Original Article

University of Birjand

Applied Linguistics Inquiry

Fall 2025, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 82-94

Applied Linguistics Inquiry

https://doi.org/10.22077/ali.2025.8994.1105

Motivational Goal Orientations as Determinants of Agentic and Social Engagement of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners

Zahra Nazari[1]
Elahe Sadeghi[2*]
Fatemeh Karimi[3]

[1]Ph.D. Candidate in Applied Linguistics, Department of English, Shahreza.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran
[*2,3]Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 26 February 2025
Revised: 04 June 2025
Accepted: 14 July 2025
Published: 30 September 2025

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

E-mail: e.sadeghi@khuisf.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

Motivational goal orientations play a critical role in shaping learners' engagement in the classroom. This study was to investigate how performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach goals determine agentic and social engagement of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. For this purpose, 200 Iranian intermediate EFL learners of language institutes in Isfahan and Gachsaran, Iran, were selected by convenience sampling. The OQPT was administered to ensure the homogeneity of the participants. The data were collected by Goal Orientation Survey and Student Engagement Questionnaire, which were distributed online and analyzed using standard multiple regression. The findings demonstrated that the mastery approach and performance approach significantly determined agentic engagement, and the performance approach significantly determined social engagement. These findings provide valuable insights into the motivational dynamics within Iranian intermediate EFL classrooms. Educators can enhance student engagement by focusing on fostering mastery and performance goal orientations and creating a supportive learning environment, ultimately improving the language learning outcomes of Iranian intermediate EFL learners.

***KEYWORDS*:** engagement, EFL learners, goal orientation, motivation

1. Introduction

Skinner and Pitzer (2012) delineated the construct of student classroom engagement as the degree to which learners exhibit enthusiastic commitment to and active participation in the educational process. Empirical inquiries within the domain of student engagement elucidate three interrelated strengths. Firstly, engagement serves as a robust predictor of critical academic outcomes, encompassing student learning, achievement, and performance, alongside retention and graduation rates (e.g., Lei et al., 2018; Upadyaya & Salmela-Aro, 2013). Moreover, engagement provides a protective mechanism, shielding students from various conventional adolescent risks, such as delinquency and dropout rates (e.g., Virtanen et al., 2021; Wang & Fredricks, 2014).

Secondly, in contrast to the majority of status indicators related to academic outcomes (such as gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status), engagement has demonstrated its nature as a malleable state susceptible to modification by numerous factors within the purview of educational institutions and parental influence. This characteristic renders it a prime candidate for targeted intervention strategies (Fredricks, 2014; Fredricks, 2019). Thirdly, certain manifestations of engagement are observable within the classroom environment. In reality, its opposite, disengagement or disaffection of students, represents a significant source of stress for educators (e.g., Fredricks, 2014). Consequently, educational practitioners and institutional leaders readily recognize its significance (Finn & Zimmer, 2012).

Furthermore, there exists a widespread agreement concerning the significant influence that motivation exerts on the process of acquiring a non-native language, as well as on its associated outcomes, the learner's emerging second language (L2)

Cite this article: Nazari, Z., Sadeghi, E. & Karimi, F. (2025). Motivational goal orientations as determinants of agentic and social engagement of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *Applied Linguistics Inquiry*, *3*(2), 82-94. https://doi.org/10.22077/ali.2025.8994.1105

competence. As Cohen and Dörnyei (2002) point out, "[m]otivation is often seen as the key learner variable, because without it nothing much happens" (p. 172). Investigating the motivation of learners not only facilitates the identification of the determinants of learners' endeavors to acquire L2 proficiency but also provides significant insights into the manner in which L2 learners interact with their immediate sociocultural context and, by extension, the broader global environment (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Loan, 2023).

Motivation also holds considerable significance in influencing the rate and efficacy of second and foreign language acquisition, specifically within classroom settings (Al Kaboody, 2013; Esra & Sevilen, 2021). Beyond the contributions of cognitive ability and language aptitude in the EFL/ESL domain, motivation emerges as a pivotal determinant of successful language acquisition endeavors. It is conceptualized as goal-directed behavior and characterized as the amalgamation of effort, a desire to attain language learning objectives, and positive attitudes toward the language learning process (Anjomshoa & Sadighi, 2015).

Motivational Goal Orientations, a motivation-related theory also called goal orientation, represent "the purposes that individuals have for engaging in specific behaviors" (Anderman & Wolters, 2006, p. 371). Theoretical frameworks have initially proposed a dichotomy in personal goal orientations, specifically mastery (i.e., an emphasis on comprehension and personal advancement) and performance (i.e., a concentration on surpassing peers) (Ames, 1987).

Regarding motivational goal orientations, both empirical studies have elucidated the link between mastery goal orientation and an array of favorable outcomes. For instance, research indicates that students who endorse mastery goal orientation exhibit a higher likelihood of being significantly engaged in the task at hand (De La Fuente, 2004), employing effective problem-solving tactics (Matos, 2007), and demonstrating self-regulation in their learning processes (Elliot & Dweck, 1988). Furthermore, it has been established that mastery goals are associated with enhanced effort and persistence, bolstered self-efficacy beliefs (Sakiz, 2011), heightened interest and intrinsic motivation (Elliot & Church, 1997), positive emotional states (Roeser, 1996), and a reduction in anxiety levels (Wolters, 1996), all of which contribute to an increased probability of success.

Goal orientations play a pivotal role in students' learning trajectories. Empirical evidence suggests that individuals engaged in learning-oriented curricula tend to achieve higher evaluative metrics, whereas those with a predominant performance goal orientation exhibit lower evaluative metrics (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2003). In a similar vein, Ames and Archer (1988) posited that students who acknowledge the significance of goal orientation within educational settings are more likely to implement effective strategies, favor more challenging tasks, exhibit a more favorable disposition toward the class, and harbor a stronger conviction that success is a product of individual effort.

