

Demotivating Factors in an Iranian Private Language Institute: Do teachers and Students Think the Same?

¹ Fahimeh Farjani

² Nader Assadi*

IJEAP- 2003-1511

³ Haniyeh Davatgari Asl

Received: 2020-02-08

Accepted: 2020-04-15

Published: 2020-05-04

Abstract

The main focus of this study was to investigate to what extent Iranian intermediate EFL learners were motivated to learn English. Besides, an attempt was made to find the differences between teachers and learners in terms of their perceptions of demotivation sources and the strategies used to reduce them. To that end, some two hundred Intermediate English learners doing their BA's in different fields, one hundred experienced EFL teachers with at least three years of experience, and 80 novice EFL teacher with less than three years of experience were asked to participate in the survey and share their perceptions of demotivation sources as well as strategies to reduce demotivation. For this survey study, a quantitative approach was adopted. The results revealed that all the motivational constructs of Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) considerably decreased as the EFL learners were preceding along the course. Furthermore, Demotivation Sources Questionnaire (DSQ) and Demotivation Reduction Strategies Questionnaire (DRSQ) were distributed among the chosen participants, and one-Way ANOVA was run to examine any statistically significant difference between the three groups of participants' perceptions or priorities of two constructs. The findings revealed that there was no remarkable difference between the perceptions and priorities of three groups. The study concluded with several suggestions for language teachers and

Keywords: Demotivation, Demotivation Sources, Demotivation Reduction Strategies, Experienced EFL Teacher, Novice EFL Teacher

1. Introduction

The majority of Iranian high school students are incapable of applying the taught material for communication of meaning in real-life circumstances. Lack of sufficient opportunities for learners to learn and practice English communicatively might cause Iranian EFL learners to develop a negative attitude and lose interest, producing a damaging outcome in the process of learning English. This has caused many parents' dissatisfaction, and most of their children have to study in private language institutes to have foreign language education. Although students are conscious of the fact that they need to participate in classroom activities and study hard to pass exit and final tests, they do not seem to understand the relevance of learning English to their real lives outside schools and institutes. Such demotivated students usually get distracted easily, might distract their classmates too, attend the class irregularly, or tend to be very negative towards learning English. As a result, many of them are unable to do well in class and on exams. Thus, they hardly enjoy the learning process and class environment.

The notion of demotivation has been added recently to the field of the second/foreign language motivation. This is mainly due to the large number of demotivated learners observed by

¹ PhD Candidate of TEFL, fahimefarjani@yahoo.com; Department of English Language Teaching, Ahar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahar, Iran.

² Assistant Professor (Corresponding Author), n.asadi@iau-ahar.ac.ir; Department of English Language Teaching, Ahar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahar, Iran.

³ Assistant Professor, hdavatgar@ymail.com; Department of English Language Teaching, Ahar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahar, Iran.

researchers in different language classes across the world ([Hamada, 2008](#); Hu, 2011; [Khoshsima & Hashemi Toroujeni, 2017](#); [Kim, 2009](#); [Meshkat & Hassani, 2012](#); [Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009](#); [Sharififar & Akbarzadeh, 2011](#)). The majority of investigations conducted on this phenomenon has mainly sought to shed light on the demotivating variables concerning ESL/EFL learners ([Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011](#)). Knowledge of the causes of EFL learners' demotivation enables the scholars and researchers to obtain information about the learners' failure in L2 learning as well as their unwillingness to learn English more seriously and enthusiastically.

There is not enough knowledge about the features and nature of demotivation as inadequate investigations have been carried out on this phenomenon. This is because demotivation has been recently emphasized in the field of second language (L2) motivation ([Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011](#); [Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009](#)). Another problem entails the lack of ample studies on strategies to reduce demotivation. Therefore, discovering and studying such strategies are critical as a large number of ESL/EFL learners think that their failure in learning target language emanates from their demotivation ([Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011](#); [Falout, Elwood, & Hood, 2009](#); [Hu, 2011](#); K. J. Kim, 2009). This has pushed many scholars to try to identify the causes of demotivation sources among second language learners ([Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011](#)). As mentioned by [Dörnyei and Ushioda \(2011\)](#), the major challenge is that both instructors and learners are not completely aware of strategies which can reduce the influence of demotivating factors.

Therefore, stimulated and motivated by these needs and the critical circumstances of motivation in Iranian EFL learning situations, the researchers of the current study aimed at achieving two goals 1) to probe if EFL learners were influenced by demotivation sources, and 2) whether there was any difference between perceptions and level of understanding of EFL learners and EFL teachers on demotivating factors and demotivation reduction strategies. Considering both theoretical and pedagogical perspectives, the following research questions were addressed in this study to accomplish the aforementioned main objectives:

Research Question One: Is there any statistically significant difference between the motivation levels of Iranian intermediate EFL learners before and after studying in Iran Language Institute?

