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Abstract: Second language learning is the long-term time process of commitment to seeking a high degree of success. In this manner, the majority of learners get more experience of success than failure. However, a small number of learners involve a string of repeated failures arising from the lack of self-confidence and a feeling of hopelessness. Thus, the role of mindsets is crucial in recognizing how learners respond to challenging situations. Fueled with the role of mindsets and their association with language relevant variables, researching to promote perseverance in challenging situations is still at its infancy. This study fills the lack of systematic research on mindset through examining its correlations with goal orientations and responses to failure in the Iranian EFL context. Three sets of structured questionnaires were distributed to a group of 100 male and female university-level learners. The Pearson product-moment correlational analysis was employed to analyze the data. The findings of this piece of research revealed a direct correlation between fixed and growth mindsets and goal orientation. Likewise, a direct correlation between mindset and responses to failure was found to be present. The results of our study have various implications for foreign
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Failures are often a part of the process of learning a new skill. Like any complex competency, language learning is a process that requires a long-term time commitment and perseverance. Language mindsets are argued to be instrumental in learning a language because they carry implications as to how learners respond to adverse situations. This study has sought to answer the question of why language learners with different mindsets react differently in failure situations. The results of this study revealed that L2 learners holding a growth mindset are more motivated to learn and as a consequence set higher learning goals. But L2 learners who view language ability as being stable, probably adopt learning goals regardless of their competence level because they are firmly of the opinion that their effort cannot develop their ability. However, contrary to other studies, this pattern turned out to marginally significant in the present study.
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1. Introduction

Learning a new language is a fundamental process for learners to attain educational and professional development. Gardner (2010) believes that second language learning (L2) is a process that requires a continuing commitment to achieving a high degree of success (Gardner, 2010). In this process, failure and mistakes are a natural phase for the majority of learners to reach the success level (McDowell & Parke, 2009). Most learners experience more success than failure (McDowell & Parke, 2009). However, the learning process for a small number of learners comprises a string of repeated failures, which results from a lack of self-confidence, feeling of complete hopelessness, and lack of motivation to attempt any new challenges.

In this sense, focusing on the experience of challenges is the focal character of successful learners, whereas unsuccessful learners tend to avoid difficulty and give up (Gan et al., 2004). Therefore, according to Burnette et al. (2013), conducting studies on mindsets demonstrates how to promote perseverance in facing challenging situations. For instance, mindset is systematically related to different effort attitudes, goal-orientations, and learning strategies (Molden & Dweck, 2006). In the L2 context, priming of different mindsets is expected to lead learners to pursue a variety of achievement goals in challenging situations.

Language mindsets are claimed to be focal as they have implications for how people react to challenging situations (Mercer & Ryan, 2010). In the same vein, Gan et al. (2004) believe that L2 learners may find themselves in situations that result in awkward or even unsuccessful communicative interactions. Fueled with the role of mindsets, there is a lack of systematic research on the language mindset and its correlations with goal orientations and responses to failure. More specifically, reviewing the related literature suggests that there is a lack of research design considering the correlation between the three constructs (Language mindset, Goal orientation, and Responses to failure) in the Iranian EFL context. Therefore, the current research seeks to fill up this gap to see whether there is a significant correlation between language mindset variables (Entity and Incremental) with goal orientation (Performance-approach, Performance-avoidance, and Learning goal) and responses to failure (Mastery, Helpless, and Anxious responses).

To achieve the objectives of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Are there any statistically significant relationships between students’ fixed and growth mindset with goal orientations, such as learning goals, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance?

2. Are there any statistically significant relationships between students’ fixed and growth mindset with responses to failure such as mastery, helpless, and anxious responses?

1.1. The concept of mindset in language learning

Mindset is defined as a set of central beliefs about the nature of ability and its role in successful learning within a specific domain (Molden & Dweck, 2006). Mindset is categorized into two core attitudes as “Fixed” and “Growth.” The former is recognized as “Entity” that individuals’ attributes are fixed, whereas the latter is known as “Incremental” that individuals’ attributes are malleable and can be improved through effort (Dweck, 2017).
Mindsets are relatively domain-specific (Dweck, 2017). For instance, a learner considers that his math ability can be developed, but not his sports skills. In language learning, it has long been argued to be a unique educational domain. According to Gardner (2010), language learning takes place not only in the classroom; but also in the broader community through interactions with speakers of the target language. Hence, not only can learners fail in a language task in the tests, but also outside that classroom when using the L2 to interact with native speakers.

