İlgi tarihli yazınız kapsamında Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü bünyesindeki Lisansüstü Programlarda halen tez aşamasında kayıtlı olan **Ali Dikici** isimli öğrencimize ait tez evraklarının "Üniversitemiz Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu Onayları" alınmak üzere Ek'te sunulmuş olduğunu arz ederim.

Doç. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürü

Ek : 1 Adet öğrenciye ait tez evrakları listesi.



T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Rektörlük

Sayı : E-81570533-044-2200001882

09.03.2022

Konu : Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği
Kurul İzni Hk.

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi : a) 03.03.2022 tarih ve E-81570533-050.01.04-2200001705 sayılı yazınız.
b) 04.03.2022 tarih ve E-81570533-050.01.04-2200001734 sayılı yazınız.
c) 07.03.2022 tarih ve E-81570533-050.01.04-2200001773 sayılı yazınız.

İlgi yazılarda söz konusu edilen Çağrı Emir, Ali Dikici ve Elmas Çelebi isimli öğrencilerimizin tez evrakları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulunda incelenerek uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi ve gereğini rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Ünal AY
Rektör



T.C.
 ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
 Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Sayı : E-23867972-044-2200001909

10.03.2022

Konu : Ali Dikici'nin Tez Anket İzni Hk.

DAĞITIM YERLERİNE

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında kayıtlı **Ali Dikici** isimli öğrencimizin, **“İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı arasındaki ilişki”** konulu tez çalışması Üniversitemiz öğretim üyesi **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Betül Altaş** danışmanlığında halen yürütülmektedir. Adı geçen öğrenci tez çalışmasında **Üniversiteniz Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulunda halen eğitim görmekte olan öğrencileri** kapsamak üzere kopyası Ek’lerde sunulan anket uygulamasını yapmayı planlamaktadır. Üniversitemiz Etik Kurulunda yer alan üyelerin onayları alınmış olup, gerekli izin verilmesini bilgilerinize sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ünal AY
 Rektör

Ek : 1 Adet Tez Anket İzin Onay Dosyası.

Dağıtım:

Gereği:

Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi Rektörlüğüne
 Harran Üniversitesi Rektörlüğüne

Appendix G: Official Permission from Rectorate of Social Sciences University of Ankara



T.C.
ANKARA SOSYAL BİLİMLER ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Basın Yayın ve Halkla İlişkiler Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-30275491-044-36603

30.03.2022

Konu : Ali Dikici'nin Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE
Adana-Mersin Karayolu Üzeri PK:33800 Yenice-Tarsus/MERSİN

İlgi : 10.03.2022 tarihli ve E-23867972-044-2200001909 sayılı yazınız

İlgi sayılı yazınızda Ali Dikici isimli öğrencinizin Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Betül Altaş danışmanlığında yürütmekte olduğu "İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı arasındaki ilişki" konulu tez çalışması kapsamında Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulunda halen eğitim görmekte olan öğrencilere anket uygulaması yapmak istediği belirtilmektedir.

Çalışmaya yönelik onaylı etik kurul kararının iletilmesi durumunda, çalışmaya yönelik anket uygulamasının Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu öğrencilerine uygulanması uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Prof. Dr. Bülent KENT
Rektör a.
Rektör Yardımcısı

Appendix H: Official Permission from Rectorate of Harran University

T.C.
HARRAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı

Sayı : E-78521740-044-115609
Konu : Anket İzni (Ali Dikici)

17.03.2022

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE
Adana-Mersin Karayolu Üzeri PK:33800 Yenice-Tarsus/MERSİN

İlgi : 10.03.2022 tarihli ve E-23867972-044-2200001909 sayılı yazı,

İlgi yazı ile, Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Ali DİKİCİ'nin, "*İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı arasındaki ilişki*" konulu tezi kapsamında, Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda anket çalışması yapma talebi belirtilmektedir.

