

The Correlation between EFL Learners' Achievement Goal Orientation and their Level of Conversational Skills

Prof. Dr. Salam Hamid Abbas

dr.salamhamid@gmail.com

Nada Mohammed Hindi

Nada.hindi87@gmail.com

College of Education, Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences/

University of Baghdad

Keywords: EFL Learners, Achievement Goal Orientation, Conversational Skills

الكلمات المفتاحية: متعلمو اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية, التوجه نحو تحقيق الاهداف, مهارات المحادثة

DOI:10.23813/FA/92/20

FA/2022012/92E/480

Abstract

One of the main objectives to learn English language is for purposes of communication through which information, ideas and feeling are communicated, viewpoints are expressed, topics are negotiated and emotions are evoked in effective conversations. However, making fluent as well as accurate conversations may be affected by a variety of factors, among which are motivational goals towards which learners exert effort and consequently achieve better academic outcomes. Accordingly, the current study is designed to investigate the correlation between EFL learners' achievement goal orientation and their level of conversational skills. The sample of the study is represented by 300 EFL students at the departments of English in three colleges of education (college of education, University of Diyala, college of education, Ibn Rushd,

University of Baghdad, and college of education, university of Wasit). After collecting data to be analyzed, results have revealed a positive significant correlation between participants' achievement goal orientation and their level of conversational skills.

العلاقة بين التوجه نحو تحقيق الاهداف و مهارات المحادثة لدى متعلمي اللغة
الانكليزية لغة اجنبية

ا. د سلام حامد عباس

ندى محمد هندي

كلية التربية/ابن رشد للعلوم الانسانية, جامعة بغداد

الخلاصة

تعتبر دراسة اللغة الانكليزية لأغراض تواصلية احدى اهم الاهداف التي من خلالها يتم مشاركة المعلومات, الافكار, والعواطف اضافة الى التعبير عن الآراء و مناقشة المواضيع المختلفة و التأثير في عواطف الاخرين خلال اجراء محادثات فاعلة. غير ان الاداء المتقن للمحادثات في اللغة الانكليزية قد يتأثر بالعديد من العوامل من بينها الاهداف التحفيزية التي يبذل المتعلمون جهدا في سبيل تحقيقها للوصول الى نتائج افضل.

وعليه فقد تم اجراء الدراسة الحالية للإيجاد العلاقة بين التوجه نحو تحقيق الاهداف و مهارات المحادثة لدى متعلمي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية. اما عينة البحث فقد اشتملت على 300 طالب وطالبة من المرحلة الثالثة والرابعة من كلية التربية/ابن رشد للعلوم الانسانية /جامعة بغداد , كلية التربية /جامعة ديالى , وكلية التربية / جامعة واسط) . وقد اظهرت نتائج البحث وجود علاقات ذات دلالة معنوية بين التوجه نحو تحقيق الاهداف و مستوى مهارات المحادثة لدى الطلبة متعلمي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية.

1. Introduction

1.1 Problem of the Study

Classroom is a social environment in which a variety of activities such as expressing ideas, revealing thoughts, arguing for viewpoints are shared through meaningful interaction. Interactions usually are carried out through conversations between students, on the one hand, and between students and their teachers, on the other. As described by Zwiers & Crawford (2011, p. 2) " since the dawn of language, conversations have been powerful teachers" and "powerful Sculptor" in that

conversations teach individuals how to construct ideas, communicate thoughts, solve problems and how others view life.

Moreover, individuals cannot achieve any personal or professional associations unless they establish good communication which involves the ability to effectively communicate verbally and nonverbally, that is, to be aware of what to say (words uttered) as well as how to say a message and how it is interpreted (Johar, 2016, p.1).

Yet, employing such skills in conversation is affected by a variety of factors such as learners setting reasons for themselves to engage in certain tasks and actions. Such reasons for language learning are referred to as goal orientation which plays a key role and underlies a force in directing the choice of specific reasons. Goal orientation is viewed as the impetus for a motivated behavior and desired outcomes and as a source of effort and achievement (Mercer, et al, 2012, p. 188).

Accordingly, it is proposed that this component is crucial in shaping students' performance in conversational activities, that is, students who adopt achievement goal orientations for engagement in conversation, whether they seek better performance or mastery of the skills, will consequently orient themselves with persistence to achieve their goals, cope with difficulties and challenges and ultimately be successful communicators.