1.2. The concept of goal orientation in language learning
Goal orientation is comprehensively defined as situated directions for action in an achievement task (Kaplan & Maehr, 2007). Rather than focusing on the content of achievements (e.g., objectives, specific standards), goal orientations define the reasons how people are trying to make numerous objectives (Anderman & Young, 1994). According to Pintrich and Zusho (2002), goal orientations cover cognitive, affective, and behavioral components, which are considered to be highly relevant for explaining different academic behaviors and performances. Although there are several definitions of the goal orientations, most researchers focused on two main adjustments that Ames (1992) labeled them as “Mastery,” and “Performance” goals. “Mastery goals orientation” refers to an individual's purpose of developing competence, such as focusing on learning, understanding, and developing skills (Ames, 1992). In the perspective of Midgley (2002), mastery goals orientation has been regularly found to be associated with positive outcomes including self-efficacy, persistence, preference for a challenge.

“Performance-oriented” learners focus on managing the impression that others have of their ability: attempting to create an idea of high capacity and avoid creating a feeling of low skill (Dweck, 2017). When pursuing performance-approach goals, the learner is oriented towards the desired possibility of demonstrating high ability in the task.

Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996) suggested that Performance-avoidance goals” are geared towards the undesired chance of showing low expertise in the task to avoid such a demonstration. Elliot (1999) claims quite firmly that “Performance-avoidance” targets are associated with challenging outcomes. According to Urdan and Giancarlo (2001), “Performance-avoidance goals” have been revealed to be related to low efficacy, anxiety, self-handicapping strategies, and low grades. In contrast, the pattern of associations related to “Performance-approach goals” is mostly considered positive as revealed to be connected to outcomes such as persistence, positive effect, and grades (Harackiewicz et al., 2002). A possible problem with “Performance-approach goals” is the potential of their transformation into “Performance-avoidance goals” when students experience changes in circumstances or the likelihood of failure (Middleton & Midgley, 2004).

A study conducted by Lou (2014) examined how priming an “Entity” mindset, or an “Incremental” mindset can orient language learners’ goals. The findings revealed that in the “Incremental” condition, learners more strongly endorsed learning goals regardless of their proficiency. In contrast, in the “Entity” condition, more proficient learners endorsed “Performance-approach goals.”

1.3. The concept of responses to failure in language learning
Failure is a natural part of the learning process, understood by most learners as necessary for success (McDowell & Parke, 2009). Perceiving that one is unable to overcome failure can have highly debilitating effects on performance, while perceiving that one can avoid failure can have facilitating effects (Dweck, 2017).

A study conducted by Lou (2014) revealed that in the “Incremental” condition, learners more strongly endorsed learning goals, and in turn, reported more “Mastery-oriented” responses in failure situations and more definite intention to continue learning the target language. In contrast, in the “Entity” condition, more proficient learners endorsed “Performance-approach goals,” and in turn, reported more helpless-oriented responses.
2. Method

2.1. Research design
A quantitative research design was utilized to examine the relationship between Iranian EFL learners’ mindset (Entity and Incremental) with goal orientations (Performance-approach goal, Performance-avoidance goal, and Learning goal) and responses to failure (Mastery, Helpless, Anxious). This research is a quantitatively driven type employing three sets of questionnaires including Elliot and Church (1997) three-dimensional Goal Orientation Scale entailing 21 items to which participants responded on a 7-point Likert scale. Also, participants rated their failure using the Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (Conroy et al., 2002), which includes 6 items to which participants responded on a 7-point Likert scale. Moreover, they completed the full scale of the MLLS entailing 18 items concerning beliefs about the fixedness and malleability of the three aspects of language ability (Lou, 2014).

2.2. Participants
The accessible population for the descriptive correlational study was male and female senior undergraduate students enrolled in the college of language and literature at Zand University in Shiraz, Iran (N = 100). The participants were between 21 to 34 years old. A sample of 80 students was drawn randomly from the population of senior students. The sample size (n = 80) was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table of sample sizes, specifying a five (5) percent margin of error. Twelve students had missing data on mindset and goal orientation. There were a total of 68 participating students with complete data.

2.3. Instruments
The Mindsets of Language Learning Scale (MLLS) questionnaire (see Appendix A), devised by Lou (2014), includes 18 items concerning beliefs about the “Entity” and “Incremental” mindsets. The lead researcher translated the questionnaire into Persian (see Appendix A) for its adaptability to Iranian culture. The reliability of the questionnaire was measured using Cronbach Alpha, which turned out to be 0.84 indicating an excellent internal consistency (Salkind, 2007).