Research Question Two Is there any statistically significant difference between Iranian intermediate EFL learners, experienced teachers, and novice teachers' perceptions of sources of demotivation?

Research Question Three: Is there any statistically significant difference between Iranian intermediate EFL learners, experienced teachers, and novice teachers' perceptions of the most effective strategies used to reduce learners' demotivation?

Accordingly, there are three null hypotheses developed as followings:

Hypothesis 1: There is not any statistically significant difference between the motivation levels of Iranian intermediate EFL learners before and after studying in Iran Language Institute.

Hypothesis 2: There is no statistically significant difference between Iranian intermediate EFL learners, experienced teachers, and novice teachers' perceptions of sources of demotivation.

Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant difference between Iranian intermediate EFL learners, experienced teachers, and novice teachers' perceptions of the most effective strategies used to reduce learners' demotivation.

2. Review of Literature

According to [Soureshjani and Riahipour \(2012\)](#), the teacher plays a vital role in increasing or decreasing student motivation in class. It is hypothesized that the application of influential strategies for reducing demotivation is likely to solve some of the related problems; however, inadequate investigations have been conducted to examine the impact of such strategies and their potentiality in solving the language learning-related problems. Similarly, [Ho \(1998\)](#) asserts that despite the importance of demotivation in L2 learning in general, very few studies have dealt with L2 learners'

demotivation. Moreover, the investigations conducted on this issue (e.g., Ho, 1998) have sought to make a connection between demotivation and low motivation, rather than analyzing it as a construct in its own right. A look at the literature shows that when it comes to the role of motivation in learning a second language, the majority of educators, L2 teachers, learners, material developers, and researchers view motivation as a single construct contributing to the quality of learning.

[Heidari and Oghli \(2015\)](#) investigated the effects of being demotivated on EFL learners' speaking skills. A questionnaire including teacher-related, student-related, and classroom-related demotivating factors was given to 100 first grade high school students. The findings demonstrated that all three factors hurt students' speaking ability. However, among all three factors, classroom related had the most negative influence on students' speaking skill.

In a study, [Daif-Allah and Alsamani \(2014\)](#) found that external factors such as teachers' competence, teaching styles, and class environment were the main reasons for demotivation. To recover the interests of these students, they implemented the following techniques: reducing class size, administering weekly quizzes, giving corrective feedback, doing in-class work, coordinating language skills, instant payment for replacement, and eliminating cheating. The results of their study indicated that the implemented strategies had a significant positive impact on restoring students' motivation.

3. Methodology

3.1. Design of the study

A quantitative approach based on triangulation method, including data triangulation and investigator triangulation, was chosen to obtain a better understanding of the perceptions of three groups of participants. This study enjoys a descriptive and survey design since the data collection method is questionnaire and there is no treatment involved. Furthermore, it can be considered comparative study too since the researchers will make different comparisons between the subgroups.

3.2. Setting and Participants of the Study

The participants of this study were selected from six branches of Iranian Language Institute (ILI) situated in Tehran. This institute was chosen since it is a nationally well-accredited private language institute in Iran and has so many branches across Iran. Furthermore, most Iranian families and EFL learners believe in its effectiveness. Two researcher assistants collected the required data from different branches of ILI in Tehran. As the ILI students take a placement test before admission to be placed appropriately at a level, no additional placement test was administered in order to select the intermediate level EFL learners as of the target group for the study. Thus, 200 EFL learners (115 male (n=57.5%) and 85 female (n=42.5%); with different ages ranging from 16 to 45 responded to Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) questionnaire in the first phase of the study in two sessions with an interval of four months. In the second phase of the study, 100 experienced teachers and 80 novice teachers as well 200 as students were asked to respond to two questionnaires: DSQ and DRSQ questionnaire.

3.3. Instruments

The first instrument used in this study was Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). It has a 6-point Likert scale form, in which the respondents indicate their preferences through choosing a number from strongly agree (6), moderately agree (5), slightly agree (4), slightly disagree (3), moderately disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1). This instrument was constructed to measure different perspectives of the socio-educational model of second language acquisition proposed primarily by [Gardner in 1985](#). It consists of 96 items, the responses to which will reveal the attitudes and overall feelings of the learners towards English and discuss the levels of the motivation that foreign language learners have in learning English. The test items correspond to the 5 main subscales: Motivation (30 items), Integrativeness (22 items), Attitudes toward Learning Situation (20 items), Instrumentality (4 items) and Language Anxiety (20 items). According to

[Gardner and MacIntyre \(1993\)](#) the validity of AMTB has been supported. The internal consistency reliability and test-retest reliability of the test in Canadian context were reported to be 0.91 and 0.79 respectively ([Gardner, 2005](#)).