1.2 Aims

The study aims at finding out :

1. EFL students' level of achievement goal orientation and conversational skills.
2. The correlations between EFL students' achievement goal orientation and level of conversational skills,

1.3 Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that there is no statistically significant correlation between EFL students' achievement goal orientation and level of conversational skills.

1.4 Limits

This study is limited to:

1. Iraqi EFL 3rd and 4th year students at the English departments of colleges of education .
2. The academic year 2020-2021

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is hoped to be of value to:

- 1.EFL learners to raise their awareness of how their achievement goal orientation and cognitive flexibility may be correlated with their conversational skills and use of emotive language which may be helpful to improve their conversation proficiency.
- 2.English language teachers to highlight the role of these constructs in supporting learners to achieve their tasks goals in general and in learning English in particular.
- 3.Educators and researcher who may benefit from the findings of this study in approaching investigation of the variables involved in this study from different perspectives.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Achievement Goal Orientation: Definition & Theory

The view of achievement goals is seen to be more in line with perspectives on goals that focus on content and view goals as " cognitive representations of what is hoped to accomplish, and they give direction and energy to behavior" (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 231), or "what it is that an individual is trying to achieve in a given situation"(Wentzel & Wigfield, 1998, as cited in Pajares & Urdan, 2002, p. 144).

As far as goal orientations in academic contexts are concerned, they can be defined as the reasons for engaging in achievement behaviors, thus, goal orientation theory explains the cognitive processes students go through when making decisions about how to reach a desired objective (Goode, 2008, p. 115). There are two major types of achievement goal orientation in the 2x2 construct, **mastery - approach goals** and

performance-approach goals. Mastery-approach goals, also referred to as 'learning goals' or 'task goals', are intrinsic goals that promote intrinsic motivation, foster perceptions of challenge, encourage learning and task-involvement, generate excitement and task-enjoyment, and increase self-determination and persistence in the face of failure(Bahad, 2009, p. 19).

The other construct that has been added later to the 2x2 achievement goal framework is called **mastery-avoidance** in which learners avoid self- or task-based incompetence for example, not losing one's skills or not misunderstanding materials (Elliot, 2008, p. 226).

When learners focus their attention on learning as it relates to external factors or outcomes such as praise and high grades, they are said to endorse **performance-approach goals**(Dunn, 2015, p. 413).When performance goals focus attention on the uncontrollability and negative value of normative failure, they are referred to as **performance-avoidance goals** promoting experience of prospective anxiety and hopelessness, and retrospective shame (Pekrun et al., 2018, p. 66).

2.2 Conversation Skills

Conversation, the word that denotes in the old French language the manner of conducting oneself in the world, may occur between two or more people to express feelings, thoughts, and exchange news and information (Ranjesh, 2020, p.1).

When thinking of conversation, one might think of it as being monitored by a range of rules used unconsciously and factors that motivate different types of talks, but the fact is that it is something spontaneous, instinctive, habitual and as described by Montaigne "the most fruitful and natural play of the mind", or as put by William Hazlitt in the "Plain Speaker" " the art of conversation is the art of hearing as well as of being heard" (Crystal, 2020, p. viii- x).

Wehmeyer (2007, p. 169) states that conversational skills include responding to a conversation partner's question or statement with relevant statement or answer, initiating conversation at appropriate times, taking turns appropriately,

and showing continued interest in a conversation by employing brief speech acknowledgers (e.g. "yes, I see" or "right") in addition to the use of voice tone, volume, intonation as well as paralinguistic aspects.

2.3 Achievement Goal Orientation and Language Skills

Goal orientation theory was developed specifically to explain achievement behavior so learners who choose or have appropriate goals can be motivated in learning behavior. It is said that the goals learners choose, reflect both their beliefs in intelligence and ability and their typical behavior patterns in achievement situations (Nakata, 2006, p.96). Moreover, setting goals has been proved to have positive effects in sustaining motivation, increasing self-efficacy, influencing self-regulated learning, fostering autonomy, increasing confidence and improving learning performance and consequently affecting academic achievement particularly when combined with teacher's feedback (Morrison, 2011, p. 104).

The types and properties of goals that language learners establish for themselves are essential to the motivational process that will be used in achieving these goals, for example, the goals that are challenging are likely to lead to higher achievement such as the goals that learners seek to master difficult language skills where the intention is to satisfy the learner alone in contrast to performance goals which focus on gaining public appeal(Macaro, 2003, p. 94). On this basis, in Woodrow (2006) model of adaptive learning, it is stated that learners who endorse mastery goals were more likely to have high self-efficacy, use of metacognitive language learning strategies and have a high level of English speaking (Mercer et al., 2012, p. 193).