Nonetheless, the insufficient motivation exhibited by EFL learners constitutes a considerable challenge for language educators within the state-operated educational framework of Iran. It is frequently observed that students participate in EFL classes lacking the requisite enthusiasm necessary to engage meaningfully and achieve success in the inherently demanding endeavor of acquiring a foreign language. In an effort to counteract this deficit in student motivation, some instructors may resort to behavioral techniques acquired through experiential learning, which they believe will enhance student interest in language acquisition, while others may experience frustration in response to their unmotivated students, consequently leading to a decline in the quality of their instructional delivery (Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012). Therefore, the present study aimed to find the way motivational goal orientations of Iranian intermediate EFL learners determine their agentic and social engagement in the classroom.

2. Literature Review

Classroom engagement refers to a student's active involvement in a learning activity in the classroom (Christenson, 2012). As posited by Reeve and Tseng (2011), engagement constitutes a multifaceted construct that comprises four interrelated components: behavior, emotion, cognition, and agency.

Reeve and his associates suggested that agentic engagement constitutes a significant aspect of student engagement, characterizing it as the endeavor of individuals to actively enhance their educational experiences while assuming accountability for those experiences (Reeve, 2012; Reeve & Tseng, 2011). Illustrative activities encompass students articulating their viewpoints in the classroom and informing the instructor when a particular topic captivates their interest. Reeve (2012) advocated for the integration of agentic engagement as a fundamental dimension of student engagement, asserting that engaged students do not merely respond to educational activities but instead adopt a proactive stance towards those activities, thereby exercising agency over their own learning.

Agentic engagement embodies the pre-emptive, mutual, and pedagogically constructive actions that students undertake to stimulate their own learning and personal advancement (Bandura, 2006; Reeve, 2013). It is characterized by the pre-emptive measures the student employs prior to and during the initiation of a learning experience (e.g., proposing an idea, contributing input, articulating a preference) with the expectation that the educational facilitator (the teacher) will modify the instructional approach to better align with the student's interests and objectives. Learners who are actively engaged participate to "make a difference" in the instructional process they encounter, often through making choices (such as choosing a book or a YouTube video) or voicing their preferences.

Agentically engaged learners pursue a dynamic of teacher-student interaction that encompasses mutual connection, implying that the teacher's verbal and non-verbal behaviors during instruction influence the student's responses and actions, and

conversely, the student's contributions during instruction reciprocally shape (e.g., alter, enhance, enrich) the teacher's actions and discourse (Sameroff, 2009). Within the framework of agentic engagement, the student attempts to collaborate with the teacher to cultivate a more motivationally supportive educational milieu and a teacher-student rapport that is more adept at generating rewarding, motivating, and personally meaningful learning experiences for the student. In summary, agentic engagement serves as a learner-initiated avenue to (a) enhance one's learning, development, and performance and (b) make pedagogical activities (and the broader learning environment) more conducive in terms of motivation (Reeve & Shin, 2020).

The concept of social engagement represents an additional dimension of engagement; however, the scholarly investigation of this dimension remains comparatively limited, rendering it less firmly established in relation to the other three engagement dimensions. Finn and Zimmer (2012) were the first scholars to define social engagement as the degree to which students adhere to classroom regulations or the prevailing social norms within the educational environment. Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia (2012) conceptualize social engagement as socio-behavioral engagement. Their characterization of socio-behavioral engagement encompasses the notion that students cultivate top-grade social relationships with their peers, which can yield positive ramifications for students' learning experiences. Such relationships entail students collaborating effectively and providing mutual support.

In their examination of engagement within the language learning environment, which transcends mere interactive tasks, Oga-Baldwin et al. (2021, p. 225) also deliberated the incorporation of social engagement as an additional dimension within the engagement framework, asserting that it represents "a special case of the more basic cognitive, behavioral, and emotional aspects of interaction." Indeed, the social dimension is evident in learners' behaviors (e.g., how students begin and sustain turns during interactions in paired or group settings), affective responses (e.g., the eagerness and enjoyment exhibited by students during collaborative interactions), and cognitive engagement (e.g., the attentiveness of students to the construction and application of either content or language to facilitate effective communication). A pertinent example by Philp and Duchesne (2016) aptly illustrates this assertion. When students actively listen to each other, draw upon one another's knowledge and opinions, and offer constructive feedback, they exemplify social engagement.

The cultivation of social engagement may foster positive connections between agemates and teachers (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012), thereby mitigating the likelihood of social isolation, detachment, and student attrition (Hoi & Hang, 2021). The elements constituting social engagement within the classroom environment include collaboration, attentive listening, punctuality, and the maintenance of equitable relationships with both instructors and peers (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012). In contexts beyond the classroom, social engagement is predicated upon shared values and objectives that facilitate participation in community clubs and student groups (Wentzel, 2012).

2.1. Motivational Orientation

A goal is outlined as "the object or aim of an action, for example, to attain a specific standard of proficiency, usually within a specified time limit" (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 705). Goals delineate the learners' objectives and the underlying motivations for executing educational tasks. Varied categories of goals are linked with distinct cognitive, affective, or behavioral reactions. Furthermore, students' motivational goals and their cognitive performance are highly related (Barker, 2002). Proponents of the cognitive perspective on motivation assert that goals can provide learners with guidance and impetus for the completion of tasks (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Goal orientations pertain to the rationales or intentions that learners possess for engaging in educational tasks, characterized by goal-directed and cognition-based behaviors (Midgley, 2000). This orientation embodies a cohesive framework of beliefs that culminates in "different ways of approaching, engaging in, and responding to achievement situations" (Ames, 1992, p. 261). Behaviors that are goal directed hold significant relevance for language learners, as their mental frameworks will profoundly influence their approach to and engagement in the educational tasks. Distinct goals engender varying patterns of response (Midgley, 2000). Besides, goal orientation "can reflect a type of standard by which individuals will judge their performance or success, which then has consequences for other motivational beliefs such as attributions and affect as well as actual performance and behavior" (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996, p. 234).

