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Abstract:
This research aimed at identifying the self-efficacy and its role to build the architectural character of a sample of students from the Department of Architecture Engineering in Al-Mustansiriya University and its impact on academic engagement to achieve achievement and enhance results, as the belief of the students of the Department of Architecture with their self-efficacy and their effective ability to possess the skills that qualify them to integrate academically according to features related to In the behavioral, cognitive and emotional aspect, their empowerment and empowerment in managing their learning process qualifies them for engagement and active participation in the architecture community. Practical results indicated a positive relationship between students' effectiveness and their sense of responsibility towards their studies and academic achievement through the process of academic engagement.
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1. Introduction:
Architectural education is an area that is concerned with improving students' abilities and skills and can be seen as a form of practical training within an institutional environment specifically organized for teaching and learning, with its own practice methods and assessment of skill and competence. As building the architectural character and the sense of being is manifested in adopting and gaining the knowledge, skills and capabilities required for professional practice as well as building a real meaningful experience through re-evaluation of expectations, goals and a sense of self towards the cultural pluralistic of the field of architecture, as the intertwined and dynamic relationship between the academic side of the engineering schools Architecture and profession are evident in all aspects of education. It plays a central role in supporting the profession, and changing the lives of its students through mutual investment in building and shaping its future and supporting architects to providing the appropriate environment for their engagement in architectural education and enhance academic performance and reaching the stage of professional career in real life. The research seeks to clarify the main research concepts represented by self-efficacy. In addition, academic engagement according to its characteristics of behavioral, cognitive, emotional and empowerment, and their role in building the architectural character as motivators.

The research problem was determined by: What is the relationship between self-efficacy and academic engagement and their role in building the architectural character

2. Self-Efficacy
The concept of self-efficacy is one of the most important concepts of modern psychology, and it is one of the concepts that have become common in psychological writings, and its importance is due to the vital role that it plays in pushing, guiding and sustaining behavior. It affects his decisions and behaviors in various fields (Yusuf 2016, p. 25)
Self-efficacy is associated with student engagement and learning. Self-efficacy can lead to more inclusion, and then, to more learning and higher results. The more the student becomes more engaged, the more he learns and the greater his level of achievement and achievement. Most theories of motivation and human behavior include self-beliefs as a key component. Their self-evaluation and therefore individuals become either successful if they have a high-efficacy activity or are depressed if they have a low-efficacy activity (Bandura, 1982, p122).

According to social cognitive theory, people are more likely to perform tasks that they think they are able to accomplish and are less likely to be integrated into tasks that they feel are less efficient, and self-efficacy is the central structure of this theory, which Bandura defines as the judgments of an individual over their ability to produce specific levels of performance. (Lindsey2017, p30).

People form their beliefs about self-efficacy by interpreting information from four sources:

1. Experiences of mastery.
2. Verbal persuasion.
3. Emotional and physical states (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997).
4. Alternative experiences

The most important sources of information can be identified for self-efficacy:

1. The most important source of information comes from the results explained by past performance and experience of mastery. When one masters a task or skill, this creates a strong sense of efficacy to accomplish similar tasks in the future. Instead, repeated failures can reduce feelings of effectiveness toward a task or skill, especially if these failures occur early in the learning process and these failures cannot be attributed to a lack of effort or external circumstances. On the other hand, continued success supports the feeling Self-efficacy which failures cannot weaken.

2. The second source of self-efficacy information, alternative experiences, occurs when other individuals are noticed performing tasks. When it is observed that others who are considered to be similar in ability succeed or fail in a task, this information contributes to an individual's belief in his own capabilities. In cases where individuals have little experience in judging their competence, monitoring of others proves particularly useful information in terms of self-efficacy. (Lindsey2017, p31)

3. Beliefs in personal agency are also influenced by verbal persuasion that one receives from others. These take the form of verbal messages and social encouragement for a task and can encourage individuals to make an extra effort to maintain the consistency required for success, which leads to the continuous development of skills and personal effectiveness. These verbal and social messages can also undermine effectiveness beliefs when used to persuade people who lack the ability to succeed.

4. Individuals also receive information about their effectiveness from their physical and emotional states. Tension is often interpreted as an indication of a tendency to fail, and a person's mood can have a noticeable effect on self-efficacy beliefs.