The Goal Orientations Scale was the second set of questionnaires (see Appendix B) introduced by Elliot and Church (1997) asked students about their goals in their L2 class. The questionnaire includes three dimensions, such as “Learning goals,” “Performance-approach goals,” and “Performance-avoidance goals”. The time allotted to complete the scale was 15 minutes. The researcher translated the questionnaire into Persian (see Appendix B) for its adaptability to Iranian culture. For the sake of confirming the face and content validity of the instrument, it was observed by the two applied linguists at Shiraz Azad University. To make sure that the translated version was the same as the original, the translated questionnaire was back-translated into English without having access to the original English form. For the sake of assessing the reliability of the Persian version of the questionnaire, a pilot study was carried out.

The reliability of the questionnaire measured via Cronbach Alpha turned out to be 0.87 indicating an excellent internal consistency (Salkind, 2007).

Finally, the Failure Situation Scale (Mastery, Helplessness, and Anxious responses) questionnaire (see Appendix C) originated by Lou (2014) asked learners about failure scenarios that learners might encounter during learning or using their L2.

They were asked to rate how anxious/concerned they would be in each situation on a 6-point scale from “not anxious/concerned at all” to “very anxious/concerned” (i.e., “How anxious/concerned would you be in this situation?”). The eight scenarios covered the aspects of writing, reading, speaking, and listening comprehension.
The reliability of the questionnaire assessed using Cronbach Alpha equaled 0.79 showing good internal consistency. In this research, we used the translated versions (see Appendixes A, B, and C) of the questionnaires to avoid any misunderstandings by learners. Besides, the questionnaires were piloted with 20 students in order to estimate their reliability indices.

2.4. Data analysis procedure
This research utilized a Pearson product-moment correlational analysis to analyze the quantitative data. The analysis was applied to examine if there were any significant relationships between learners’ mindsets (Entity and Incremental) with goal orientation (Performance-approach goal, Performance-avoidance goal, and Learning goal) and responses to failure (Mastery, Helplessness, and Anxious responses).

3. Results

3.1. The relationship between Iranian EFL learners’ mindset with goal orientation
To examine the relationship between language mindsets (Entity and Incremental) with goal orientations (Learning goal, Performance-approach, and Performance-avoidance), the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was performed. The pertaining results are shown in Table 1.

As illustrated in Table 1, the average score on each of the five subscales including “Mindsets,” “Mastery goal orientation,” “Performance-approach goal orientation,” and “Performance-avoidance goal orientation” were calculated. The findings revealed a direct and positive significant correlation of .33 between the “Entity” mindset and “Goal orientation”, which is considered to be moderate according to Cohen’s (1998) conventions.

As shown in Table 1, the significance levels of the fixed mindset and subcategories of goal orientation (Performance goal orientation, Performance-avoidance goal orientation, and Learning goal orientation) are 0.017, 0.012, and 0.052, respectively. The findings portray a moderate correlation of 0.288 and 0.304 between the “Performance goal orientation” and “Performance-avoidance goal orientation”. Moreover, the findings demonstrate no correlation between the “Entity” mindset and “Learning goal orientation,” which portray that the variables are independent.

| Table 1. Correlations between Mindsets and Goal Orientations |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Mindset | Performance approach goal | Performance avoidance goal | Learning goal orientation |
| Pearson Correlation | N | Sig. (2-tailed) | N | Sig. (2-tailed) | N | Sig. (2-tailed) | N |
| Entity | .34k7 | .328 | .262 | .263 |
| N | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| Incremental | .335 | .288 | .304 | .237 |
| N | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| Performance-approach goal | .004 | .006 | .011 | .031 |
| N | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| Performance-avoidance goal | .005 | .017 | .012 | .052 |
| N | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| Learning goal orientation | .010 | .007 | .130 | .038 |
| N | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
Furthermore, the results revealed a moderate correlation of .0310 between the “Incremental” mindset and “Goal orientation.” As it is addressed in Table 1, the significance levels of the “Incremental” mindset and subcategories of goal orientation (Performance goal orientation, Performance-avoidance goal orientation, and Learning goal orientation) are 0.007, 0.130, 0.038, respectively. The findings illustrate a moderate correlation of 0.322 between growth mindset “Performance-goal orientation” and a weak correlation of 0.252 between growth mindset and “Learning goal orientation.” However, there is independence between the “Incremental” mindset and “Performance-avoidance goal orientation.” and the findings show there is no association between them.

3.2. The relationship between Iranian EFL learners’ mindset with responses to failure

To specify the relationship between language mindsets (Entity and Incremental) with responses to failure (Helpless responses, Mastery responses, and Anxious responses), the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was run (Table 2).