The capacity to discern various categories of goal orientations among learners enables stakeholders to comprehend a student's motivational drivers, thereby facilitating their educational success (Harnar, 2021). Furthermore, individuals who align themselves with mastery goals exhibit enhanced perseverance when confronted with challenges, in contrast to those who adopt performance goals, who are prone to evading difficult tasks (Ford, 1998). The distinct categories of achievement goals that a student pursues are correlated with varying patterns of affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses (Elliot & Hulleman, 2017). Scholars of motivational goal theory typically categorize achievement goals based on competence, specifically in terms of either advancing competence through mastery of tasks or exhibiting competence in comparison to peers (Guo, 2022). Moreover, motivational goal orientation is posited to have a significant relationship with students' engagement (Miller, 2021), which subsequently influences a student's readiness and motivation to acquire knowledge. This concept is intrinsically linked to a student's perceived competence and their motivation to engage in behaviors aimed at enhancing competence (Urhahne & Wijnia, 2023).

Goal orientations are categorized into four primary types: mastery, performance, approach, and avoidance, along with four subdivisions— mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach, and performance avoidance. Mastery-approach goals are directed toward achieving the optimal outcome from a given situation, wherein students possess confidence in their capabilities, thus perceiving their errors, mistakes, or failures as fundamental components of their educational journey

(Stoeber, 2008). The mastery approach emphasizes engagement in the learning process and skill development; consequently, students identified with this orientation prioritize their focus on their own abilities and skills. Mastery-avoidance goals represent one of the most common forms of achievement goals, reflecting an individual's aspiration to evade performance that falls short of their personal desires or expectations (Poortvliet, 2015). Individuals oriented toward mastery-avoidance are apprehensive about their potential inability to master a task and may not consistently strive to leverage the situation to its fullest advantage (Stoeber, 2008).

Individuals possessing a performance-approach orientation primarily concern themselves with the impressions they convey; they aspire to demonstrate superior abilities relative to their peers (Stoeber, 2008). Performance-approach goals revolve around the notion of showcasing competence and capabilities. An individual with a performance-approach orientation evaluates their personal values based on their abilities in relation to others and seeks to publicly validate their capabilities, as such validation constitutes their definition of success. Conversely, an individual with a performance-avoidance orientation aims to evade unfavorable impressions, which translates into a desire not to perform inferiorly compared to others (Stoeber, 2008). The underlying premise is that performance-avoidant individuals attempt to prevent or circumvent negative evaluations of their abilities while striving to conceal their failures or perceived incompetence. Such students are motivated to avoid appearing incompetent, lacking in capability, or being less skilled than their classmates (Wolters, 2004). In other words, the emphasis lies in the avoidance of failure and the perception of incompetence in relation to one's peers (Schunk, 2008).

2.2. Motivation Goals and Engagement

To elucidate the manner in which perceived goal structures may either facilitate or obstruct student engagement, we need to acknowledge that motivation and engagement represent closely related meta-constructs characterized by considerable commonality. Eccles and Wang (2012) denoted that definitions of both motivation and engagement that are excessively broad or overly specific can present significant challenges, albeit for distinct reasons. Vague, excessively generalized definitions provide minimal guidance to educators to enhance their student's learning experiences, whereas definitions that are overly precise are of limited utility to both policymakers and theorists.

Student agentic engagement emphasizes the importance of the student as an invaluable agent in the learning environment. The agentically engaged student contributes independent thoughts, asks constructive questions, and expands on discussions between and among classmates and the instructor in a social environment where dialogue encourages further learning through discussion (Reeve, 2013; Reeve & Tseng, 2011).

Agentically engaged students socialize with instructors and peers to provide constructive input that increases personal and peer learning (Reeve, 2013). In addition, Reeve (2013) asserted that an instructor who creates a welcoming and accepting environment promotes socialization and encourages student agentic engagement. Klassen (2013) and Cadime (2016) argued that instructor social engagement with students is an essential element in building a classroom climate conducive to learning; Kelly and Zhang's (2016) research confirmed previous findings that the student-instructor relationship positively correlated to student agentic engagement.

Given that research on agentic engagement is comparatively recent, few empirical studies investigated the link between agentic engagement and goal orientations. Nevertheless, Reeve and Lee (2014) posited that when educators foster a mastery-oriented classroom environment, their students are likely to demonstrate heightened attention and effort, enjoy diligent work, employ more profound cognitive strategies, and perceive peers as valuable sources of knowledge, assistance, and support. In essence, such students focus comprehensively on all facets of engagement (i.e., behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and agentic). The underlying rationale for the emergence of agentic engagement in such educational settings is that students are afforded the opportunity to articulate their opinions or feelings during activities as active participants (Ainley, 1993). Furthermore, agentic engagement necessitates that students possess the capacity to navigate novel and challenging circumstances (Peach & Matthews, 2011), and it is believed that students' mastery goal orientations are instrumental in fulfilling these prerequisites.