Positive optimism and a positive mood usually reinforce the beliefs of self-efficacy, while depression or hopelessness undermines it (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000).

Studies show that the information obtained from these four sources does not directly affect subjective efficacy; rather, the effect of this information on subjective efficacy depends on how the information is perceived appropriately (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy beliefs that people have influence the choices they make, the amount of effort they make, the flexibility to face adversity, their persistence in facing the difficulties, the anxiety they face, and the level of success they ultimately achieve (Bandura 1986, p8).

It appears from the above that self-efficacy focuses on character traits, abilities and skills that foster academic engagement and enhance results towards building character and its ability to face real life.

3. The Architectural Character:

Character is an important determinant of human behavior, and it is a factor that affects a person's entire life through personal relationships and work preferences. Therefore, the focus on character is important to get to know a person or people's attitudes. Discussions about character revert back to the time of Aristotle who tried to classify the characteristics of individuals into broad categories, but specialized studies have already begun to produce results in the twentieth century (M. Özdemir, N. Özdemir, S Gören et al. 2019, p2).

The architectural character includes what is related to the side of the self in the architecture represented by the character of the existing one, i.e. the architectural character, so the traits of the architectural character are reflected in his architectural treatment style and each architect has his distinctive character and it is not
enough to follow a style, model or style appropriate only for him, but all of this must stem from Himself and his knowledge of the environment and the needs and potential of society (Al-Harith 2007, p. 326)

The architectural character is highly sensitive and sufficiently aware of the environmental problems, needs, and potentials of society as it departs from imitation, simulates the actions of others and repeats them, and avoids memorizing the various rules and theories of architecture in an automatic and mechanical way (Afifi 2012, p. 35)

### 4. Self-efficacy and building the architectural character:

(Al-Harith) study indicated the importance of psychological capabilities in architectural education and emphasizing the capabilities that can be taught, as the most important data that the educational system shares with the student in building it according to the goals of the institution and the intended results of the educational process represented by practical lessons is a lesson of architectural design and its engagement with theoretical courses that differ in Teaching methods and the extent of their assimilation by students to determine the graduate's skills and abilities that qualify them for engagement at the professional level (Al-Harith 2007, p. 327)

The building of the creative architectural character depends on the design capabilities, which depend mainly on the psychological capabilities that the architecture carries.

(Lawson) indicates the importance of creativity derived from the spirit of the architect and subject to his personal organization, as it leads to the uniqueness of the work through the possibility of the self and its ability to define, address and adapt to the design requirements that contribute to the renewal and creativity of the architectural work and support the desire to make influential decisions creatively (Lawson 1999, p133)

It included a longitudinal study of the intellectual and personal features of architects through tests, self-assessments, and observations. MacKinnon found that creativity and intelligence depended on one another and were set as a threshold and result of intelligence, as the architects involved in the McKinnon study demonstrated a willingness to try and take risks and know what might work, MacKinnon 1965 emphasized the features of creative architecture by having a range of capabilities and features including:

1. Talent with a high level of energy.
2. with a kind of cognitive flexibility that enables them to continue.
3. Trust is the ultimate success. These people persevere until they reach creativity.
4. Originality and independence, intuition, curiosity, acceptance, willingness to learn, and courage.
5. Intuition to find deeper meanings and hidden possibilities in situations.
6. It also uses their senses to identify the surrounding evidence.
7. Intuitive visualization. (Meakin2012 .p3)

### 5. Academic Engagement:

Numerous studies have addressed the concept of student assimilation in accordance with a wide range of intellectual trends and at different time stages since the beginning of the last century, up to modern propositions, as the process of student assimilation is a concept that is being actively discussed by academics and decision makers.

The importance of the concept of student engagement in the service of two primary goals of higher education are institutional and individual development. At the institutional level, there are some positive policies and practices related to students. Higher. With appropriate resources allocated to enhance student inclusion, learning productivity can be increased at lower costs that directly increase productivity (Abdullah. M et al 2015, p2).