As demonstrated in Table 2, the significance level between “Mindset” and “Responses to failure” is 0.000, which portrays a direct correlation between them. In the same vein, the significance levels of mindset and responses to failure (Mastery responses, Helpless responses, and Anxious responses) turned out to be 0.010, 0.020, and 0.000, respectively which revealed the direct correlation between “Mindset,” and “Responses to failure” (Mastery responses, Helpless responses, and Anxious responses).

However, there is a moderate correlation of .439 between a fixed mindset and helpless responses and a weak correlation of .27 between mindset and anxious responses. On the other hand, there is independence between the fixed mindset and mastery responses to failure.

In addition, the statistical information revealed there is independence between the “Entity” mindset and “Mastery responses to failure.” Similarly, the results showed there is a strong correlation of 0.503 between the “Incremental” mindset and “Responses to failure.” Hence, the significance levels of the “Incremental” mindset and “Responses to failure” (Mastery responses, Helpless responses, and Anxious responses) are 0.012, 0.005, and 0.000, respectively and there is a moderate correlation of 0.302,0.338 and 0.490 between them.

In the context of the relationship between “Mindset” with “Responses to failure,” the findings of the study portrayed that learners are motivated to “not fail the class.” Such learners may be entirely passive in their behavior in order to avoid appearing incompetent to themselves or others.

### Table 2. Correlations between Mindset and Responses to Failure

| Mindset       | Responses to failure | Helpless responses | Mastery responses | Anxious responses |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
|               | Pearson Correlation  | .438               | .311             | .281             | .499             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)| .000                 | .010               | .020             | .000             |
| N             | 68                   | 68                 | 68               | 68               |
| Entity        | Pearson Correlation  | .311               | .276             | .183             | .439             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)| .010                 | .023               | .135             | .000             |
| N             | 68                   | 68                 | 68               | 68               |
| Incremental   | Pearson Correlation  | .503               | .302             | .338             | .490             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)| .000                 | .012               | .005             | .000             |
| N             | 68                   | 68                 | 68               | 68               |
4. Discussion
This study specified how fixed and growth mindsets relate to different kinds of behavioral and affective responses in situations that involve challenge, threat, or failure.

The results of the first research question revealed that there was no correlation between a fixed mindset and learning goal orientation. However, there was a positive marginal trend toward significance between a growth mindset and learning goal. The most significant correlation between the three subcategories was observed between mindset and performance-approach. The trend regarding a growth mindset and performance-avoidance was not in the expected direction. In other words, there was no relationship between a growth mindset and a performance-avoidance goal orientation. However, there was a correlation between a fixed mindset and a performance-avoidance goal orientation.

The results of our study agree with those of Lou (2014) who stated that mindsets can influence different kinds of responses in the language learning context. Also, the results are in accord with Mercer and Ryan (2010) who highlighted the importance of the interaction between language mindsets and the role of different goal orientations as mediators, for understanding how language mindsets influence students’ responses in challenging situations.

Along the same lines, Burnette et al. (2013) obtained similar results and found that learners who primed with a growth mindset were more likely to set learning goals and to be more optimistic about the effects of effort than learners primed with a fixed mindset. This finding supports the SOMA model claiming that mindsets directly impact learning goals (Burnette et al., 2013).

Similar results were observed in studies conducted by Horwitz (1999), Mercer and Ryan (2010) who maintained that growth mindset learners had greater intention to continue L2 study and mastery responses through the mediation of learning goals. A relatively more fixed-oriented mindset learner interacted with performance-approach goals, and in turn, had more helpless and anxious responses to failure.

Concerning research question two, the results are in line with the hypothesis regarding the correlation between growth mindset and responses to failure, besides, there is a positive correlation between the fixed mindset and helpless responses and anxious responses. However, the trend is in the opposite route between the fixed mindset and mastery responses to failure; these variables are independent.

The results of our study accord with Spray et al. (2006) who held that the correlation between mindsets and responses to failure was mediated by learning goals and that learners with learning goals reacted more optimistically when faced with failure situations and were more likely to continue learning the target language. These results are in harmony with Bonney, Cortina, Smith-Darden, and Fiori’s (2008) study in which language learners who endorsed learning goals were more motivated to employ more positive learning strategies and that they used the target language more actively (e.g., initiating conversation using the target language), all of which were related with language success.

Consistent with the socio-cognitive model of mindset theories by C. S. Dweck and Leggert (2000), the results indicated that learners primed with a fixed mindset were likely to set goals of gaining positive judgments (performance-approach goals). One justification for this finding might be that less talented people who think their talent is unchangeable would set performance-avoidance goals because it is useless to exert effort to achieve an unattainable objective (King & McInerney, 2014).

