

## **Answers to Prof. Csizér's review**

### **Hazim Alkhrisheh**

Concerning the literature review, the reviewer states that she misses the author's critical voice. What concerns us mostly is the development of the new measure. Thus, the critical voice is apparent mostly in chapter 3. The critical view of the concept of effort along with breaking down the concept in accordance with each perspective is most critical in my opinion. The missing of the critical voice in reviewing critical thinking, motivation, and multilingualism is attributed to the fact that there is nothing new to add to these aspects of the dissertation. The reader must keep in mind that the new measure is the new addition to the research field and thus other aspects are kept as they are because the measurements that we used are all taken as they are with no criticism and no suggestions or recommendations for improvement. Additionally, the critical voice is also apparent in reviewing the links between the concepts in the literature review.

Concerning the context, the reviewer states that she would have appreciated more detailed background information on the country not just previous empirical studies. The main issue here is that the background information is irrelevant. This kind of information is available anywhere and anytime on the internet. I believe that I provided the information that the reader needs to know about the study and the context of the study.

Concerning the piloting of the study, it was mentioned that the questionnaire was piloted to students from Pannonia. The result of the pilot study did not differ much from the actual study.

Q.1. What do you think about the possible usefulness of a follow-up qualitative study?

A.1. A follow up qualitative study has many possible uses including improving the current study by exploring how the hypotheses were supported in this research on one hand. On the other hand, it can help understand why the hypotheses were supported in this research. This understanding is necessary because the context in which the data was collected might have had an impact on the results. This means that the hypotheses could have been unsupported in a different context. There are many variables that could have changed the results including age (which was dismissed from our analysis) because almost all participants were in the same age group. For example, a follow up study could include asking participants from different age groups open ended questions about their efforts to achieve higher proficiency levels as well as higher academic achievement. We can determine whether age can be valuable or not as a variable depending on the answers provided by the participants. For example, a younger age group could present less effortful acts than an older age group. Another possible useful merit to a follow-up study is to confirm the validity of a new measure or provide a basis for estimating possible errors in the underlying measure(s). Furthermore, a follow-up study could provide richer data that might add to the new measure in addition to synthesizing multiple theories.

Q.2. What other contexts do you think your results could be generalized and transferred?

Since this study is conducted on one Jordanian University, the results can only be generalized in the Jordanian context. If other studies follow up using the new measure in other countries with

similar results, the findings could be further generalized on a wider scale and the new measure would be further validated. Moreover, if follow-up studies show different but consistent results, it can still be generalized to each context individually. However, if follow-up studies show different and inconsistent results, generalization would be invalid and this in turn would compromise the validity of the new measure.

Q.3. On p. 79, you write that “We excluded age as an independent variable from this study because the sampling method caused a violation in the sample distribution”. Can you provide a thorough justification for this statement?

This is because the majority of these students (around 70%) were aged between 20 to 22. This means that the majority fall within one age group. With a one hundred students sample around 30% were distributed to 19, 23, 24, 25, and 26. Thus neither a comparison nor a correlation analysis based on age groups was feasible due to the lack of sufficient samples in these age groups.