Moreover, mastery goal-orientations are proved to contribute to academic achievement in which learners focus on increasing competence and outcomes are measured as growth from self -comparison of previous abilities. And on the basis of a section of the IELTS, it is proved that mastery goal orientation is positively correlated with speaking proficiency and is seen as a positive L2 self in learning another language (Budzinska & Majchrzak, 2021, p. 85).

Furthermore, mastery-goal orientation is apparent when L2 learners set a particular challenge, for example, when being able to comprehend a short news report in English paying little attention to relative performance; while an example of performance-goal orientation in language learning contexts could be when learners are working hard to outperform their classmate on an important test. However, in many educational contexts, the focus of English language teaching is still very much on performance (Burns & Richards, 2018, p. 56).

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants of the Study

The sample is purposive and represented by 300 EFL students purposively selected from the 3rd and 4th year students of the English departments of the college of education, Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences/ university of Baghdad (110 students), college of education/ university of Diyala (107 students), college of education/ university of Wasit (83 students) for the academic year (2020-2021). The total number of 3rd and 4th year students in the departments included is 995 students from whom a percentage of 30% is relied on in selecting the sample which is regarded as highly reliable in correlational studies.

3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 The Achievement Goal Orientation Scale

The achievement goal orientation scale (AGO scale henceforth) is prepared through adopting items from two scales. The first is Elliot & Murayama scale, 2008, which consists of 12 items. Whereas the second scale is Young scale, 2012 from which 16 items are adopted. The total number of the AGO scale is 28 and the scale is a 5 point Likert type ranging from (strongly agree 5) to (strongly Disagree 1).

Moreover, the scale examines four domains or orientations, *mastery- approach goals*, *performance- approach goals*, *mastery-avoidance goals* and *performance- avoidance goals* with 8,8,6,6 items respectively for each orientation. It is worth

to mention that the higher score to be obtained by the participant is (140) while the lower score is (28) with a theoretical mean of (84). See (Appendix A)

3.2.2 Conversational Skills Test and its Rating Scale

The second instrument used in this study is the conversational skills test and its rating scale. The best method to assess participants conversational skills is to elicit as much as possible natural responses. Thus, ten variant topics are selected from different areas which are familiar, simple and best reflect everyday life situations starting from greeting, self-introducing, examination preparation to talking about topics like future plans and jobs. The participants are tested orally through interview between participant A (the interviewer) and participant B through which a variety of speaking skills are used. As far as its rating scale is concerned, it consists of (20) items adopted from Spitzberg and Adams, 1994, with (5) points for each ranging between(1 inadequate to 5 excellent). Accordingly, the higher score that can be obtained by the participant is (100) and the lower score is (20) with a theoretical mean of (60) . The test procedure and topics as well as the rating scale are illustrated in appendix (B)

3.3 Face Validity

In order to assess face validity, as stated by Salkind & Rasmussen (2010, p.473), the test should be presented to experts who have substantive knowledge about the research topic of interest to provide constructive insights and observations that help the development of the research project. Thus, the four measures of the current study are exposed to a jury of (15) experts in the field of Methods of Teaching English and the field of Linguistics to provide their viewpoints concerning the adequacy and appropriateness of the items of each measure. The experts show their approval for the appropriateness of the items for the topic and sample concerned with certain recommendations. See appendix (C)

3.4 Test Reliability

As far as the current study is concerned, two types of reliability are addressed, test-retest and internal consistency. The

measurement of test-retest means that if the same respondents complete a test at two different points in time, the responses should be stable and the set of results should be reproducible (Sharma & Sharma, 2006, p. 34). As far as the current study is concerned, the AGO scale is administered to a sample of (50) participants chosen randomly from the fourth year EFL students at the College of Education, University of Diyala. After two weeks the same measure is applied on the same sample. Using Pearson correlation coefficient to estimate reliability, or r -value, between the two sets of responses, results show that r -value for the AGO scale is (0.87) which is an indicator of good reliability since the value is higher than (0.70) (Litwin, 1995, p. 8).