The next instruments were demotivation sources questionnaire and demotivation reduction strategies questionnaire. Both of these questionnaires have a 5-point Likert scale form and were developed by [Farjami, Aidinlu and Davatgari Asl \(2018\)](#). Having done the content validity of the questionnaires by the analysis and reviewing of the panel of experts including Ph.D. holders in TEFL, and factor analyzing, the questionnaires were piloted on a sample of 15 EFL teachers and 15 EFL learners with similar characteristics to check their reliability. The questionnaire was administered to this sample, and the collected data were prepared for Cronbach's alpha. Following that, the questionnaires were administered to the 200 teachers for factor analysis to uncover the underlying construct of demotivation and strategies to reduce it in Iranian EFL Context. These instruments were used to measure the perceptions of three groups of participants on demotivation sources and the strategies that can be used to reduce them. The DSQ consists of 42 items, but the DRSQ comprises of 40 items. Consequently, to examine the internal consistency of the constructed questionnaires, a Cronbach's α reliability analysis was performed on the obtained responses of the 30 respondents for both questionnaires. The analysis of the internal consistency resulted in relatively high-reliability coefficients (for Sources of Demotivation Questionnaire, $\alpha=88$ & for Demotivation Reduction Strategies Questionnaire, $\alpha=87$).

4. Results

4.1. Research Question One

Descriptive statistics were used to compare the mean score on pre-test and post-tests of AMTB. To answer the research question one, we needed to compare two means of AMTB administration sessions in order to find out any statistically significant difference between them to attribute it to the change of EFL learners' motivation and their positive or negative attitudes towards learning English in ILI. Since parametric statistical tests are based on several common assumptions, the researcher had to confirm the fulfillment of the three assumptions of interval data, independence of subject, and normality of distribution. The questionnaire's statements were assigned numbers and calculated based on an interval scale. The respondents of pre and post administrations who were assigned to one group were independent of each other and no treatment by peer or group work was administered in this study. Thus, the final requirement was to check the normality of the data.

Table 1: Testing the Normality Assumption

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	DF	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-Attitudes	.058	200	.099	.989	200	.116
Post-Attitudes	.056	200	.200*	.989	200	.121
Pre-Integrativeness	.062	200	.058	.988	200	.092
Post-Integrativeness	.051	200	.200*	.986	200	.051
Pre-Motivation	.062	200	.059	.988	200	.089
Post-Motivation	.050	200	.200*	.990	200	.172
Pre-Language Anxiety	.061	200	.065	.988	200	.094
Post-Language Anxiety	.049	200	.200*	.990	200	.187
Pre-Instrumentality	.058	200	.093	.987	200	.057
Post-Instrumentality	.057	200	.200*	.987	200	.059
Pre-Parental Encouragement	.063	200	.050	.987	200	.075
Post-Parental Encouragement	.053	200	.200*	.989	200	.136

According to Table 1 and given the p-values greater than 0.05, it was concluded that independent variable constructs were normally distributed. After satisfying the required assumptions of paired-sample t-test, the statistical test was run to examine if there was any statistically significant difference in participants' attitudes across two administrations of AMTB.

Table 2: Paired t-test Results for Six Constructs of both AMTB Administrations

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower			
Pair 1	Pre-Attitudes Post-Attitudes	2.5	0.6	.01	2.00	2.08	.75	199	.000
Pair 2	Pre-Integrativeness Post-Integrativeness	1.47	0.67	.23	1.30	2.24	.64	199	.000
Pair 3	Pre-Motivation Post-Motivation	2.32	0.13	.03	1.94	2.09	.56	199	.000
Pair 4	Pre-Language Anxiety Post-Language Anxiety	2.35	0.04	.09	2.31	2.69	.60	199	.000
Pair 5	Pre-Instrumentality Post-Instrumentality	2.39	0.21	.08	2.22	2.56	.52	199	.000
Pair 6	Pre-Parental Encouragement Post-Parental Encouragement	0.73	0.37	.25	1.85	2.84	.65	199	.000

From Table 2, the inferential analysis of the data revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between all constructs' mean scores on pre-administration and post-administration of AMTB (pre and post-Attitudes= $t(199)=1046.75$, $P=000$, pre and post-Integrativeness= $t(199)=89.64$, $P=000$, pre and post-Motivation= $t(199)=507.56$, $P=000$, pre and post-Language Anxiety= $t(199)=215.60$, $P=000$, pre and post-Instrumentality= $t(199)=241.52$, $P=000$, pre and post-Parental Encouragement= $t(199)=80.65$, $P=000$). This test provided a pretty convincing piece of evidence for the presence of demotivation sources' effect on EFL learners' motivation. In other words, based on the obtained results of paired sample t-test, it can be concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between mean scores of EFL learners as respondents of the study across pre-test and post-test of the motivation questionnaire.