İlgi yazınız Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Müdürlüğü'ne iletilmiş olup, verilen cevabi yazı ekte gönderilmektedir.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Prof. Dr. Murat DEMİR
Rektör a.
Rektör Yardımcısı

Ek:Cevabi yazı (1 sayfa)

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 16.03.2022-115377



T.C.
HARRAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-64221277-044-115377
Konu : Anket İzni (Ali Dikici)

16.03.2022

Eğitim-Öğretim, Planlama ve İstatistik Şube Müdürlüğü

İlgi : 14.03.2022 tarihli ve 114795 sayılı yazınız,

İlgi yazınız gereğince, Yüksekokulumuz Öğretim Görevlisi Ali DİKİCİ'nin "İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisi stratejileri kullanımı ve eleştirel okuma öz yeterlilik algısı arasındaki ilişki" konulu tezi kapsamında Yüksekokulumuzda anket çalışması yapma talebi Müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmüştür.

Gereğini bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Doç. Dr. Fatih Mehmet CİĞERCİ
Müdür

Dağıtım:
Gereği:
Eğitim-Öğretim, Planlama ve İstatistik Şube
Müdürlüğüne

Bilgi:
Sayın Öğr. Gör. Ali DİKİCİ

Appendix I: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to Gender between Reading Strategies Use and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scales

Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to Gender between Reading Strategy Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Scale/Sub-Scale	Gender	Skewness	Kurtosis
Inquiry	Female	-.08	-.21
	Male	-.12	-.42
Inference	Female	-.02	-.37
	Male	-.11	.21
Analysis	Female	-.16	-.50
	Male	-.25	-.27
Evaluation	Female	-.44	.17
	Male	-.44	-.51
Finding Similarities and Differences	Female	-.35	-.17
	Male	-.55	.60
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	Female	.09	-.42
	Male	-.11	-.34
Constructing	Female	-.08	-.13
	Male	.01	-.32
Planning	Female	-.13	-.40
	Male	-.29	-.38
Management	Female	-.52	-.21
	Male	-.57	-.05
Assisting	Female	-.31	-.08
	Male	-.15	-.78
Visualization	Female	-.59	-.15
	Male	-.39	-.54
Self-regulation	Female	-.40	-.49
	Male	-.63	-.22
Reading Strategy Use Scale	Female	-.02	-.15
	Male	.03	.29

Appendix J: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to Department between Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to Department between Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Scale/Sub-Scale	Department	Skewness	Kurtosis
Inquiry	English Language	-25	.06
	Teaching		
	Other	-.05	-.49
Inference	English Language	-.18	.08
	Teaching		
	Other	.03	-.30
Analysis	English Language	-.37	-.13
	Teaching		
	Other	-.06	-.69
Evaluation	English Language	-.73	.52
	Teaching		
	Other	-.38	-.36
Finding Similarities and Differences	English Language	-.32	-.24
	Teaching		
	Other	-.49	.41
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	English Language	-.12	-.25
	Teaching		
	Other	.09	-.48
Constructing	English Language	-.19	-.05
	Teaching		
	Other	-.01	-.13
Planning	English Language	-.26	-.69
	Teaching		
	Other	-.22	.02
Management	English Language	-.55	.03
	Teaching		
	Other	-.55	-.16
Assisting	English Language	-.05	-.27
	Teaching		
	Other	-.38	-.48
Visualization	English Language	-.48	-.33
	Teaching		
	Other	-.58	-.26
Self-regulation	English Language	-.80	.33
	Teaching		
	Other	-.38	-.48
Reading Strategy Use Scale	English Language	-.16	.27
	Teaching		
	Other	.04	-.04