The other type of reliability examined in this study is internal consistency of measures items. One of the widely used methods for assessing internal consistency of the test is Cronbach's Alpha (Franzen, 2002, p. 22). Cronbach Alpha coefficient can range from 0.00 to 1.00 to indicate very low to very high internal consistency. In addition, an Alpha of (0.65-0.80) is often considered adequate for a measure used in human dimension research (Vaske et al, 2016, p. 3). Accordingly, the study instruments (AGO scale and the conversational skills rating scale) are found to be of high internal consistency with r -values of (0.85 and 0.84) respectively.

3.5 Final Application

The study instruments are applied in different ways. The AGO scale is administered to the sample of the study through a link designed via Google forms and distributed in the electronic classrooms after explaining and clarifying the scale items by the researcher to make sure that there will be no ambiguity. The participants had enough time to consider the items and submit their responses. On the other hand, the test which assesses participants' ability to use conversational skills, both verbal and nonverbal, is applied by eliciting natural conversations from participant by talking about different topics formal and informal ones. Because the application is time consuming, the sample

was divided into groups (25-30) participants per group. The time allotted for each participant ranged from (7-15) minutes.

The application is conducted via Google meet program due to its widely use by educators at the quarantine time (due to Covid 19 pandemic) and particularly by students to get their electronic learning. Before the application of the test, students are informed that there will be such a test. They are given proper instructions and guidelines of the purpose of the test and the criteria according to which they will be rated like speaking rate, fluency, vocal confidence, prosody, facial expressions, etc. participants' performance has been taped so that it can be listened to over and over again and accurately scored.

4. Results & Discussions

4.1 Results Related to the First Aim: EFL Students' Level of AGO & Conversational Skills

As far as EFL students' level of AGO is concerned, results calculated show that the mean score is (98.603) with a standard deviation of (14.322). In order to identify the significance of the variance between the mean score and the theoretical mean which is (84), t-test for one independent sample is used. It reveals that the computed t-value (17.661) is higher than the critical one (1.96) at a level of significance (0.05) and degree of freedom (298). Accordingly, it is statistically significant and the sample has a satisfactory level of achievement goal orientation. See the next table:

Table (1)
The Mean Score, Standard Deviation and t-Value of the AGO Scale

Variable	Sample Size	M	S.D	Theoretical Mean	t- Value		Significance (0.05) significant
					computed	Critical	
Achievement goal orientation	300	98.603	14.322	84	17.661	1.96	

This result may be attributed to several factors. For example, the sample of the study is represented by third and fourth year college students who are more advanced and mature and reveal

a degree of awareness of their academic goals. Thus, in order to achieve their desirable outcomes and to be motivated to engage in learning tasks, they set certain goals for themselves and pose questions as " why am I doing this task?".

In order to find out EFL students' level of conversational skills, the test is applied to the sample of the study. After scoring participants' responses using a rating scale, results show that the mean score of the sample scores is (72.573) with a standard deviation of (3.787) while the theoretical mean is (60). In order to identify the statistical significance, t-test for one independent sample is used. The results calculated show that the computed t-value (57.511) is higher than the critical on (1.96) at a level of significance (0.05) and degree of freedom (298) which indicate that there is a statistical significance difference which is in favor of the mean score and that the sample has a accepted level in using conversational skills, as illustrated in the next table :

Table (2)
Mean Score, Standard Deviation and T-Value of the
Conversational Skills Test

Variable	Sample Size	Mean Score	S.D	Theoretical Mean	t-Value		Significance 0.05
					Computed	Critical	
Conversational Skills	300	72.573	3.787	60	57.511	1.96	Significant

The conversational skills rating scale adopted in the current study consists of both verbal and nonverbal skills. The participants, as advanced learners, have studied conversation from the first to the third year of their academic study in addition to studying a variety of materials in English language which tapped into their knowledge, skills and competence enabling them to employ their previous and current knowledge in effective conversation.

Furthermore, they usually engage in conversational situations when they participate in class and pair discussion. This justification is in correspondence to Johar (2016, p.2-3) who asserted that the linguistic knowledge learned throughout

their journey of academic study contribute to their good level as well as knowing how to say words and utterances which is also considered vital in communication, that is, the use of non-verbal communication behavior like stress, intonation and body language.

Moreover, the satisfactory conversational level can also be attributed to the fact that L2 language learners already have a well-developed conversational competence that is common to all languages, after all language is universal and conversations share a considerable number of features such as turn taking, back channels, closing, topic change, hesitations, self-repairs etc. as stated by Thornbury & Slade(2006, p. 224-225).