Based on the results of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, the mean scores of respondents in pre-administration of AMTB were higher, and there was a statistically significant difference between the mean score of all six constructs of AMTB administered to the same group in two sessions. In other words, the EFL learners of the study were more motivated to learn English in ILI at the beginning of the semester. Additionally, the results of the AMTB were measured as a whole instrument (Table 3).

Table 3: Paired t-test Results for Both Pre and Post Administration of AMTB

	Paired Differences					t	D.F.	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower			
Pre-post administration of AMTB	1.20	1.35	2.07	-3.04	5.44	.579	199	.02

Then, according to the inferential analysis, there was a statistically significant difference between the participants' mean scores on pre-administration of AMTB and post administration of AMTB ($t(199)=0.579$, $P=.02$). Therefore, to answer the first research question, the findings confirm that EFL learners became demotivated during EFL classrooms.

4.2. Research Question Two

The second research question was about finding any statistically significant difference between EFL learners', experienced EFL teachers', and novice EFL teachers' perceptions of sources of

demotivation they identify in ILI EFL classes. In order to find the answer to the second research question and confirm or reject the hypothesis, the related data (perceptions of sources of demotivation) gathered from administration of valid and reliable DSQ questionnaire (Farjami et al., 2018) to three groups of participants. The participants included 200 intermediate level EFL learners, 100 experienced EFL teachers, and 80 novice EFL teachers randomly selected from different branches of ILI in Tehran. The data were analyzed by One-Way ANOVA to determine whether there existed any statistically significant difference between the means of three independent (unrelated) groups. It was used to compare the means of three sets of scores, belonging to three groups obtained in one session.

First of all, internal consistency of the DSQ in the new EFL context was checked via Cronbach's alpha that is a common measure for multiple Likert scales of questionnaires. However it must be mentioned that the validity and reliability of the instrument were approved in Iranian EFL context by Farjami et al. (2018). Cronbach's alpha coefficient between .7 and .8 is good, .8 and .9 is high, and .9 and above is very high. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the questionnaire turned out to be much over 0.7. This indicated that the questionnaire was reliable for all three groups in the EFL context of the current research. Reliability coefficients of .751, .766, and .789 for three sets of data were obtained from the administration of DSQ to three groups of EFL learners, experienced EFL teachers, and novice EFL teachers, respectively. Then, it was concluded that reliable research data and data collection instrument were used in the study. Furthermore, since normal data is the fundamental assumption in parametric statistical testing, the researchers checked the assumption of normality as well as homogeneity of variances for One-Way ANOVA, the results of which are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Demotivation Sources Questionnaire Normality Tests

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
EFL learners' DSQ	.073	200	.012	.988	200	.077
Experienced EFL Teachers' DSQ	.067	100	.200*	.985	100	.318
Novice EFL Teachers' DSQ	.079	80	.200*	.989	80	.720

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

According to Table 4 and given that $p=.077$ ($p>.05$) for DSQ data gathered from EFL learners' group, $p=.318$ for DSQ data gathered from experienced EFL teachers' group, and $p=.720$ for DSQ data gathered from novice EFL teachers' group, it was concluded that data enjoyed normal distribution. Since the sample size of three groups was not equal, equal population variances should be checked.

Table 5: Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Levene's Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.195	2	377	.823

Based on the results of the Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Levene's test), it was concluded that variances of the groups' data were equal. Table 5 reported Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances, $F(2,377) = .195$, $p=.823$, that shows the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated, $p(.823) < \alpha(.05)$. Then, because the three sets of data had similar variances, parametric statistical test (One-Way ANOVA) could be run.