Despite the growing body of research on motivational goal orientations in educational settings, there is a notable scarcity of studies specifically examining how these orientations influence both agentic and social engagement among EFL learners, particularly in the Iranian context. While existing literature has explored the impact of motivational goals on various aspects of student behavior and achievement, the interplay between these orientations and distinct types of engagement remains underexplored, especially within the Iranian educational landscape. Furthermore, much of the current research either focuses exclusively on academic outcomes or only on one type of engagement without considering the multifaceted nature of student involvement in the classroom. This study sought to fill this gap by investigating how performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach goals determine agentic and social engagement among intermediate EFL learners in Iran, thereby responding to the following questions contribute to a deeper understanding of the motivational processes that influence language learning and classroom dynamics.

1. Do motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) of Iranian intermediate EFL learners determine their agentic engagement in the classroom?
2. Do motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) of Iranian intermediate EFL learners determine their social engagement in the classroom?

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive correlational design to explore the relationships between motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) and agentic and social engagement of Iranian EFL learners. This design was chosen because it allowed us to identify patterns and associations between these variables as they naturally occurred without manipulating them. Specifically, this approach was suitable as our research aims to investigate if agentic and social engagement were predicted by motivational goal orientations. While this design inherently does not establish causation (Salkind, 2010), its utility in examining how variables are related and providing insights into their co-occurrences is paramount for our objectives. Furthermore, the inclusion of predictive elements enabled us to assess how well the independent variables (motivational goal orientations) could predict the dependent variables (agentic and social engagement) (Field, 2013). This predictive capability is crucial as it offers valuable insights into the dynamics between these variables.

3.2. Participants

The participants in this study were selected from intermediate male and female Iranian EFL learners, whose ages ranged between 18 and 35, studying English at the intermediate level classes of language institutes in Isfahan and Gachsaran, Iran. The learners were initially classified at the intermediate level according to the language school's placement criteria; however, to ensure a more objective assessment of the homogeneity of the learners with respect to their English proficiency levels, an Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT; Allan, 1992) was administered. Based on the band score criteria established by the OQPT, a sample of 200 learners who satisfied the criteria for placement in an intermediate group was identified as the target participants for the study. The demographic information of the participants is presented in table 1.

Table 1.

Demographic Information of Participants

Demographics		Frequency	Percent (%)
Age	18-23	114	57
	24-29	59	29.5
	30-35	27	13.5
Gender	Male	83	41.5
	Female	117	58.5
Proficiency	Intermediate	200	100

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Oxford Quick Placement Test (QQPT; Allan, 1992)

The OQPT serves as an instrument for assessing English language proficiency, comprising 60 multiple-choice items that evaluate vocabulary (30 items) and grammar (30 items), and is aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Learners who achieve scores ranging from 0 to 10 are classified as beginners; those obtaining scores between 11 and 17 are categorized as breakthrough learners; learners scoring between 18 and 29 are identified as elementary; pre-intermediate students score between 30 and 39; intermediate learners attain scores between 40 and 47; advanced students score between 48 and 54; and proficient students achieve scores ranging from 55 to 60. The reliability of the test, estimated by Cronbach's alpha, was .82.

3.3.2. Goal Orientation Survey (Miller, 2019)

It consists of 20 statements that are aligned to specific goal orientations of performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach, each comprising five items. Participants responded to each statement using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). The reliability coefficients of the four sub-scales were above 0.87 (Miller, 2019). The reliability of the survey, estimated by Cronbach's alpha, was .89.

3.3.3. Students' Engagement Questionnaire (Reeve & Tseng, 2011)

This questionnaire includes 27 statements that measure the five engagement components, namely emotional engagement (four items), social engagement (five items), cognitive engagement (eight items), behavioral engagement (five items), and agentic engagement (five items). The responses are rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). It is noteworthy that the social and agentic sub-scales of this questionnaire were used in the present study, which comprised ten items. The reliability coefficients of the social and agentic sub-scales were 0.82 and 0.75, respectively (Reeve & Tseng, 2011). The

reliability coefficients of the social and agentic sub-scales estimated by Cronbach's alpha in the present study were .86 and .84, respectively.

3.4. Procedure

The data collection took four months, and the instruments were distributed online using Google Docs (https://docs.google.com/forms) among 200 intermediate Iranian female and male EFL learners. The first researcher's email was provided so that the participants could contact her if they had any questions regarding the questionnaires. It is noteworthy that all the participants signed the online consent form, and the aims and objectives of the study were briefly explained in the online form of research instruments. Finally, the obtained data were analyzed by standard multiple regression.

4. Results

The First research question of the study sought to uncover whether motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) of Iranian intermediate EFL learners determined their agentic engagement in the classroom. Multiple regression was run to answer this question.

Table 2.

Model Summary of Agentic Engagement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.38	.14	.12	.64

According to the adjusted coefficient of 0.12, it can be stated that the independent variables of the model explained 12% of agentic engagement variances.

Table 3.

ANOVA Test of Multiple Regressions Agentic Engagement

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.79	4	2.44	5.87	.00
	Residual	56.7	136	.41		
	Total	66.5	140			

The model as a whole was statistically significant ($F(4, 136) = 5.87$, $p < .05$) (Table 3). In other words, the motivational goal orientation components (i.e., mastery approach, performance approach, performance avoid, and mastery avoid) could significantly predict agentic engagement. Standardized and unstandardized coefficients of the components of motivational goal orientation are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.

Coefficients of Agentic Engagement

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.44	.48		3	.00
	performance-avoid	.1	.1	.1	1	.31
	performance approach	.16	.07	.21	2.29	.02
	mastery avoid	-.12	.12	-.1	-1.02	.3
	mastery approach	.34	.12	.27	2.71	.00

Based on the above table, the mastery approach and performance approach significantly predicted agentic engagement. In other words, 21% and 27% of the variances in agentic engagement were predicted by mastery and performance approach, respectively.