4.2 Results Related to the Second Aim

In order to find out the correlation between " *EFL students' achievement goal orientation and level of conversational skills*, a null hypothesis has been posed as " there is no statistically significant correlation between EFL students' achievement goal orientation and level of conversational skills". To verify the hypothesis, Pearson correlation coefficient is used to investigate the correlation between the two variables. The results calculated reveal that the r- value is (0.537) and the computed t- value (10.959) is higher than the critical one (1.96) at a level of significance (0.05) and degree of freedom (298). This indicates that there is a positive significance correlation between EFL students' achievement goal orientation and level of conversational skills, i.e., the higher the level of achievement goal orientation, the higher the level of EFL students in conversational skills. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative one is accepted as illustrated in the next table:

Table (3)

The Correlation between AGO and Conversational Skills

Sample Size	r- Value	t- Value		Significance 0.05
		Computed	critical	
300	0.537	10.959	1.96	Significant

This result may be attributed to the social origin of motivation in learning a language ,that is, learners may learn for a set of practical reasons which are important for learners to determine the degree of effort made and the cost paid for learning, revealing that socially determined factors constitute a significant part, as referred to by Sung and Spolsky (2014, p.29). For example, language learners ,when using conversational skills in a variety of contexts of social communication, are motivated by goals and instrumental plans to achieve these goals such as achieving pragmatic functions as bargaining, instruction, deliberation, discussing, expressing ideas etc. Thus, setting goals in communication is essential to move the listener somewhere relative to a communication goal.

5. Conclusions

On the basis of the results, the following conclusions are posed:

1. By investigating EFL learners' level of conversational skills, data analysis provides evidence that they are able to communicate satisfactorily employing a variety of skills in communication.
2. With respect to the conversational skills tested in this study, EFL learners succeed to use non-verbal skills which constitute a large amount of human communication.
3. The major difficulties faced by EFL learners, as observed throughout study procedures, are their speaking rate that influences on how speech is perceived by listeners.
4. The analysis of achievement goal orientation demonstrates that EFL learners are aware of their goals and reasons for engagements in tasks in English language.
5. Achievement goal orientation is proved to be a positive predictor of learners' conversational skills. That implies its role in promoting learners performance in conversation.

In the light of the conclusions, the following recommendations are drawn:

1. Teachers should be aware enough that motivation is a fundamental factor for learners' engagement in learning tasks

and consequently in their academic success. That is, when they set certain goals, they work hard, exert effort, overcome challenges and all that would tap into their overall proficiency. Teachers should extend their knowledge about how to help learners to set goals and reasons for themselves, that is achieved through reading extra resources such as books, articles, blogs, encyclopedia, etc. and attending workshops, lectures, seminars held for relevant topics.

2. It is recommended that teachers should focus learners goal orientations towards mastery-approach goals due to their efficacy in enhancing learners' self-regulatory, self-efficacy, self-persistence, and effort then focus on performance-approach goals to enhance better performance.

3. Goal orientation is proved to be essential in speaking skills, thus, teachers should encourage learners orient their goals towards learning new skills in conversation for purposes of communication in the foreign language.

References

1. Bahad, E. (2009). *The Social Psychology of the Classroom*. New York: Routledge.
2. Barron, K. & Harackiewicz, J. (2000). Achievement Goals and Optimal Motivation: A Multiple Goals Approach. *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation*, 229-254.
3. Budzinska, K. & Majchrzak, O. (2021). *Positive Psychology in Second and Foreign Language Education*. Cham: Springer.
4. Burns, A. & Richards, J. (2018). *The Cambridge Guide to Learning English as a Second Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Crystal, D. (2020). *Let's Talk. How English Conversation Works*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
6. Elliot, A. (2008). *Handbook of Approach and Avoidance Motivation*. New York: Psychology Press.
7. Elliot, A. & Murayama, K. (2008). On the Measurement of Achievement Goals: Critique, Illustration, and Application. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(3), 613-156.