Concerning the direct link between priming mindsets to performance goals and responses to hypothetical failure situations, our finding largely runs counter to Burnette et al. (2013) study in
which mindsets directly influenced people's performance goals and responses in situations with an immediate threat, such as when participants failed a task or received negative feedback. Therefore, one justification for our findings in this regard might be that the participants responded to a hypothetical rather than actual challenging situations.

5. Conclusion and implications
The present study examined the relationships between mindset (growth and fixed) and goal orientations (Performance-approach goal, Performance-avoidance goal, and Learning goal). It also investigated the relationships between mindset (growth and fixed) and responses to failure (mastery, helpless, and anxious responses).

This study extended C. Dweck and Sorich (1999) model to the language learning context by examining how learners' language learning mindsets affect their goals setting and responses in challenging situations.

Language learners' mindset beliefs in accomplishing language tasks are fundamental building blocks of academic and personal success. The findings of the present study indicate that holding a growth mindset predisposes language learners to display more positive emotions and mastery reactions in response to personal and hypothetical failure situations while learning and/or using foreign or second languages.

This study carries clear implications for language teachers and educational psychologists. It provides insights into how mindset theories are perceived by language learners. Informed of language learners' perceptions of goal orientations, mindsets, and failure situations, language teachers can better assist them to resolve their language learning problems. In view of the results of this study, teacher trainers might raise language teachers' knowledge as to how to enhance the growth mindset culture among learners. The findings might contribute to language teachers to make their learners self-motivated, self-regulated, and independent. On this point, language teachers should promote learners' growth mindset beliefs by providing challenging situations and tasks. In this regard, language teachers are suggested not to merely center on good grades but to set learning goals aligned with mastery and performance goals.

The results might also conduce to syllabus designers and material developers to incorporate salient themes integral to goal orientations, mindsets, and failure situations into instructional materials and resources.

Another important implication is that the enhancement and development of the growth mindset are liable to lead to a reduction in learners' failure rate. Therefore, there is a need to consider language learners' mindset as a crucial factor in dealing with EFL learners' failure rate. The findings of this study might aid teachers to draw more on enhancing EFL learners' growth mindset. Thus, English language teachers are expected to take into account the vitality of attending to learners' language mindset more accurately than before. Likewise, language teachers need to capitalize on growth mindsets and learning goals in the course of instruction to assist learners to reduce the gap between their ideal and actual capability by making more effort in learning a language and by viewing their failures as positive experiences.

There are some limitations in this present study that should be acknowledged. Firstly, the sample size of 68 language learners is small. Secondly, the language learners' perceptions concerning goal orientations, mindsets, and failure situations were explored through three self-report instruments that might not completely reflect language learners' perceptions. Future research might consider a larger student sample size using a qualitative account through semi-structured interviews to shed more light on language learners' perceptions of the variables in question.
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Appendix A
The implicit theory of language intelligence scale

The implicit theory of language intelligence scale

Instructions: Below are a number of statements about language intelligence, language and intelligence is the capacity to use spoken and written language, your native language, and perhaps other languages, to express what's on your mind and to understand other people. People with high language intelligence display a facility with words and languages. They are typically good at reading, writing, telling stories.

Please rate how much you personally agree or disagree with these statements. There is no right or wrong answer. .

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |

Beliefs bout general language intelligence (GLB):

1. You have a certain amount of language intelligence, and you can't really do much to change it.
2. Your language intelligence is something about you that you can't change very much.
3. To be honest, you can't really change your language intelligence.
   *4. No matter who you are, you can significantly change your language intelligence level
   *5. You can always substantially change your language intelligence.
   *6. No matter how much language intelligence you have, you can always change it quite a bit.

Beliefs bout second language learning (L2B):

1. To a large extent, a person's biological factors (e.g., brain structures) determine his or her abilities to learn new languages.
2. It is difficult to change how good you are at foreign languages.
3. Many people can never do well in a foreign language even if they try hard because they lack natural language intelligence.
   *4. You can always change how your foreign language ability.
   *5. In learning a foreign language, if you work hard at it, you will always get better.

Spray, C. M., John Wang, C. K., Biddle, S. J. H., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Warburton, V. E. (2006). An experimental test of self-theories of ability in youth sport. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 7(3), 255–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2005.05.001
Stipek, D., & Grolinski, J. H. (1996). Children’s beliefs about intelligence and school performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 88(3), 397–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.88.3.397
Urdan, T., & Giancarlo, C. (2001). Differences between students in the consequences of goals and goal structures: The role of culture and family obligation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
6. How good you are at using a foreign language will always improve if you really work at it.

Beliefs about age sensitivity and language learning (ASB):

(1) How well a person speaks a foreign language depends on how early in life he/she learned it.