And the process of academic engagement was defined procedurally (Janabi 2019,) as:

An institutional process that intends to engage and empower students of architecture within the stimulus experience to learn more and address scientific ideas with the aim of participating in the activity within flexible mechanisms capable of changing the functions of time and context to define their architectural identity within the paths of emotional self-engagement and curricula and professors and specialization and colleagues and university systems and regulations The mother (Al-Janabi 2019, p. 65)

### 6. Aspects of engagement

A study (J Reeve 2012) was presented to describe the engagement of students during learning activities as a constructive component that includes behavioral, emotional and cognitive aspects (Aspects). (2012, Fredricks, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004 and 2010, Trowler) have four features which include:
A- Behavioral engagement:

It is a judgment about the extent to which a student is actively involved in learning activities that involve: assessment, focus, interest, and effort (Reeve, J, 2012, p3)

(Fredricks, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004) define behavioral engagement as an interaction based on an individual’s participation in academic, social, and extracurricular processes in an educational institution in the context of multidimensional concepts and is one of the features of engagement, which is used to determine whether student participation fully in all of the academic activities provided by the institution as well as the curriculum. (DeVito, 2016, p17)

As students who engage behaviorally usually conform to the rules and behavioral norms such as attendance and contribution, and thus the absence of subversive or negative behavior, as it refers to students' special behaviors related to learning, such as focus, exerting effort, taking initiative, being continuous in facing failure and following the rules and interaction Positive with teachers and peers among others (Conner, 2011) Research indicates that the behavioral dimension is likely to lead to greater academic achievement (Hattie 2013) as a mediator between contextual factors and desirable learning outcomes, behavioral inclusion can be increased by changing aspects of the learning environment. (Krause, 2005, p12).

It is clear from the above that behavioral inclusion is based on active participation in learning activities that involve: evaluation, focus, interest and effort and taking the initiative.

B- Emotional engagement:

Emotional inclusion was defined by (Fredricks et al. 2004) as focusing on how students interact and interact with the educational institution and includes feelings of belonging or evaluation, or a feeling that it is important to their educational institution, as well as an appreciation of success in study-related outcomes (Christenson et al., 2012). Emotional inclusion also focuses on the extent of positive / negative reactions to faculty, peers, academics, and the institution in general. As it is assumed, positive emotional engagement contributes to students 'ties with educational institutions, i.e. college and university, and affects students' desire to study and integrate into other activities related to the institution. Students who integrate emotionally enjoy emotional reactions such as enjoyment and a sense of belonging. (Trowler 2010, p7)

It is clear from the above that emotional engagement is based on the interaction and interaction of students and includes feelings of belonging or evaluation or feeling. Students who integrate emotionally enjoy emotional reactions such as enjoyment and a sense of belonging.

C- Cognitive engagement

It is a question of student will, that is, how students feel about themselves, their work, their skills, and the strategies they use to perfect their work (Metallidou & Viachou 2007, p3 ,), teachers may be familiar with the student who works always hard but seems unable to learn effectively. As this student is integrated into the behavior, but not merging cognitive. In other words, just because students are working on the task at hand does not mean they are learning. It is important to note that this effort participates in both behavioral and cognitive definitions of inclusion, and in this sense cognitive engagement refers to the quality of student engagement, while absolute effort indicates the amount of their participation in the task (Pintrich 2003, p105).

Knowledge engagement is often concerned with the extent to which students invest in learning and whether they are willing to work additional to obtain better academic results, and this is what he referred to (Connell & Wellbron, 1991, p12). Knowledge engagement is a self-organized method or strategy in the learning in which they use Metacognition Strategies in Planning, Monitoring, and Knowledge Assessment (Connell & Wellbron, 1991, p44).

Connell & Wellbron (1991, Pintrich & De Groot, 1990) agreed that there are three components of self-organized learning in the classroom:

First: a metacognitive strategy for planning, monitoring and modifying learning.
Second: Managing and controlling efforts in learning and academic assignments.
Third: Cognitive strategies that students use in learning, remembering, and in learning tasks (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990, p35)

It is clear from the above that students 'efforts to do the work and effort that focuses on understanding and mastery, the cognitively integrated student is an optimistic, strategic student, and ready to make the necessary effort to understand complex ideas or master difficult skills and focus on the quality of student engagement.

D- Agentic Engagement:

The extent of trying to enrich the learning experience rather than just receiving it negatively as given (Reeve J, 2012, p3) (T. seng, 2001) adds that this kind of engagement in which students deliberately create and personalize what they learn and define conditions Under which learning is taking place, where students demonstrate initiative, ask questions, express what they need, make recommendations regarding learning goals and topics, make teachers know what they want and what they care about, identify learning resources and opportunities, ask for clarifications, and find options (Montenegro, A. 2017, p4.)