8. Franzen, M. (2002). *Reliability and Validity in Neuropsychological Assessment*(2nd ed.). New York: Springer.
9. Goode, T. (2008). *21st Century Education: a Reference Handbook*,(vol.1). California: SAGE.
10. Johar, S. (2016). *Emotions, Affect, and Personality in Speech: the Bias of Language and Paralanguage*. New Jersey: Springer.
11. Litwin, M. (1995). *How to Measure Survey: Reliability and Validity*. California: SAGE Publication.
12. Macaro, E. (2003). *Teaching and Learning a Second Language: a Guide to Recent Research and its Application*. New York: Continuum.
13. Mercer, S., Ryan, S. & Williams, M. (2012). *Psychology for Language Learning, Insights from Research, Theory and Practice*. New Morrison, B. (2011). *Independent Language Learning: Building on Experience, Seeking New Perspective*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. York: Palgrave Macmillan.
14. Nakata, Y. (2006). *Motivation and Experience in Foreign Language Learning*. New York: Peter Lang.
15. Pekrun, R., Muis, K., Frenzel, A. & Geots, T. (2018). *Emotions at School*. New York: Routledge.
16. Ranjesh, E. (2020). *Ranjesh's Practical English Conversation for all Learners*. Blue Rose Publish.
17. Salkind, N. & Rasmussen, K. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Educational Psychology* (vol.1). California; SAGE Publication.
18. Sharma, R. & Sharma, R. (2006). *Experimental Psychology*. New Delhi: Atlantic.
19. Spitzberg, B. (1995). *The Conversational Skills Rating Scale: an Instructional Assessment of Interpersonal Competence*. San Diego: NCA.
20. Sung, K. & Spolsky, B. (2014). *Conditions for English Language Teaching and Learning in Asia*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

21. Thornbury, S. & Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: from Description to Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Conunpre.
22. Vaske, J., Beaman, J., & Sponarski, C. (2016). *Rethinking Internal Consistency in Cronbach's Alpha*. California: Routledge.
23. Wehmeyer, M. (2007). *Promoting Self-Determination in Students with Developmental Disabilities*. London: The Guilford Press.
24. Young, J. (2012). *Augmenting the Achievement Goal Questionnaire-Revised*. Unpublished Masters of Education Thesis, University of Houston.
25. Zwiers, J. & Crawford, M. (2011). *Academic Conversations: Classroom Talk that Fosters Critical Thinking and Content Understanding*. Portland: Stenhouse Publishing.

Appendix (A)

Achievement Goal Orientation Scale

Respond to the following items by selecting the options that best reflect your goal orientation in relation to the materials presented in your English classes. The items reveal either mastery or performance orientation.

1: Strongly Disagree (SD) 2: Disagree (D) 3: Undecided (UD)
 4: Agree (A) 5: Strongly Agree (SA) Degree of Agreement of Achievement Goal Orientations

Items	SD 1	D 2	UD 3	A 4	SA 5
1. My goal is to completely master the material presented in class .					
2. My goal is to learn as much as possible from the tasks at hand.					
3. My goal is to understand the content of the courses as thoroughly as possible.					
4. I worry that I may not learn					

all that I possibly could in the class .					
5. Sometimes I'm afraid that I may not understand the content of courses as thoroughly as I would like .					
6. My goal is to do well compared to other students .					
7. My goal is to get a better grade than most of the other students .					
8. My goal is to avoid performing poorly compared to others .					
9. I ask my teacher for help so I can do better than other students.					
10. I want to learn as much of the material taught in class as I possibly could.					
11. I study to learn more about the material being taught.					
12. When I receive graded assignments back, I look for feedback and comments in order to learn more about the material.					
13. I pay careful attention in class so that I can learn the material.					
14. I work on assignments because I want to learn the material being taught.					
15. I do not ask for help because I know I can remember the material.					
16. My fear of performing poorly in class is often what motivates me.					

17. My goal is to avoid less learning than it is possible to learn.					
18. I do not work on assignment because other students do not.					
19. I do not review class notes because other students do not review the notes.					
20. I put enough effort into my work so that I do not forget the material being taught.					
21. I do not try to engage in a problem-solving tasks if I forgot the material.					
22. I use what I learn to demonstrate that my abilities are better than the other students' abilities					
23. I put more effort into my work to show that I am better than other students.					
24. I work on assignments because I want to show how much better my performance is compared to other students' performance.					
25. I study so that I can show that I am better than other students.					
26. I take notes so that I can do better than other students.					
27. I put enough effort into my work so that I will not do worse than other students.					
28. I do not ask for help because I think other students will think that I am not as good as they are.					