The second research question of the study sought to uncover whether motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) of Iranian intermediate EFL learners determined their social engagement in the classroom. Multiple regression was run to answer this question.

Table 5.

Model Summary of Social Engagement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.46	.21	.19	.8

According to the adjusted determination coefficient of 0.19, it can be said that the independent variables of the model explain 19% of social engagement changes.

Table 6.

ANOVA Test of Multiple Regression of Social Engagement

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	24.63	4	6.15	9.42	.00
	Residual	88.86	136	.65		
	Total	113.5	140			

The model as a whole was statistically significant (F (4, 136) = 9.42, p< .05) (Table 6). In other words, the motivational goal orientation components (i.e., mastery approach, performance approach, performance avoid, and mastery avoid) could significantly predict social engagement. Standardized and unstandardized coefficients of the components of motivational goal orientation are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.

Coefficients of Social Engagement

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.78	.6		1.29	.19
	performance-avoid	.08	.13	.06	.67	.5
	performance approach	.37	.09	.36	4.05	.00
	mastery avoid	.02	.15	.01	.15	.88
	mastery approach	.22	.16	.13	1.42	.15

As the above table shows, the performance approach significantly predicted social engagement. In other words, 36% of the variances in social engagement are explained by performance-approach orientation.

5. Discussion

The first research question was to find the motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) of Iranian intermediate EFL learners, which determined their agentic engagement in the classroom. In so doing, a multiple regression was run, and the findings demonstrated that the mastery approach and performance approach significantly predicted agentic engagement.

Consistent with the finding of this question, Shih (2021) established that a performance-approach goal orientation serves as a positive predictor of agentic engagement. Students who strive to exhibit their abilities or skills through performance-approach goals are inclined to seek enrichment and personalization in the instructional experiences they encounter (Reeve, 2012).

To further substantiate the findings, agentic engagement encapsulates students' endeavors to initiate processes that enhance the likelihood of experiencing both heightened motivation and substantive learning. Consequently, it is not unexpected that both mastery-oriented and performance-oriented goals, whether oriented toward individual improvement or exceeding the performance of peers, exhibit associations with this facet of academic engagement (Shih, 2018).

Moreover, agentic engagement entails students' affirmative and proactive exercises of their autonomy within the instructional context (Sinatra, 2015). For instance, within the classroom environment, students may advocate for diverse inputs to the instructional process, articulate their preferences, suggest alternative instructional methodologies to their educators, convey their needs and ideas, pose inquiries, seek clarification regarding concepts they find perplexing, and request assistance in modeling, tutoring, and receiving feedback throughout the instructional process (Reeve & Tseng, 2011). These characteristics of engagement align with both mastery and performance approaches, as performance-approach goals are inherently concerned with the demonstration of abilities within the classroom context, while individuals who resonate with a mastery goal orientation possess an intrinsic motivation to enhance their competencies and a desire to acquire new skills while refining existing ones.

Therefore, these two categories of learners are likely to advocate for various inputs to the instructional discourse, articulate their preferences, and propose alternative instructional methodologies to their educators (specifications of agentic engagement).

In other words, agentic engagement encompasses the articulation of ideas that have the potential to influence the course flow in line with the preferences and needs of students. Indeed, it is anticipated that students who perceive a mastery-oriented focus within the educational environment will engage actively in the course dynamics with the objectives of learning and personal development (Datu et al., 2022).

Consistent with the findings of the present study, Hıdıroğlu and Sungur (2015) found that mastery approach goals made a significant contribution to the prediction of students' agentic engagement in science. This means that students who are willing to learn and master the material express their preferences and manipulate the flow of the course according to their learning style. Students' mastery avoidance goals and performance approach goals also correlated positively with students' agentic engagement.

Kıran (2019) further demonstrated that students' agentic engagement within science classes was significantly predicted by their mastery approach goals, self-efficacy beliefs, performance-approach goals, and mastery avoidance goals. Reeve and Tseng (2011) established that student achievement could be anticipated by the degree of agentic engagement exhibited. Reeve (2013) also found that the framework encompassing behavioral, emotional, agentic, and cognitive engagement accounted for 25% of the variance observed in academic achievement. Nonetheless, the associations between cognitive and emotional engagement and achievement were not substantiated, while the connections between behavioral and agentic engagement and academic success were affirmed. Collectively, researchers have concluded that agentic engagement functions as a pre-emptive, deliberate, cooperative, and beneficial pathway initiated by students, leading to enhanced academic performance and motivational support.

The second research question aimed to uncover whether motivational goal orientations (performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach) of Iranian intermediate EFL learners determined their social engagement in the classroom. For this purpose, a multiple regression was run, and the findings indicated that the performance approach significantly predicted social engagement.

Performance-approach orientation is characterized by a focus on demonstrating ability and outperforming others (Silver, 2006). EFL learners with this orientation may be more motivated to engage socially in language learning environments to prove their competence. They might seek opportunities to showcase their skills, which can lead to increased participation in group activities or discussions, thereby enhancing their social engagement (Bryson & Hand, 2007).

Learners who are driven by a performance-approach orientation often engage more with peers to compare their performance and receive feedback. This interaction can create a dynamic social environment where learners collaborate, share knowledge, and support each other, nurturing the appreciation of social engagement and community (Rogat & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2019). Besides, a performance-approach orientation thrives in competitive contexts. In EFL settings where assessments, rankings, or comparison of performance are prevalent, learners might engage more socially to form study groups, participate in competitions, or engage in peer-led activities (Lack, 2010), all of which can enhance their social ties and engagement.