Table 6: Three Groups' Mean Scores Descriptive Statistics for DSQ

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
EFL Learners	200	2.5825	.25435	.01799	2.5471	2.6180	2.00	3.26
Experienced EFL teachers	100	2.5779	.25852	.02585	2.5266	2.6292	2.00	3.26
Novice EFL teachers	80	2.5589	.23670	.02646	2.5063	2.6116	2.00	3.24
Total	380	2.5763	.25138	.01290	2.5510	2.6017	2.00	3.26

Based on Table 6, EFL learners' mean score on DSQ ($M=2.58$, $SD=.25$) was a bit higher than two other groups' mean score (Experienced EFL teachers/ $M=2.57$, $SD=.25$, and novice EFL teachers/ $M=2.55$, $SD=.23$). Between two experienced EFL teachers and novice EFL teachers, the former mean score on DSQ ($M= M=2.57$, $SD=.25$) was higher than that of the later ($M=2.55$, $SD=.23$). It means that the demotivation sources identified in Iranian EFL learning situations are more importantly recognized by EFL learners. It may be because EFL learners are more engaged in facing these demotivating factors, and their EFL learning performances are more susceptible to be influenced by these factors. Overcoming these factors may give them great progress and success in their learning situations.

Table 7: One-Way ANOVA Results for Second Research Question

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.032	2	.016	.253	.776
Within Groups	23.917	377	.063		
Total	23.950	379			

Based on the results of One-Way ANOVA analysis in which the mean score difference is considered statistically significant at 0.05 level, the significance level was .776 (i.e., $p=.776$) which was greater than 0.05. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the three groups and the second null hypothesis is accepted.

4.3. Research Question Three

The third research question was about finding any statistically significant difference between EFL learners', experienced EFL teachers', and novice EFL teachers' perceptions of demotivation reduction strategies they identified in ILI EFL classes. In order to find the answer to this research question and confirm or reject the hypothesis, the related data (perceptions of demotivation reduction strategies) gathered from administration of valid and reliable DRSQ to three groups of participants (including 200 Intermediate level EFL learners, 100 experienced EFL teachers, and 80 novice EFL teachers randomly selected from different branches of ILI) were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (One-Way ANOVA).

Table 8: Demotivation Sources Questionnaire (DRSQ) Data Distribution Normality Tests

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	DF	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
EFL learners' DRSQ	.059	200	.088	.987	200	.060
Experienced EFL Teachers' DRSQ	.061	100	.200*	.986	100	.403
Novice EFL Teachers' DRSQ	.058	80	.200*	.987	80	.612

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As regards the reliability of DSQ questionnaire, the internal consistency of the DRSQ questionnaire in the new Iranian EFL context was examined via checking Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Although the validity and reliability of the instrument were approved in Iranian EFL context by Farjami et al. (2018), the reliability coefficients of .705, .765, and .745 for three sets of data were obtained from the administration of DRSQ to three groups of EFL learners, experienced EFL teachers, and novice

EFL teachers, respectively. Then, it was concluded that research data were reliable, and data collection instrument were valid.

Table 9: Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Mean Scores on DRSQ			
Levene's Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.248	2	377	.781

Based on the results, since the Sig. Values of the Shapiro-Wilk test for all three sets of data received from three independent groups of the last phase of the study were greater than 0.05 (EFL learners/ $p=.060$, experienced EFL learners/ $p=.403$, and novice EFL teachers/ $p=.612$) ($p>.05$), the data did not deviate from a normal distribution, and it was concluded that the data were normally distributed. Additionally, Levene's test indicated that the variances for DRSQ performance of three groups were equal, $F(2, 377) = .248, p = .781$ (Table 9).

Table 10: Three Groups' Mean Scores Descriptive Statistics on DRSQ

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
EFL learners	200	2.6833	.29591	.02092	2.6420	2.7245	1.88	3.48
Experienced EFL teachers	100	2.7235	.27563	.02756	2.6688	2.7782	1.98	3.43
Novice EFL teachers	80	2.7581	.27858	.03115	2.6961	2.8201	2.10	3.48
Total	380	2.7096	.28794	.01477	2.6806	2.7386	1.88	3.48

Based on Table 10, novice EFL teachers' mean score on DRSQ ($M=2.75, SD=.27$) was higher than two other groups' mean score (EFL learners/ $M=2.68, SD=.29$, and experienced EFL teachers/ $M=2.72, SD=.27$). Between two EFL learners and experienced EFL teachers' groups of participants, the later mean score on DRSQ ($M=2.72, SD=.27$) was higher than that former mean score on DRSQ ($M=2.68, SD=.29$). It means that the strategies recommended to be used in Iranian EFL learning situations are more importantly recognized by novice EFL teachers to be observed in EFL classes. The reason may be that the novice EFL teachers who have been recently recruited by ILI are more updated and familiar with more modern learning situations and conditions.