Appendix K: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to How Often EFL Learners Read English Texts and Where EFL Learners' Family Lives in Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to How Often EFL Learners Read English Texts and Where EFL Learners' Family Lives in Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Scale/ Sub-scale	How often EFL Learners Read English Texts			Where their Family Lives	Skewness	Kurtosis
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes			
Inquiry	Never	.19	-1.46	Village	-.65	.00
	Seldom	-.33	-.23	District	.16	.48
	Sometimes	.13	-.43	Province	-.11	-.72
	Often	-.32	-.16	Metropolitan	-.08	-.40
Inference	Never	-.42	1.08	Village	-.40	-.65
	Seldom	.12	.30	District	.53	-.10
	Sometimes	-.04	-.04	Province	.06	-.34
	Often	-.15	-.54	Metropolitan	-.03	-.21
Analysis	Never	.28	-1.54	Village	.41	-.68
	Seldom	.10	-.39	District	-.40	-.33
	Sometimes	-.29	.11	Province	-.06	-.45
	Often	-.47	-.70	Metropolitan	-.25	-.41
Evaluation	Never	-.32	-1.36	Village	-.94	0.81
	Seldom	-.34	-.19	District	-.42	-.11
	Sometimes	-.62	.56	Province	-.41	-.07
	Often	-.39	-.74	Metropolitan	-.45	-0.16
Finding Similarities and Differences	Never	-.57	-.56	Village	-.12	-1.10
	Seldom	-.39	.21	District	-.81	1.51
	Sometimes	-.18	-.12	Province	.01	-.44
	Often	-.66	.34	Metropolitan	-.41	-.01
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	Never	-.07	-1.04	Village	-.34	-.43
	Seldom	-.03	-.13	District	.23	.42
	Sometimes	.17	-.11	Province	-.03	-.66
	Often	-.19	-.81	Metropolitan	.05	-.54

Appendix L: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to How Often EFL Learners Read English Texts and Where EFL Learners' Families Live in Reading Strategy Use Scale

Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to How Often EFL Learners Read English Texts and Where EFL Learners' Families Live in Reading Strategy Use Scale

Scale/ Sub-Scale	How often EFL learners Read Engli Texts		Skewness	Kurtosis	Where their Family Lives	Skewness	Kurtosis
	Never	Seldom					
Constructing	Never	Seldom	-.19	-1.13	Village	-.53	-.14
	Seldom	Sometimes	.17	.63	District	.35	-.41
	Sometimes	Often	-.06	-.19	Province	.04	.81
	Often		-.13	-.23	Metropolitan	-.08	-.23
Planning	Never	Seldom	-.09	-1.46	Village	-.88	.49
	Seldom	Sometimes	.30	.48	District	-.63	-.18
	Sometimes	Often	-.66	.41	Province	-.12	-.29
	Often		-.11	-.93	Metropolitan	-.09	-.41
Management	Never	Seldom	.92	-.06	Village	-.50	-.57
	Seldom	Sometimes	-.71	.61	District	-.82	-.34
	Sometimes	Often	-.66	.26	Province	-.87	.79
	Often		-.49	-.60	Metropolitan	-.41	-.13
Assisting	Never	Seldom	.57	-.89	Village	-.87	.23
	Seldom	Sometimes	.07	.06	District	-.65	.43
	Sometimes	Often	-.34	-.36	Province	-.21	-.51
	Often		-.33	-.50	Metropolitan	-.20	-.59
Visualization	Never	Seldom	-.91	-.23	Village	-1.13	1.17
	Seldom	Sometimes	-.72	.28	District	-.24	-.91
	Sometimes	Often	-.65	-.32	Province	-.23	-.63
	Often		-.44	-.50	Metropolitan	-.60	-.21
Self-regulation	Never	Seldom	.22	-1.43	Village	-.24	-.94
	Seldom	Sometimes	-.28	-.14	District	-.59	.19
	Sometimes	Often	-.59	-.30	Province	-.62	.07
	Often		-.89	.72	Metropolitan	-.51	-.40
Reading Strategy Use	Never	Seldom	.52	-1.14	Village	-.66	-.40
	Seldom	Sometimes	.37	2.47	District	-.56	.07
	Sometimes	Often	-.46	.34	Province	.29	-.48
	Often		.23	-.79	Metropolitan	.22	.03

Appendix M: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to the Type of English Text EFL Learners Read Most Between Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and Reading Strategy Use Scale

Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients According to the Type of English Text EFL Learners Read Most Between Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and Reading Strategy Use Scale

Scale/Sub-Scale	Type of Text EFL Learners Read Most	Skewness	Kurtosis
Inquiry	Literary Texts	.34	-.83
	Newspaper and Magazines	-.43	-.18
	Social Media Texts	-.10	-.11
Inference	Literary Texts	-.08	-.43
	Newspaper and Magazines	-.17	-.07
	Social Media Texts	-.01	-.09
Analysis	Literary Texts	-.32	.56
	Newspaper and Magazines	-.32	-.65
	Social Media Texts	-.16	-.59
Evaluation	Literary Texts	.00	-.74
	Newspaper and Magazines	-.38	-.68
	Social Media Texts	-.63	.14
Finding Similarities and Differences	Literary Texts	-.61	-.04
	Newspaper and	.03	-.28
	Social Media Texts	-.45	.13
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	Literary Texts	.34	-.80
	Newspaper and	-.02	-.79
	Social Media Texts	-.09	-.16
Constructing	Literary Texts	.58	.00
	Newspaper and	-.24	-.35
	Social Media Texts	-.07	-.14
Planning	Literary Texts	.04	-.25
	Newspaper and	-.71	.59
	Social Media Texts	-.07	-.64
Management	Literary Texts	-.77	.11
	Newspaper and	-.33	-.64
	Social Media Texts	-.57	.06
Assisting	Literary Texts	.29	-.96
	Newspaper and	-.42	-.31
	Social Media Texts	-.29	-.46

	Literary Texts	-.58	.50
Visualization	Newspaper and	-.53	-.82
	Social Media Texts	-.45	-.38
	Literary Texts	-.70	.04
Self-regulation	Newspaper and	-.31	-.07
	Social Media Texts	-.58	-.23
	Literary Texts	.30	.62
Reading Strategy Use	Newspaper and	-.52	.66
Scale	Social Media Texts	.17	-.49

Appendix N: Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to The Family Members' Reading English Books, Newspapers, and Texts between Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Skewness and Kurtosis Coefficients according to The Family Members' Reading English Books, Newspapers, and Texts between Reading Strategy Use Scale and Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Scale/Sub-scale	Family Members' Reading English Books, Newspapers, and Texts	Skewness	Kurtosis
Inquiry	Yes	-.66	.90
	No	.02	-.53
Inference	Yes	-.27	-.02
	No	-.01	-.15
Analysis	Yes	-.75	.66
	No	-.10	-.59
Evaluation	Yes	-.69	-.27
	No	-.48	.04
Finding Similarities and Differences	Yes	-1.01	.99
	No	-.28	-.16
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	Yes	-.33	-.30
	No	.07	-.39
Constructing	Yes	.11	.79
	No	-.08	-.24
Planning	Yes	-.46	-.29
	No	-.20	-.21
Management	Yes	-.40	-.52
	No	-.58	-.01
Assisting	Yes	.70	.36
	No	-.34	-.50
Visualization	Yes	-.32	-.24
	No	-.58	-.28
Self-regulation	Yes	-.44	-.57
	No	-.54	-.18
Reading Strategy Use Scale	Yes	.23	.29
	No	-.05	.01

Appendix O: Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Relationship Between the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and Reading Strategy Use Scale

Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Relationship Between the Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and Reading Strategy Use Scale

Scale/Sub-scale	Skewness	Kurtosis
Inquiry	-0.10	-0.30
Inference	-0.05	-0.19
Analysis	-0.21	-0.38
Evaluation	-0.51	-0.04
Finding Similarities and Differences	-0.42	0.10
Critical Reading Self-Efficacy Perception Scale	0.01	-0.39
Constructing	-0.08	-0.14
Planning	-0.24	-0.26
Management	-0.55	-0.11
Assisting	-0.28	-0.40
Visualization	-0.54	-0.29
Self-regulation	-0.53	-0.22
Reading Strategy Use Scale	-0.04	0.05