(2) People can't really learn a new language well after they reach adulthood.

(3) Even if you try, the skill level you achieve in a foreign language will advance very little if you learn it when you are an adult.

*4. Everyone could do well in a foreign language if they try hard, whether they are young or old.

*5. How well a person learns a foreign language does not depend on age; anyone who works hard can be a fluent speaker in that language

*6. Regardless of the age at which they start, people can learn another language well.

Note: * These items are incremental theories.
نظریه‌های دیگر مورد هوش عمومی زبان

۱. شما میزان مشخصی هوش زبانی دارید و در واقع کار زبانی برای تغییر ان نمی‌توانید انجام دهید. ۲. هوش زبانی چیزی در مورد شماست که چنین نمی‌توانید ان را تغییر دهید. ۳. اگر بخواهید صادق باشید نمی‌توانید هوش زبان خود را تغییر دهید. ۴. مهم نیست شما چه کسی هستید، شما می‌توانید به طور قابل توجهی دسته هوش زبان خود را تغییر دهید. ۵. شما می‌توانید به طور قابل ملاحظه‌ای هوش زبان خود را تغییر دهید. ۶. مهم نیست که چقدر هوش زبانی دارید، شما همیشه می‌توانید آن را انتخاب ای تغییر دهید.

بازه‌ها در مورد یادگیری زبان

۱. یادگیری زبان زبان‌های جدید مشخص می‌کند.
۲. تغییر دادن اینکه چقدر در یادگیری زبان‌های خارجی خوبی هستید شروع است.
۳. اگر یادگیری زبان یادگیری بزرگ‌تر باشد، دقت یادگیری بزرگ‌تر خواهد شد.
۴. شما همیشه می‌توانید یادگیری زبان خارجی خود را تغییر دهید.
۵. در یادگیری یک زبان خارجی، در صورت تلاش کردن همیشه بهتر خواهد بود.
۶. اگر واقعاً تلاش کنید مهارت شما در استفاده از زبان خارجی بهبود خواهد یافت.

چگونگی‌ها در مورد حساسیت و یادگیری زبان

۱. چگونگی‌ها در مورد حساسیت کردن زبان خارجی یک فرد بستگی به این دارد که چقدر زود شروع به یادگیری کرده است.
۲. محدود واقعاً نمی‌توانند به خوبی یک زبان یاد خواهند را پس از رسیدن به زبان‌گشایی یاد بگیرند.
۳. اگر یادگیری کنید، سطح مهارت شما در یک زبان خارجی پیشرفته‌تر کمی خواهد داشت اگر در بزرگ‌ترین ان را فرا بگیرید.
۴. هر کس خواهید یاد یافت در مورد عمک倒是 خوبی در زبان خارجی تلاش اگر جستجو کند.
۵. مهارت فرد در یادگیری زبان خارجی به سن بستگی ندارد بلکه با میزان تمرین زیاد می‌تواند.
۶. خوبی بستگی کند.

بدون در نظر گرفتن سن افراد می‌توانند به خوبی زبان دیگری را یاد بگیرند.
Appendix B
Goal orientations

Adapted from Elliot & M. Church (1997)

Performance-approach goal

1. It is important to me to do better than the other students in my [L2] class.
2. My goal in this [L2] class is to get a better grade than most of the students.
3. I am striving to demonstrate my ability relative to others in this [L2] class.
4. I am motivated by the thought of outperforming my peers in this [L2] class.
5. It is important to me to do well compared to others in this [L2] class.
6. I want to do well in this [L2] class to show my ability to my family, friends, advisors, or others.

Performance-avoidance goal

1. I often think to myself, “What if I do badly in this [L2] class?”
2. I worry about the possibility of getting a bad grade in this [L2] class.
3. My fear of performing poorly in this [L2] class is often what motivates me.
4. I just want to avoid doing poorly in this [L2].
5. I’m afraid that if I ask my TA or instructor a “dumb question, they might not think I’m very smart.
6. My goal for this [L2] class is to avoid performing poorly.”

Learning goal

1. I want to learn as much as possible from this [L2] class.
2. It is important for me to understand the content of this [L2] course as thoroughly as possible.
3. I hope to have gained a broader and deeper knowledge of [L2] when I am done with this [L2] class.
4. I desire to completely master the material presented in this [L2] class.
5. In a [L2] class like this, I prefer course material that arouses my curiosity, even if it is difficult to learn.
6. In a [L2] class like this, I prefer course material that really challenges me so I can learn new things.