Table 11: One-Way ANOVA Results

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.347	2	.173	2.102	.124
Within Groups	31.077	377	.082		
Total	31.424	379			

Table 11 reported the output of the One-Way ANOVA analysis, and if there was any statistically significant difference between the mean scores of three independent groups of the study. According to the results, the significance value was 0.124 (i.e., $p=.0124$), which was above the significance level 0.05. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in mean of demotivation reduction strategies identification between groups and the third null hypothesis is accepted.

One-Way ANOVA results indicated that the differences between the mean scores of three groups on DRSQ (EFL learners/ $M=2.68, SD=.29; n=200$, Experienced EFL teachers/ $M=2.72, SD=.27; n=100$, and novice EFL teachers/ $M=2.75, SD=.25; n=80$) were not statistically significant, $Sig=.124, p > 0.05$. Therefore, the statistical tests confirmed the fifth, sixth, and seventh null hypotheses that there was no statistically significant difference in the results of three groups' performance on DRSQ. It means that identification of demotivation reduction strategies did not

differ significantly in the view of three EFL learners, experienced EFL teachers, and novice EFL teachers.

5. Discussion

The present study aimed at investigating the differences between the learners' and teachers' perceptions of sources of demotivation and strategies for reducing demotivation. The results of each perspective of AMTB's analysis showed that EFL learners were more motivated to learn English at the beginning of the course or semester rather than at the end of the course. However, the lack of motivation created by some factors that demotivate EFL learners may pose serious challenges to them in learning communicative skills, which will ultimately have negative effects on their achievements. Therefore, the demotivation sources or the factors that may demotivate EFL learners should be recognized in EFL classes, and appropriate strategies should also be applied in such classes either to reduce the effects or omit those sources. Although the EFL learning context in which the current study was done was different from the other regular contexts, the findings are in line with the findings of other previously done studies ([Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006](#); [Kim & Kim, 2015](#)) demonstrated the same general representative patterns reported in studies done in the related literature. This study demonstrated that the Iranian EFL learners were likely to suffer from several demotivation sources in their EFL learning situations that caused them lose their motivation during their learning process. Then, EFL teachers and teaching practitioners should be familiar with the learning situation and aware of those sources to take the most appropriate actions and proper strategies either to reduce the effect of demotivation sources or omit them. Besides, to reduce the demotivation sources, it is important to generate motivated EFL learners and improve their motivation. EFL teachers and learners, lesson planners, curriculum designers, and all those who are engaged in EFL learning context can utilize several strategies to create the situations and conditions in which EFL learners' motivation is stimulated.

The findings indicated that both EFL learners and teachers had similar ideas of strategies that should be applied in EFL classrooms to reduce demotivation. One reason for such similarity may be that teachers were also learners one day, and they may still hold the same attitude towards demotivation and demotivation strategies. Another reason can be the use of self-report scales to explore the perceptions of sources of demotivation and strategies to reduce demotivation. In other words, such self-report scales are limited in that students need to choose from among the limited number of items ([Brown, 2000](#)) which may not capture the perception of sources of demotivation and strategies to reduce demotivation comprehensively.

Generally speaking, in EFL classrooms, the primary motivation to learn English should be fostered rather than demotivating learners. To boost motivation in class, realistic purposes of learning English should be set. Learners should know that they learn English to satisfy their real-life needs outside the classroom. Unfortunately, to the best knowledge of the researchers of the current study as EFL practitioners and researchers, Iranian EFL learners have no commonly positive attitudes towards learning English. Surprisingly, the most important point of this study was that EFL learners who were motivated at the beginning of the course developed a state of demotivation at the end of the course. It means that motivated students who have positive attitudes towards English and have a great interest in learning attend the ELT classes and English training system, but they are demotivated by the system. The education system is believed not to be capable of maintaining and protecting EFL learners' motivation. Therefore, demotivation sources or demotivating factors of ELT context of ILI must be omitted and suitable motivational strategies be adopted. These might include providing stimulating learning materials, improving self-confidence of learners for not being shy and embarrassed when making mistakes or participating in class activities, and training learners to think critically and independently. If these strategies must seriously be considered and continuously used from the beginning of the course, it is hoped that the initial motivation is created, maintained and protected until the end of the course.