The aforementioned features include the idea of inclusion, as it is an effective participation that requires activity and a sense of meaning and feelings, as dividing the concept of student engagement into multiple features enriches the information, because it allows clarifying the term in a more clear and practical way, because it has become easier to measure student engagement or testing it experimentally. Which included an important note, which is students 'focus on the task, investing in effort, and continuing to face difficulties.

7. Self-efficacy and Engagement

(Linnenbrink & Pintrich’s 2003) suggests that all aspects of learning outcomes related to building an architectural character are linked together as increasing self-efficacy can lead to increased assimilation, and therefore the relationships within the self-efficacy and engagement process and learning outcomes continue over time, and the more the assimilation increases Students in education had better performance results, increased their self-efficacy, and their personalities were distinguished according to the outputs of skills and abilities gained as a result of the engagement process (Linnenbrink & Pintrich’s 2003, p122). Figure 1 shows the causal relationship between self-efficacy, academic engagement, and catalysts for building Architectural character.

![Figure (1) shows the causal relationship between self-efficacy, academic integration, and the architectural character building incentives](image)

It has been assumed that the process of student assimilation directly affects character building while the effect of self-efficacy mediates this component through assimilation processes, and research indicates a positive relationship between self-efficacy and students' behavioral assimilation (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003, p. 127).
Students who believe that they are able to complete the task are more cognitive fusion than those who have low self-efficacy beliefs, as high self-efficacy beliefs support students' efforts to understand content, think deeply about it, and increase metacognitive processes. Research indicates a positive relationship between self-efficacy and student use of metacognitive and metacognitive strategies (Linnenbrink & Pinterrich, 2003).

Self-efficacy is associated with emotional engagement, where experiences indicate the effect of emotions on effectiveness and beliefs of effectiveness have an effect on emotions. Students can develop their sense of efficacy in a specific task, which leads to building a positive attitude towards this task. On the other hand, students may first like some tasks or subject area and this interest encourages the student to integrate into the task. As the student continues to fuse the task or subject, feelings of self-efficacy will grow (Lindsey 2017, p33).

Self-efficacy is also associated with engagement with empowerment, as this type of engagement in which students intentionally create and personalize what they are learning and determine the conditions under which learning takes place, and accordingly, it is observed that self-efficacy is associated with engagement with empowerment that arises from empowering students and realizing their role and effectiveness in achieving and achieving specific task. (Al-Janabi 2019, p. 65)

8. Method and procedures
8.1. Curriculum:
The data collected will be analyzed through the questionnaire that adopted the (MSLQ) scale for each of (Pintrich & De Groot 1990) using the descriptive analytical method to verify paragraph discrimination and internal consistency, and to identify indicators of validity and reliability of the tools adopted in statistical application.

8.2. The study population and its sample
The study population is represented by the students of the Department of Architecture Engineering at Mustansiriya University and the choice of the research sample, which was represented by the third stage students of the Engineering Department, where they number (15) students, with a rate of five students to ten students.

8.3. Statistical analysis of the field aspect
8.3.1 Validity and reliability tests of the measuring instrument
The content validity test is used in comparison with the peripheral to show the sincerity of the questionnaire paragraphs in the representation of self-efficacy and academic engagement the best representation, while the stability test through the use of the stability factor (Cronbach's Alpha) confirms the reliability of the data we get from the sample, after applying the steps of the two tests the results were on as follows:

A- Content validity test for independent variable clauses (subjective efficacy)
Table (1) confirmed that the value of T calculated between the mean of the two sections of the total items of self-efficacy was recorded (10.993) which is significant because it is greater than the value of the tabular value of (2.447), especially since the level of significance recorded (0.00), which indicates the passage of all items of self-efficacy to test Honesty is successful.

B- Test the content validity of the dependent variable paragraphs (academic engagement)
Table (1) has specified that the value of T calculated between the average of the two sections of the total academic engagement paragraphs was recorded (7.618) which is significant because it is greater than the tabular value of (2.447), especially since the significance level recorded (0.00), which includes the passage of all paragraphs of academic engagement to test Honesty is successful.