To further justify the findings, it can be stated that engagement with others can enhance a learner's social identity. For EFL learners with a performance-approach orientation, building a positive reputation among peers through social collaboration (Levy, 2004) can reinforce their self-concept as competent language users, further promoting social engagement.

Also, in many cultures, such as the Iranian culture, language learning is often viewed as a collective endeavor. EFL learners might feel a greater sense of obligation or desire to engage socially (Erez, 2013) to adhere to cultural expectations of teamwork and sharing knowledge.

In general, a performance-approach orientation can positively influence the social engagement of EFL learners by driving motivation, facilitating peer interactions, creating competitive dynamics, encouraging feedback seeking, reinforcing social identity, and aligning with cultural expectations of collaboration. These factors collectively enhance their engagement with both the language and their peers, contributing to a more interactive and supportive learning environment (Smith, 2005).

6. Conclusion

The findings of this study emphasized the critical role that motivational goal orientations play in determining both agentic and social engagement among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. By exploring how performance-avoid, performance-approach, mastery-avoid, and mastery-approach goals influence various engagement styles, the research sheds light on the complex motivational dynamics that underpin effective language learning. The findings underscore the importance of understanding these motivational factors in order to create a more engaging and supportive educational environment. As students navigate their learning experiences, the interplay between their motivational orientations and their engagement behaviors can significantly impact their overall language proficiency and classroom satisfaction.

Regarding the implications of this study, teachers should be encouraged to integrate principles of goal orientation theory into their teaching practices. By fostering a mastery-oriented classroom culture that emphasizes intrinsic motivation, educators can encourage learners to focus on personal improvement and the joy of learning English rather than merely striving for external rewards or grades.

Furthermore, the study highlights variations in motivational goal orientations among learners in terms of their

engagement. Educators should adopt differentiated instructional strategies that cater to diverse motivational needs and preferences. For instance, providing options for collaborative projects may benefit those with a strong social goal orientation, while individualized assignments could support mastery-oriented students seeking to challenge themselves. Professional development workshops can also equip educators with the necessary skills to identify and respond to students' motivational goals, ultimately improving instructional effectiveness and student outcomes.

The study was not without limitations. The study sample was limited to specific language schools in Iran, which may not represent the broader population of EFL learners nationwide. Variations in educational practices, cultural contexts, and learner demographics in different regions may influence motivational orientations and engagement levels. Consequently, caution should be exercised when generalizing these findings to other contexts within Iran or to EFL learners in different countries.

The reliance on self-reported measures to assess goal orientations and engagement can also be a source of bias. Participants may have provided socially desirable responses or may not have fully understood the scales used for measurement, which could lead to inaccuracies in data. Future research could benefit from incorporating multiple data sources, such as observations or interviews, to obtain a more nuanced understanding of learners' motivations and engagement behaviors.

Finally, this study adopted a cross-sectional design, capturing data at a single point in time. This design limits the ability to infer causal relationships between motivational goal orientations and classroom engagement. Longitudinal studies could offer deeper insights into how these dynamics evolve over time and under varying educational circumstances.

7. References

Ainley, M. D. (1993). Styles of engagement with learning: Multidimensional assessment of their relationship with strategy use and school achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(*3), 395-405. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.85.3.395

Al Kaboody, M. (2013). Second language motivation; the role of teachers in learners' motivation. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies, 3*(4), 45-54. https://www.academia.edu/62131001/Second_Language_Motivation_The_Role_of_Teachers_in_Learners_Motivation

Allan, D. (1992). Oxford Placement Test 2. Oxford University Press. https://elt.oup.com/feature/global/oxford-online-placement/?srsltid=AfmBOophk7LzlAOhSekOy6w5_VLzjtmzTfU2D0suyqauMhmi-uA35gjG&cc=ir&selLanguage=en

Ames, C. (1987). The enhancement of student motivation. In M. Maehr & D. Kleiber (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement, Volume 5: Enhancing motivation* (pp. 123–148). JAI Press. https://books.google.com/books/about/Advances_in_Motivation_and_Achievement.html?id=FUKFAAAAIAAJ

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 261. https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1993-03487-001

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 260-271. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.3.260

Anderman, E. M., & Wolters, C. (2006). Goals, values, and affect: Influences on student motivation. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 369–389). Erlbaum. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203874790/handbook-educational-psychology-patricia-alexander-philip-winne

Anjomshoa, L., & Sadighi, F. (2015). The importance of motivation in second language acquisition. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 3*(2), 126-137. https://www.academia.edu/70501465/The_Importance_of_Motivation_in_Second_Language_Acquisition

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*(2), 164-180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x

Barker, K. L., McInerney, D. M., & Dowson, M. (2002). Performance approach, performance avoidance and depth of information processing: A fresh look at relations between students' academic motivation and cognition. *Educational Psychology, 22*(5), 572-588. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144341022000023644

Barron, K. E., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2003). Revisiting the benefits of performance-approach goals in the college classroom: Exploring the role of goals in advanced college courses. *International Journal of Educational Research, 39*(4-5), 357-374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2004.06.004

Bryson, C., & Hand, L. (2007). The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(4), 349-362. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290701602748

Cadime, I., Pinto, A. M., Lima, S., Rego, S., Pereira, J., & Ribeiro, I. (2016). Well-being and academic achievement in secondary school pupils: The unique effects of burnout and engagement. *Journal of Adolescence, 53*, 169-179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.10.003

Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement*. Springer Science. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Cohen, A. D., & Dörnyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles, and strategies. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 170–190). London: Arnold. https://pbadoktoral.uin-suka.ac.id/media/dokumen_akademik/130113_20210611_norbert_schmitt_ed-_an_introduction_to_appliedb-ok-org.pdf