6. Conclusion

The most interesting and significant point of this study was that it considered the effect of teaching experience of EFL teachers on their perceptions on the constructs above. A comparison between EFL learners and teachers' perceptions of demotivation sources and strategies to reduce them in EFL classes would provide EFL teachers as the driving force of the EFL classes with a deeper understanding of how appropriately they should manage their pedagogical planning and take proper actions when they encounter demotivation in their classes. EFL teachers also may use the findings of the current study as an assessment to diagnose demotivation sources at the beginning of or during the course and use accurate strategies to keep their learners motivated and evaluate the quality, effect, and firmness of used strategies. Based on the findings of the present study, following implications can be arrived at: a) by providing insights gained from the results of this study teachers can develop an awareness regarding students' perception of demotivation factors and can consequently provide learners with better learning opportunities, b) since teachers and learner have similar perceptions in terms of sources of demotivation and the strategies to reduce demotivation, teachers may readily rely on their own perceptions of demotivation and make quick decisions for preventing demotivation, c) Teacher educators may use the results of the current study to help teachers develop a better understanding of how to keep their class healthy and free from demotivation for more efficient and effective learning, d) material developers can design materials in which the perceptions of learners and teachers in terms of demotivation are taken into account to the extent possible.

Further quantitative and qualitative studies can recruit more participants for deeper insights into EFL learners' motivation level change and most influential factors or sources that may affect such change. In other words, the factors causing demotivation to a certain degree may be different across various settings and contexts, and a larger sample size. As for delimitations, the researcher delimited the EFL teachers of the study, including experienced and novice EFL teachers of ILI. As for novice teachers, the participants were delimited to those teachers having fewer than three years of experience, and the experienced teachers were delimited to teachers with more than three years of experience.

References

- [Brown, H. D. \(2000\). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Longman](#)
- [Daif-Allah, A. S., & Alsamani, A. S. \(2014\). Motivators for demotivators affecting English language acquisition of Saudi preparatory year program students. *English Language Teaching*, 7\(1\), 128-138.](#)
- [Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. \(2006\). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.](#)
- [Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. \(2011\). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York: Longman.](#)
- [Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. \(2009\). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System*, 37\(3\), 403-417.](#)
- [Farjami, F., Aidinlu, N. A., & Davatgari Asl, H. \(2018\). EFL teachers' perceptions of intermediate learners' demotivation and the strategies used to reduce demotivation in an Iranian context. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7\(2\), 93-109.](#)
- [Gardner, R. C. \(1985\). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*, London: Edward Arnold.](#)
- [Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. \(1993\). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43\(2\), 157-194.](#)
- [Gardner, R. C. \(2005\). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. Retrieved from: <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf>](#)
- [Hamada, Y. \(2008\). Demotivators for Japanese teenagers. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 12\(2\), 1-23.](#)
- [Heidari, A., & Oghli, H. S. \(2015\). De-motivational factors of speaking English: A case of Iranian high school students. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 9\(3\), 115-122.](#)
- [Ho, M. C. \(1998\). Culture studies and motivation in foreign and second language learning in Taiwan. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 11\(2\), 165-182.](#)
- [Hu, R. J. S. \(2011\). The relationship between demotivation and EFL learners' English language proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 4\(4\), 88-96.](#)
- [Khoshsima, H., & Hashemi Toroujeni, S. \(2017\). Comparability of computer-based testing and paper-based testing: Testing mode effect, testing mode order, computer attitudes and testing mode preference. *International Journal of Computer*, 24\(1\), 80-99.](#)
- [Kim, K. J. \(2009\). Demotivating factors in secondary English education. *English Teaching*, 64\(4\), 249-267.](#)
- [Kim, T. Y., & Kim, Y.K. \(2015\). Elderly Korean learners' participation in English learning through lifelong education: Focusing on motivation and demotivation. *Educational Gerontology*, 41\(2\), 120-135.](#)
- [Meshkat, M., & Hassani, M. \(2012\). Demotivating factors in learning English: The case of Iran. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 745-749.](#)
- [Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. \(2009\). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37\(1\), 57-69.](#)
- [Sharififar, M., & Akbarzadeh, M. \(2011\). An analysis of demotivators in English classes for Iranian university. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 28, 3-9.](#)
- [Soureshjani, K. H., & Riahipour, P. \(2012\). Demotivating factors on English speaking skill: A study of EFL language learners and teachers' attitudes. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 17\(3\), 327-339.](#)

Appendix A: Demotivation Sources Questionnaire

Strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Neutral (3); Disagree (2); and Strongly disagree (1)