Notes: [L2] will be replaced by the name of the language class that participants are taking
The Translated Version of the Goal-Oriented Scale

اهداف روزمره عملکردنی

1. برای من اهمیت بسیاری دارد که بپنجم ارزیابی دانش آموزان این کلاس زبان انگلیسی عمل کنم.
2. اگر به ترتیب در کلاس زبان انگلیسی این است که نمره ی بیشتری از بسیاری از دانش آموزان یکی نگریم.
3. من در تلاش بیان ایجاد توانایی های خود نسبت به دیگران در کلاس زبان انگلیسی هستم.
4. فکر داشتن عملکرد بیشتر نسبت به چاره همسان در کلاس زبان به من انگیزه میدهد.
5. برای من مهم است که در مقایسه با دیگران در کلاس زبان انگلیسی عملکردهای بیشتری داشته باشم.
6. من خواهش عملکردهایی در کلاس زبان انگلیسی داشته باشم توانایی خود را بیان کنم

اهداف اجتماع عملکردنی

هدف عملکردهای اجتماعی

1. من اغلب با خودم فکر می کنم چه اتفاقی می افتد اگر عملکردها بیشتر بود کلاس داشته باشم.
2. من در مورد امکان گرفتن نمره بیشتر در کلاس زبان انگلیسی نگران هستم.
3. اغلب ترس من از عملکرد ضعیف در کلاس زبان انگلیسی به من انگیزه می دهد.
4. فقط من خواهش از عملکرد ضعیف در کلاس زبان نگرانی کنم.

5. من می ترسم که اگر سوال اتاقشان ایز مریب خود بررسی ممکن است فکر کرده که خیلی

باوکه نیستم

6. هدف من در کلاس زبان این است که از عملکرد ضعیف اتاقشان کنم.

اهداف یادگیری

1. من می خواهم تا آنجا که ممکن است از این کلاس یاد بگیرم.
2. برای من درک مطالب درسی زبان انگلیسی به طور کامل اهمیت دارد.
3. امیدوارم داشته گسترش تر و عمق تر از زبان انگلیسی را در پایان این کلاس به دست اورم.
4. من از این نمایش ارائه تر مطالب درسی تا کلاس تسلط بیشتر کنم.
5. در کلاس این امیدوارم تا این ترجمه متالاب درسی باعث ارائه پرگیخته شدن امکانات من

شود.

6. در کلاس زبان این امیدوارم تا دهم مطالب درسی را به چالش مانعی یک کاندیدات ارائه دهم

مطالب جدید یاد بگیرم.
Appendix C
Responses in failure situation scale (mastery, helpless, and anxious responses)

Situation 1. Imagine that you are in a room with several [L2] speakers. You just heard a joke from one of them and everyone in the room is laughing but you totally didn’t understand the joke.

| What is the likelihood that you will just leave the room or just ignore their speaking? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| What is the likelihood that you will keep listening to their talk and try to understand their talking? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**Instruction:** Following I provide several scenarios that may happen to you. Imagine what you will react when you are in such situations. There is no right or wrong answer to the following questions.

Situation 2. Imagine that you are in a [L2] classroom with native L2 teachers. You just hear an important announcement, but you are not very clear what the teacher said.

| What is the likelihood that you will ignore the announcement? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| What is the likelihood that you will raise your hand and ask the teacher for clarification? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
Situation 3. Imagine that you are at a fast food restaurant in the country where the [L2] is spoken and you are placing the order with the cashiers who cannot understand English, so you order in [L2], but the cashiers there does not understand your order.

| What is the likelihood that you will change to another restaurant where you could use English? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| What is the likelihood that you will keep trying to use the [L2] order your food in a different way? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Situation 4. Imagine that you are in a [L2] Club. The organizer asks students to form several groups for discussion. But you are left out probably because your [L2] is not as good as the others.

| What is the likelihood that you won't take part in the club again? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| What is the likelihood that you will keep going to the club and try to try to learn from the others? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
Situation 5. Imagine that you are in a [L2] class one day. The professor asks a particular question. A few students, including yourself, raise their hands to answer the question. Assume that the professor didn’t choose you because he/she thinks your [L2] is not good enough to express your ideas.

| What is the likelihood that you won't raise your hand again? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1                   | 2            | 3           | 4           | 5           | 6           |

| What is the likelihood that you will get prepare and meet with the professor? | very unlikely | very likely |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1                                                                       | 2            | 3           | 4           | 5           | 6           |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1                                                         | 2                | 3            | 4           | 5           | 6           |

Situation 6. Imagine that you are going out and a few foreigners from the country where your [L2] is spoken ask for help because they lost their way to their hotel. You use [L2] to point them the way but all of them get confused because they didn’t understand your [L2].