Datu, J. A. D., Valdez, J. P. M., & Yang, W. (2022). The academically engaged life of mastery-oriented students: Causal ordering among positive emotions, mastery-approach goals, and academic engagement. *Revista de Psicodidáctica (English ed.), 27*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicoe.2021.02.001

De la Fuente, J. (2004). Perspectivas recientes en el estudio de la motivación: la Teoría de la Orientación de Meta. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 2*(1), 35-61. https://ojs.ual.es/ojs/index.php/EJREP/article/view/1134

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 49*(3), 182. https://doi.org/doi/10.1037/a0012801

Eccles, J., & Wang, M.-T. (2012). Part I commentary: So what is student engagement anyway? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 133–145). Springer Science. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(1), 218-232. https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/1997-02176-019.html

Elliot, A. J., & Hulleman, C. S. (2017). Achievement goals. In A. J. Elliot, C. S. Dweck, & D. S. Yeager (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation: Theory and application*., 2nd ed. (pp. 43–60). The Guilford Press. https://chools.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Handbook-of-Competence-and-Motivation_-Theory-and-Application.pdf

Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(1), 5-12. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.1.5

Erez, M., Lisak, A., Harush, R., Glikson, E., Nouri, R., & Shokef, E. (2013). Going global: Developing management students' cultural intelligence and global identity in culturally diverse virtual teams. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12(*3), 330-355. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0200

Esra, M. E. Ş. E., & Sevilen, Ç. (2021). Factors influencing EFL students' motivation in online learning: A qualitative case study. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning, 4*(1), 11-22. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jetol/issue/60134/817680?utm_medium=email&utm_source=transaction

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage Publications. https://books.google.com/books/about/Discovering_Statistics_Using_IBM_SPSS_St.html?id=srb0a9fmMEoC

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 97–131). Springer. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Ford, J. K., Smith, E. M., Weissbein, D. A., Gully, S. M., & Salas, E. (1998). Relationships of goal orientation, metacognitive activity, and practice strategies with learning outcomes and transfer. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 218–233. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.218

Fredricks, J. A. (2014). *The eight myths of student disengagement: Creating classrooms of deep learning*. Corwin Press. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-23322-000

Fredricks, J. A., Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2019). *Handbook of student engagement interventions*. Academic Press. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2019-72432-000

Guo, J., Hu, X., Elliot, A. J., Marsh, H. W., Murayama, K., Basarkod, G., Parker, P. D., & Dicke, T. (2022). Mastery-approach goals: A large-scale cross-cultural analysis of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,125*(2), 397–420. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000436

Harnar, H., Peer, K., Moser, C., & Cindric, J. (2021). The impact grit and achievement goal orientation have on athletic training students' persistence. Journal of Sports Medicine and Allied Health Sciences: *Official Journal of the Ohio Athletic Trainers' Association, 7*(2), 18-32. https://doi.org/10.25035/jsmahs.07.02.02

Hıdıroğlu, M., & Sungur, S. (2015). Predicting seventh grade students' engagement in science by their achievement goals. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 16*(2), 1-17. https://www.eduhk.hk/apfslt/download/v16_issue2_files/sungur.pdf

Hoi, V. N., & Hang, L. H. (2021). The structure of student engagement in online learning: A bi-factor exploratory structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 37*(4), 1141–1153. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12551

Kelly, S., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Teacher support and engagement in math and science: Evidence from the high school longitudinal study. *The High School Journal, 4*, 141-165. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2016.0005

Kıran, D., Sungur, S., & Yerdelen, S. (2019). Predicting science engagement with motivation and teacher characteristics: A multilevel investigation. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 17*, 67-88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-018-9882-2

Klassen, R. M., Yerdelen, S., & Durksen, T. L. (2013). Measuring teacher engagement: development of the engaged teachers scale (ETS). *Frontline Learning Research, 1*(2), 33-52. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1090832

Lack, B. (2010). *Student participation in mathematics discourse in a standards-based middle grades classroom*. (Doctral dissertation), Georgia State University. https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/6d30d4ed-50fc-4165-b819-24dcf75af349/content

Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Zhou, W. (2018). Relationships between student engagement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 46*(3), 517-528. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7054

Levy, I., Kaplan, A., & Patrick, H. (2004). Early adolescents' achievement goals, social status, and attitudes towards cooperation with peers. *Social Psychology of Education, 7*, 127-159. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SPOE.0000018547.08294.b6

Loan, T. T. T. (2023). The L2 motivational self system and L2 achievement: A study of DNTU's students. *International Journal of English Language Studies, 5*(2), 103-107. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2023.5.2.10

Locke E.A., Latham G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*, 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Matos, L., Lens, W., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2007). Achievement goals, learning strategies and language achievement among Peruvian high school students. *Psychologica Belgica, 47*(1-2), 51-70. https://account.psychologicabelgica.com/index.php/up-j-pb/article/download/pb-47-1-51/124

Midgley, C., Maehr, M. L., Hruda, L. Z., Anderman, E., Anderman, L. H., Freeman, K. E., Gheen, M., Kaplan, A., Kumar, R., Middleton, M. J., Nelson, J., Roeser, R., & Urdan, T. (2000). *Manual for the patterns of adaptive learning scales*. The University of Michigan. https://www.academia.edu/download/3479746/pals_2000_v12word97.pdf

Miller, A. L., Fassett, K. T., & Palmer, D. L. (2021). Achievement goal orientation: A predictor of student engagement in higher education. *Motivation and Emotion, 45*(3), 327–344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-021-09881-7