Table (1) also determined that the value of the stability parameter (Cronbach's Alpha) for the total questionnaire paragraphs amounted to (0.819) which is more than (0.700) in order to achieve the passage of the questionnaire passages to test the stability successfully, confirming that there is a high stability in the questionnaire paragraphs, and we infer from table (2) that The value of the stability factor for the items of self-efficacy was (0.801), which indicates the presence of high stability in the paragraphs of the independent variable. As for the items of academic engagement, the stability factor was recorded (0.792). This value indicates the passage of the paragraphs of the dependent variable of academic engagement.
8.3.2 Descriptive analysis of research variables

In the descriptive statistical analysis process, the researcher used the weighted arithmetic media, the standard deviations, and the relative importance of each of the paragraphs of subjectivity and academic engagement. As for the evaluation of the response direction, the researcher relied on the hypothetical medium of (3) that indicates the boundary between agreement and disagreement, and to display a level Respondent response to the questionnaire paragraphs, the researcher used the response strength matrix, which represents an estimated balance according to the quintile Likert scale as shown in Table (2) as follows:

| Table (2) Response Force Matrix on questionnaire paragraphs |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Level of response by the respondent | The strength of response to the paragraphs of the questionnaire | The value of the weighted mean is in the period |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Low                                  | Failure to agree completely                         | From 1 to less than 1.8         |
| Average                              | Lack of agreement                                    | From 1.8 to less than 2.6       |
| high                                 | the agreement                                        | 2.6 to less than 3.4            |
|                                       | Full agreement                                       | From 3.4 to less than 4.2       |
|                                       |                                                      | 4.2 to 5                       |

- **Self - efficacy independent variable**

Table (3) specifies that the value of the weighted mean for self-efficacy was (3.7926) which is greater than the value of the hypothetical mean that represents the boundary between agreement and disagreement of (3), while the value of the weighted mean for this dimension was within the category between (from 3.4) To less than 4.2 in the matrix of the response force of the respondent, to establish that the level of significance
of the responses of the selected sample to subjective efficacy tended towards agreement to indicate that the level of response by the respondent was at a high level, and with a standard deviation recorded (0.899), which shows a marked dispersion in responses. The sample of the study regarding the paragraphs of self-efficacy formed the parent. The relative percentage of self-efficacy (75.85%), which indicates the agreement of most members of the study sample on the importance of the items of self-efficacy.

While Table (3) confirmed that the levels of importance of the items within the subjective activity have been distributed between the highest level of response achieved by the ninth paragraph among all paragraphs of the subjective effectiveness with a weighted arithmetic mean of (4.6000) and a standard deviation (0.507), and relative importance formed (92%) to confirm this. Most members of the study sample agreed on the importance of the ninth paragraph, while Table (3) presented that the seventh paragraph has achieved the lowest response level among all paragraphs of subjectivity, as the value of the weighted average mean for it was (2.8667) and the standard deviation was recorded (1.060), And relative importance formed (57.33%).

- The dependent variable of academic engagement

Table (4) showed that the value of the weighted mean of the academic engagement was recorded (3.7131) which is greater than the value of the hypothetical mean, to show that the answers of the study sample regarding academic engagement went towards agreement, while the value of the weighted mean of academic engagement was within the category between (from 3.4) To less than 4.2) in the matrix of the response force of the respondent, to establish the level of response of the respondent on most items of academic engagement with a high level, and with a standard deviation of (0.959), which indicates a noticeable dispersion in the responses of the study sample regarding the paragraphs of academic engagement, while recording the relative importance of the variable Followers (74.26%) including most of the members of the agreement shows a sample study on the paragraphs of academic engagement.