| What is the likelihood that you won't help [L2] foreigners speaking again? | very unlikely | very likely |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1                                                                         | 2            | 3           | 4           | 5           | 6           |

| What is the likelihood that you would better prepare yourself to help the [L2] speaking foreigners in the future? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1                                                                                                           | 2            | 3           | 4           | 5           | 6           |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1                                                         | 2                | 3            | 4           | 5           | 6           |
### Situation 7.
Imagine that the L2 class that you are in is having a large group discussion. The professor invites the native speakers to the class and you have to discuss with them. They obviously don’t understand you while you are expressing your opinion because you cannot speak it fluently.

| What is the likelihood that you will ignore the discussion and do your own task? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| What is the likelihood that you will keep expressing your opinion? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

### Situation 8.
Imagine that the L2 class that you are in is having a voluntary activity that students exchange their writing and provide comments. The first time, you received a comment from your classmate which has one sentence, “your writing is hard to understand.”

| What is the likelihood that you won’t take part in this voluntarily exchange writing activity again? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| What is the likelihood that you will seek outside help/practice before the next class? | very unlikely | very likely |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| How anxious/concerned would you be under this situation? | very unconcerned | Very anxious |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
The Persian version of Responses in failure situation scale

صفحه 20

1. چگونه احتمال دارد که پیش از بروز فاصله، نیازی به طراحی و اجرای اصلاحات توانایی در نظر گرفته شود؟

2. چگونه احتمال دارد که محیطی باشد که نیازی به اصلاحات و مشورت کنید؟

3. چگونه احتمال دارد که این شرایط عمومی و نگران شوید؟

4. چگونه احتمال دارد که در کلاس زبان هستید که در فست فود کشویی که در ان زبان دوم صحبت می‌شود عمومی و نگران شوید؟

5. چگونه احتمال دارد که در کلاس زبان هستید که در ان زبان دوم صحبت می‌شود عمومی و نگران شوید؟

6. چگونه احتمال دارد که در کلاس زبان هستید که در ان زبان دوم صحبت می‌شود عمومی و نگران شوید؟
موقف 5
تصمیر کنید که در کلاس زبان هستید. استاد یک سوال خاصی می‌پرسد تبدیلی از دانشجویان از جمله شما دست خود را بلند می‌کند تا به سوال جواب دهد. فرض کنید که استاد شما را انتخاب نمی‌کند، به دلیل اینکه فکر می‌کنید که انگلیسی شما به

1. چقدر احتمال دارد که دوباره دست خود را بلند نکنید؟
2. چقدر احتمال دارد که خود را اما دنیا کنید تا با استاد ملاقات کنید؟
3. چقدر احتمال دارد که تحت این شرایط عصبی و نگران شوید؟

موقف 6
تصمیر کنید که به روزنامه‌ای و تعدادی خارجی از کشوری انگلیسی زبان در خواست کمک می‌کنند به خاطر اینکه راه خود را به هنگام کرده اند. شما از زبان انگلیسی خود استفاده می‌کنید تا آن‌ها را به راهنمایی‌های خود ارائه دهید. یکی از هم‌خوانی‌های

1. چقدر احتمال دارد که دیگر به خارجی‌ها کمک نکنید؟
2. چقدر احتمال دارد که خود را به هنگام کرده اند به خارجی‌ها کمک کنید؟

موقف 7
دعوت می‌دری کلاس زبان که در این هستید در جریان است. استاد از انگلیسی زبانان یکگانی بیانگر گزارش تصویری کنید که یک تا به کلاس بیانی و مشارکت به بحث کردن با این هستی‌های شما به وضوح مرتبط تأثیر دارد در هنگامی که نظر خود را

1. احتمال دارد که بحث را نمایده باشیم و یکی از این‌ها انجام دهید؟
2. چقدر احتمال دارد که به این نظر خود ادامه دهید؟
3. چقدر احتمال دارد که تحت این شرایط عصبی و نگران شوید؟

موقف 8
تصمیر کنید کلاس زبان که در این هستید فعالیت داوطلبانه ای دارد که دانش اموزان نشسته‌های خود را با پک‌های عوض

1. می‌کنید و نظر دهید. برای اوایل بار نظر را از یکی از همکلاس‌ها دریافت می‌کنید که یک جمله مربوط در

2. چقدر احتمال دارد که دوباره در فعالیت عوض کردن نشسته‌ها شرکت کنید؟
3. چقدر احتمال دارد که به دنبال کمک با تمرين قبل از کلاس بودن باشید؟

3. چقدر احتمال دارد که تحت این شرایط عصبی و نگران شوید؟