Appendix (B)

The Conversation Test and its Rating Scale

The Test

Instructions:

The participants will be tested through interview. The test includes two stages:

1. **Prepare:** participants are provided with guidelines about the procedures undertaken in the test and informed of the criteria according to which they are assessed. They take few minutes to mind map their ideas before starting.
2. **Start the conversation:** participant A (the interviewer) and participant B have a conversation. The time allocated for each students is up to 10 minutes during which they should use different speaking skills referred to earlier. The conversation starts with greeting then proceeds with the following topics:

- Two persons introducing themselves
- Planning a picnic
- Talk about your best friend.
- Ask about a sick friend.
- Meeting for the first time in a long time (in a restaurant or any place).
- Conversation on job change
- Experience as a language teacher
- Conversation on exam preparation
- Parent – teacher conversation
- Two friends talking about coronavirus infection
- Spending time during the pandemic of coronavirus
- Environmental pollution(living near factories)
- Plans after graduation
- Choosing study field

CONVERSATIONAL SKILLS RATING SCALE (Observer Rating of Conversant Form)

Your Name:

Partner Name:

Date:

Class:

Activity:

Rate how skillfully THIS INTERACTANT used, or didn't use, the following communicative behaviors in the conversation, where:

1 = **INADEQUATE** (use is awkward, disruptive, or results in a negative impression of communicative skills)

2 = **FAIR** (occasionally awkward or disruptive, occasionally adequate)

3 = **ADEQUATE** (sufficient but neither noticeable nor excellent. Produces neither strong positive nor negative impression)

4 = **GOOD** (use was better than adequate but not outstanding)

5 = **EXCELLENT** (use is smooth, controlled, results in positive impression of communicative skills)

Circle the single most accurate response for each behavior: 1 2 3 4 5

Communicative Behaviors	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Speaking rate (neither too slow nor too fast)					
(2) Speaking fluency (pauses, silences, "uh", etc.)					
(3) Vocal confidence (neither too tense/nervous nor overly confident sounding)					
(4) Articulation (clarity of pronunciation and linguistic expression)					
(5) Vocal variety (neither overly monotone nor dramatic voice)					
(6) Volume (neither too loud nor too soft)					
(7) Posture (neither too closed/formal nor too open/informal)					
(8) Shaking or nervous twitches (aren't noticeable or distracting)					
(9) Facial expressiveness according to the situation (neither blank nor exaggerated)					

(10) Use of humor and/or stories					
(11) Smiling and/or laughing when appropriate					
(12) Asking of questions					
(13) Speaking about partner (involvement of partner as a topic of conversation)					
(14) Speaking about self (neither too much nor too little)					
(15) Encouragements or agreements (encouragement of partner to talk)					
(16) Personal opinion expression (neither too passive nor aggressive)					
(17) Initiation of new topics					
(18) Maintenance of topics and follow-up comments					
(19) Interruption of partner speaking turns					
(20) Use of time speaking relative to partner					

Appendix (C)

Names and academic Ranks of the Jury Members

Names and academic Ranks	Field
1. Prof. Dr. Shaimaa Abdul Baqi Al-Bakri, College of Education, Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.	ELT
2. Prof. Dr. Abdul Kareem Fadhil, College of Education, Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.	Linguistics
3. Prof. Dr. Sami Al- Mamuri, Al-Mansour University College.	ELT
4. Prof. Dr. Amthel Mohammed Abbas, College of Basic Education, University of Diyala.	Translation
5. Prof. Dr. Fatima Raheem Abdul Hussain, College of Basic Education, University of Missan.	ELT

6. Asst. Prof. Dr. Khansaa Hassan Hussain, Al-Imam Al-Khadem University College.	ELT
7. Asst. Prof. Dr. Sundus Abdul Jabbar Kamil, College of Education, Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.	ELT
8. Asst. Prof. Dr. Zaineb Abbas, College of Education, University of Diyala.	ELT
9. Asst. Prof. Dr. Liqaa Habeeb Al Obaidy, College of Education, University of Diyala	ELT
10. Asst. Prof. Dr. Ghazwan Adnan Mohammed, College of Education, University of Diyala.	ELT
11. Asst. Prof. Dr. Elaf Riyadh, College of Education, Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.	ELT
12. Asst. Prof. Sabeeha Hamza Dehham, College of Basic Education, University of Babylon.	ELT
13. Asst. Prof. Nadia Khairi, College of Education, Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.	Linguistics
14. Asst. Prof. Mayada Raheem, English Language Center, University of Technology.	Linguistics
15. Professor Dr. Andrew Elliot, Department of Psychology, University of Rochester.	Psychology