Academic engagement levels were distributed among the highest response level by the respondent achieved by paragraph (fifteen) among all paragraphs of the dependent variable with a weighted arithmetic mean of (4.6667), with a standard deviation of (0.617), and relative importance that made up (93.33%), while a table indicated (93.33%). 4) To paragraph (nineteen) achieved the lowest level of response among the
paragraphs of academic engagement, as the value of the weighted mean was (1.7333), and the standard deviation for the same paragraph was (0.844), and relative importance was (34.76%).

| Response level | The relative importance | Std. Deviation | Weighted Mean | 
|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| high           | 84                      | 0.775          | 4.2000        |
| high           | 74.67                   | 0.884          | 3.7333        |
| high           | 85.33                   | 0.799          | 4.2667        |
| high           | 69.33                   | 1.85           | 3.4667        |
| Average        | 62.67                   | 1.685          | 3.1333        |
| high           | 93.33                   | 0.617          | 4.6667        |
| high           | 90.67                   | 0.516          | 4.5333        |
| high           | 70.67                   | 1.06           | 3.5333        |
| Low            | 38.67                   | 1.223          | 1.9333        |
| Low            | 34.67                   | 0.884          | 1.7333        |
| Low            | 42.67                   | 1.302          | 2.1333        |
| high           | 88                      | 0.632          | 4.4000        |
| high           | 74.67                   | 0.961          | 3.7333        |
| high           | 78.67                   | 1.0363         | 3.9333        |
| high           | 81.33                   | 1.163          | 4.0667        |
| high           | 84                      | 0.676          | 4.2000        |
| high           | 84                      | 0.862          | 4.2000        |
| high           | 72                      | 1.056          | 3.6000        |
| high           | 80                      | 1.134          | 4.0000        |
| high           | 73.33                   | 0.817          | 3.6667        |
| high           | 89.33                   | 0.640          | 4.4667        |
| high           | 78.67                   | 0.594          | 3.9333        |
| High           | 78.67                   | 0.704          | 3.9333        |
| high           | 78.67                   | 1.223          | 3.9333        |
| 74.26          | 0.959                   | 3.7131         |

- **Statistical tests, the link between self-efficacy and academic engagement**

The researcher used the T TEST to prove acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis that (there is a statistically significant correlation between self-efficacy and academic engagement), as the result of the test will lead to accepting the correlation hypothesis if the calculated T value is greater than its tabular counterparts of (2.16) at a level Significance (0.05) (level of significance indicates the maximum permissible error in research scientifically), thus accepting the hypothesis with 95% confidence, and vice versa. We note from Table (5) acceptance of the first main hypothesis with a confidence rate of 95%, as the calculated value of T reached (2.711) which is significant, because it is greater than the value of the tabular value of (2.16) at
the level of significance (0.05), while the value of The Correlation coefficient Spearman correlation between self-efficacy and academic assimilation (0.601) indicates a strong positive relationship between them.

Table (5) testing the hypothesis of the link between self-efficacy and academic engagement

| Hypothesis | Variables | Correlation coefficient | Spearman | T - Test | Researcher Comment |
|------------|-----------|--------------------------|----------|----------|--------------------|
| First: Self-efficacy Academic merger | 0.601 | 2.71 | 1 | Accept the hypothesis with 95% confidence |

The value of the tabular T at a significant level (0.05) equals (2.16) Second: The effect of the TE (T TEST) test to show acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis (there is a statistically significant effect of self-efficacy in academic engagement), as the result of the test will lead to accepting the hypothesis of influence when the calculated value of F is greater than its counterparts. The spreadsheet of (4.6672) at the level of significance (0.05), i.e. acceptance of the hypothesis at (95%), and vice versa. As for showing the percentage of interpretation of the independent variable, self-efficacy in the function, the researcher used the identification factor of R2%. As we infer from Table (5) the acceptance of the second main hypothesis, especially that the calculated value of F was (12.485) which is significant, because it is greater than the value of the tabular value of (4.6672) at the level of significance (0.05), while the determination factor (49%) was including Indicates the percentage of the effect of self-efficacy on academic engagement.

9. Discuss the results:

Statistical analysis of the questionnaire for research variables, which includes subjective effectiveness and academic engagement, has demonstrated a statistically significant significant correlation between subjective effectiveness and academic engagement with a significant effect between the two variables, and therefore we infer that the effectiveness belief is one of the effective variables and influences the process of academic engagement that contributes to its engagement with its lessons. By motivating the architectural student and enhancing the skills and abilities focused on building the architectural character as a goal and an intended result, the educational institution of architecture represented by the Department of Architecture at Mustansiriya University is working to achieve it. Reaching it according to procedures related to the curriculum, educational environment, interaction factors and socialization that ensure the student gets constructive learning outcomes that qualify him for future professional engagement.
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