I think demotivation occurs when

Lesson-Plan related factors	1	The pace of the lessons is not appropriate	
	2	Most of the lessons focus on the grammars	
Textbook and Learning-Material related factors	3	English passages in the textbooks are too long	
	4	A great number of textbooks and supplementary readers are assigned	
Teacher-related factors	5	English sentences in the lessons are difficult to interpret	
	6	EFL learners are expected to use (or speak and write) grammatically correct English	
	7	The quality of instruction is low	
	8	EFL learners are not happy with their teacher and classmates	
	9	EFL learners don't like the teaching method, and it demotivates them	
	10	Teachers are not approachable or friendly	
	11	English teachers do not give EFL learners good advice for studying English.	
	12	Teachers do not give the EFL learners positive comments on their English	
	13	Teachers do not teach EFL learners what they want to learn about English.	
	14	Teachers are not enthusiastic.	
	15	Teachers are not fair with all the EFL learners	
	16	Teachers' explanations are not easy to understand.	
	17	Teachers' pronunciation of English is poor	
	18	Teachers make one-way explanations too often.	
	19	Teachers ridicule EFL learners' mistakes	
	20	Teachers shout or get angry	
	Instructional Environment-related factors	21	Inside the classroom, it is dark and depressing.
		22	Inside the classroom is not well decorated, and it does not give EFL learners a good feeling
		23	The chairs are not comfortable, and EFL learners get tired after sitting for a while
	Equipment and Technology-related factors	24	There is no window for fresh air or enough lighting.
25		Computer equipment is not used	
26		Visual materials (such as videos and DVDs) are not used.	
EFL Learner-related factors	27	The Internet is not used.	
	28	Language learning equipment is not used.	
	29	EFL learners are afraid of making mistakes	
	30	EFL learners feel embarrassed about their pronunciation and accent	
	31	EFL learners are laughed at when speaking in the classroom	
	32	EFL learners lose concentration because of too many things they need to focus on	
	33	EFL learners have an anxious personality	
	34	EFL learners have an anxious personality because of participation in classroom	
	35	EFL learners hear others talking English well, and then they lose their confidence	
	36	EFL learners are negatively evaluated by the instructor	
	37	EFL learners feel inferior to their classmates for their English ability	
	38	EFL learners are not confident in learning English	
	39	EFL learners do not do well in English tests	
	40	EFL learners are embarrassed using English in classes	
	41	EFL learners do not achieve much after starting English classes	
	42	Grades for English tests are not by students' expectations	

Appendix B: Demotivation Reduction Strategies Questionnaire (DRSQQ)

Note: Strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Neutral (3); Disagree (2); and Strongly disagree (1)

I think demotivation reduction occurs when	
Teacher-related strategies	1 Teachers assess EFL learners not only by exam
	2 Teachers do not use and focus only on a textbook in the classroom
	3 Teachers' teaching styles are more motivating
	4 More experienced teachers are employed in ILI
	5 Teachers have more interaction with EFL learners in the classroom
	6 Teachers are not changed every semester
	7 Teachers do not criticize when EFL learners are not good at the lessons
	8 There are harmonious relationship and interaction between teacher and EFL learners
	9 Teachers give helpful suggestions to the EFL learners
	10 Teachers are more easy going, patient and flexible
Teaching-content and method-related strategies	11 English teaching does not pay much attention to grammar
	12 Teaching content is more close to the daily life of EFL learners
	13 The teaching method is updated to meet the needs of EFL learners
	14 Speaking skill is more emphasized
	15 Teaching content focus on what EFL learners want to learn about English.
	16 EFL learners listen to different sources rather than just teacher
	17 Teaching method improves communication skills
	18 The teaching method is stimulating and interesting
	19 Teaching method foster independent-thinker EFL learners
EFL learner-related strategies	20 EFL learners are motivated and interested in learning English
	21 EFL learners are not to memorize and remember too many vocabularies
	22 Learning English makes great help for the future career of EFL learners
	23 EFL learners are not compared with their classmates
	24 EFL learners are praised when they make progress
	25 EFL learners do not laugh at each other when they make mistakes in speaking
	26 EFL learners do not feel shy, nervous, and embarrassed when they speak English outside the classroom
	27 EFL learners try harder
	28 EFL learners use English communicatively outside the classroom
Teaching and learning facilities-related strategies	29 Facilities in the classroom are updated to be good for learning English
	30 IT materials and technology tools such as videos or computers are used in the classroom
	31 Multimedia resources are used in the classroom
	32 Language laboratory is established in ILI
Instructional environment strategies	33 The learning environment is not inadequate with many EFL learners
	34 Immediate situations are created for EFL learners to use English effectively
	35 EFL learners' needs and learning goals are supported
	36 Interactive games and activities are employed in the classroom
	37 The flexible setting is possible in the classroom
Textbook-related strategies	38 English textbook includes enough interesting speaking activities
	39 English textbook is not over-loaded by grammatical structures
	40 English textbook encourages EFL learners to communicate in the target language