Miller, A. M. (2019). Exploring achievement goal theory, ACTFL's 5 cs, and the L2 classroom: What goals do students set? *Foreign Language Annals, 52*(2), 237-254. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12391

Oga-Baldwin, W. Q., Fryer, L. K., Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Mercer, S. (2021). A latent growth analysis of engagement in Japanese elementary schools. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 224-240). Multilingual Matters. https://dokumen.pub/student-engagement-in-the-language-classroom-9781788923613.html

Papi, M., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2012). Teacher motivational practice, student motivation, and possible L2 selves: An examination in the Iranian EFL context. *Language Learning, 62*(2), 571-594. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00632.x

Peach, D., & Matthews, J. (2011). Work integrated learning for life: Encouraging agentic engagement. In Krause, K., Buckridge, M., Grimmer, C., & Purbrick-Illek, S. (Eds.), *Research and development in higher education: Reshaping higher education* (pp. 227-237). Gold Coast. https://herdsa.org.au/research-and-development-higher-education-vol-33

Pekrun R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia L. (2012). Academic emotions and student engagement. In Chirstenson S., Reschly A., & Wylie C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 259–282). Springer. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36*(1), 50-72. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000094

Pintrich, P. R. & Schunk, D.H. (2002). The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. *Theory into Practice, 41*(4), 219-225. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_3

Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Prentice Hall Merrill. https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9781292055251_A24621767/preview-9781292055251_A24621767.pdf

Poortvliet, P. M., Anseel, F., & Theuwis, F. (2015). Mastery-approach and mastery-avoidance goals and their relation with exhaustion and engagement at work: The roles of emotional and instrumental support. *Work & Stress, 29*(2), 150-170. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1031856

Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149–172). Springer. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(1), 579–595. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032690

Reeve, J., & Lee, W. (2014). Students' classroom engagement produces longitudinal changes in classroom motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(2), 527. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034934

Reeve, J., & Shin, S. H. (2020). How teachers can support students' agentic engagement. *Theory Into Practice, 59*(2), 150–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1702451

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*, 257-267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002

Roeser, R. W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perceptions of the school psychological environment and early adolescents' psychological and behavioral functioning in school: The mediating role of goals and belonging. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(3), 408. https://doi.org/doi/10.1037/0022-0663.88.3.408

Rogat, T. K., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2019). Demonstrating competence within one's group or in relation to other groups: A person-oriented approach to studying achievement goals in small groups. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 59*, 101781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101781

Sakiz, G. (2011). Mastery and performance approach goal orientations in relation to academic self-efficacy beliefs and academic help seeking behaviors of college students in Turkey. *Educational Research, 2*(1), 771-778. https://www.interesjournals.org/articles/mastery-and-performance-approach-goal-orientations-inrelation-to-academic-selfefficacy-beliefs-and-academichelp-seeking-.pdf

Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design*. Sage Publications. https://methods.sagepub.com/ency/edvol/encyc-of-research-design/toc#_=_

Sameroff, A. (2009). *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other*. American Psychological Association. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/11877-000

Schunk, D. H., Pintrich, P. R., & Meece, J. L. (2008). *Motivation in education*. (3rd ed.). Pearson. https://www.amazon.com/Motivation-Education-Theory-Research-Applications/dp/0132281554

Shih, S. S. (2018). Examining relationships of Taiwanese adolescents' achievement goals to academic engagement and coping. *Journal of Education and Human Development, 7*(1), 153-165. https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v7n1a18

Shih, S. S. (2021). Factors related to Taiwanese adolescents' academic engagement and achievement goal orientations. *The Journal of Educational Research, 114*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2020.1861584

Silver, L. S., Dwyer, S., & Alford, B. (2006). Learning and performance goal orientation of salespeople revisited: The role of performance-approach and performance-avoidance orientations. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 26*(1), 27-38. https://doi.org/10.2753/PSS0885-3134260103

Sinatra, G. M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational Psychologist, 50*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.1002924

Skinner, E., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 21–44). Springer. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Smith, K. A., Sheppard, S. D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). Pedagogies of engagement: Classroom-based practices. *Journal of Engineering Education, 94*(1), 87-101. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00831.x

Stoeber, J., Stoll, O., Pescheck, E., & Otto, K. (2008). Perfectionism and achievement goals in athletes: Relations with approach and avoidance orientations in mastery and performance goals. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 9*(2), 102–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.02.002

Upadyaya, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). Development of school engagement in association with academic success and well-being in varying social contexts: A review of empirical research. *European Psychologist, 18*(2), 136–147. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000143

Urhahne, D., & Wijnia, L. (2023). Theories of motivation in education: An integrative framework. *Educational Psychology Review, 35*(2), 7-13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09767-9

Virtanen, T. E., Räikkönen, E., Engels, M. C., Vasalampi, K., & Lerkkanen, M. K. (2021). Student engagement, truancy, and cynicism: A longitudinal study from primary school to upper secondary education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 86*, 101972. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.101972

Wang, M. T., & Fredricks, J. A. (2014). The reciprocal links between school engagement and youth problem behavior during adolescence. *Child Development, 85*, 722–737. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12138

Wentzel, K. (2012). Part III commentary: Sociocultural contexts, social competence, and engagement at school. In Chirstenson S., Reschly A., & Wylie C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 479-488). Springer. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Wolters, C. A. (2004). Advancing achievement goal theory: using goal structures and goal orientations to predict students' motivation, cognition, and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(2), 236–250. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.2.236

Wolters, C. A., Shirley, L. Y., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). The relation between goal orientation and students' motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences, 8*(3), 211-238. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1041-6080(96)90015-1