

Context-specific dynamics of demotivators in foreign language education

Ghanizadeh, Afsaneh ✉

Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran (ghanizadeafsane@yahoo.com;
a.ghanizadeh@imamreza.ac.ir)

Jahedizadeh, Safoura

Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran (Jahedi.s1310@gmail.com)



ISSN: 2243-7754
Online ISSN: 2243-7762

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 20 June 2015
Available Online: 14 July 2015

Revised: 9 July 2015
DOI: 10.5861/ijrsl.2015.1279

Accepted: 13 July 2015

Abstract

Demotivators broadly refer to the forces that diminish students' inspiration to learn or the absence of the forces that derives effective learning. Demotivators are responsible for a host of negative repercussions in educational settings. Nevertheless, demotivators and their multi-dimensional nature still remain an uncharted territory that awaits further investigations in foreign language domain. In this study, the context-specific dynamics of demotivators are studied. In particular, this study delves into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' levels of demotivation across two different milieus of English learning in Iran, namely, language institutes, and universities. To measure students' demotivation, the study employed the Persian version of 'de-motivation scale' designed and validated by Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) and translated to Persian by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (forthcoming). The scale measures six demotivators; *teachers*, *characteristics of classes*, *experiences of failure*, *class environment*, *class materials*, and *lack of interest*. The results demonstrated that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of six demotivation constructs in which institute students experienced higher levels of demotivation than university learners. Among the six demotivators, *lack of interest* ($t=5.52, p<0.05$) had the highest difference in the two settings followed by *classroom materials* ($t=5.52, p<0.05$). *Classroom environment* ($t=2.97, p<0.05$), on the other hand, beheld the lowest difference. The other demotivators fell somewhere in between: *teachers* ($t=4.80, p<0.05$), *characteristics of classes* ($t= 4.90, p<0.05$), and *experiences of failure* ($t= 4.83, p<0.05$). The findings were discussed in the light of above statistical analyses and the pertinent implications were presented.

Keywords: demotivation; language institute; university; EFL context

Context-specific dynamics of demotivators in foreign language education

1. Introduction

Motivation as a theoretical construct embodies causes of people's actions, desires, and needs. This notion is used to explain a process that initiates, guides, and maintains goal oriented treatments. The dismal side of motivation is known as demotivation. As Dörnyei (2001a) stated, de-motivation can be expressed as "specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of behavioural intention or an on-going action"(p. 143). On the other hand, this negative counterpart of motivation is not a static-incident and individuals can experience re-motivation, a process in which motivation is recovered. The process of learning a foreign language encompasses a number of factors such as textbook, teachers, learners, materials, facilities, teaching methodologies, which can affect students' degree of motivation in different stages of EFL learning. Many studies investigated the contribution of motivation in language learning, but it seems that the role of demotivation was not considered as significant as the positive side. Of course, some researchers have recently explored a number of de-motives to investigate the role of de-motivation in predicting students' failure or success. Gorham and Christophel (1992), for instance, conducted a study to find motivating and de-motivating factors. In their study, 308 college students were asked to list the causes of motivation and de-motivation. The context, structure factors, and teachers' behaviours were found to be the most fundamental causes of students' motivation. The same causes were also detected by the researchers to be the salient causes of demotivation. Finally, it was concluded that, learners perceive de-motivation as a teacher-owned problem, but motivation as a student-owned state.

In a similar vein, a study done by Gorham and Millette (1997) revealed that teachers' behaviours, format/structure, and context are important demotivators among English students and teachers perceived such de-motivating factors related to students. Another study was carried out by Rudnai (1996) who interviewed 15 demotivated students who were studying English to find the sources of their demotivation. Negative past experiences, lack of skilled teachers, lack of a pleasant and relaxed atmosphere, lack of free choice, and inappropriate group regarding students' English proficiency were the most significant sources of demotivation. Accordingly, Oxford (1998) surveyed 250 students' experiences and emotions over five years by analysing their essays. The results indicated classroom activities, teachers' attitude toward the course, teachers' behaviours, and conflicts between teachers and students the most principal causes of learners' demotivation.

Ushioda (1998) in a structured interview with 20 students found that students restrict their sources of demotivation to external factors such as, learning tasks, teachers' styles, and methodologies. In other words, they separate loss of motivation from their own internal elements. In a study carried by Chambers (1999) several sources of de-motivation were identified among which inferior equipment, utilizing out of date materials, lack of clear instructions and explanations, and not getting feedback from the students were found to have the most detrimental effects on students' motivation. Teachers on the other hand, did not perceive themselves to be considered as a demotivator. In another study Dörnyei (2001b) identified nine de-motivating factors: interference of another language being studied, course book, compulsory nature of the course, students' negative attitudes toward the language, teacher's methodology, personality, competence, and commitment, group members and L2 community, lack of self-confidence, and inadequacy of facilities.

Williams, Burden, and Lanvers (2002) carried out a study to investigate the relationship among students' demotivation, gender, age, and the language. It was concluded that males were more de-motivated than females and there was a negative relationship between age and motivation level. The results also demonstrated that German students feel higher motivation than learners studying French. Ikeno (2002) identified distrust in the character and ability of teachers, lack of control over the material being learned, peers' negative attitude toward English learning, exam-oriented classes, and feeling of inferiority regarding one's English ability as the main sources of students' demotivation. Another research done by Hasegawa (2004) proved the previous results in

which teachers were the most detrimental sources of de-motivation in an EFL context. Falout and Maruyama (2004) also carried out a study to investigate the relationship between students' proficiency level (low and high) and demotivation. Demotivating factors for the lower-proficiency group were attitudes toward the language, teachers, materials, and group members, while the only demotivator for higher-proficiency group was only self-confidence. It was concluded that, the two groups experienced demotivation to the same degree, but the lower-proficiency group lost their motivation earlier than the higher-proficiency group.

Arai (2004) categorized demotivating factors of 33 EFL university students. Teachers' behavior/ personality and boring classroom atmosphere were among the most causes of students' loss of motivation. In a similar vein, Kojima (2004) conducted a survey to find the most detrimental de-motivating factors. The learner level problem, the language level problem, and the learning situation level problem had the most negative influence on students' motivation level. Muhonen (2004) have also explored several factors which lead to English learners' de-motivation among which teacher related de-motives, i.e., teacher's methodology, personality and competence were the most significant causes of students' de-motivation.

Tsuchiya (2006a, 2006b) investigated the most important demotivators in relation to students' proficiency level. Teachers, classes, lack of positive English speaking models, the compulsory nature of the course, negative attitudes toward English language and community, reduced self-confidence, and ways of learning were detected as sources of demotivation. It was also revealed that the lower-proficiency community was more de-motivated than the higher-proficiency group. Similarly, Zhang (2007) found five sources of de-motivation including; teachers' incompetence, teachers' indifference to the course and students, boring presentations, unfair testing, and the amount of information.

In an attempt to design and validate a 35-item questionnaire regarding students' de-motivation, Kikuchi and Sakai (2007) extracted five demotivating factors: inappropriate methodology, inadequate school facilities, teachers' competence and teaching styles, course books, and test scores. Trang and Baldauf (2007) identified two broad groups of de-motives: internal and external factors. The first category comprised students' experiences of failure, negative attitudes toward English learning, and lack of self-esteem. The external attributions consisted of teacher-related factors, and learning environment factors. Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) conducted a study to explore the most salient de-motivating factors based on a six-factor model (teachers, class environment, lack of learners' interest, characteristics of classes, students' experiences of failure, and class materials) from which five factors were extracted. It was also found that learners with no or a little motivation were more affected by lack of intrinsic motivation than the individuals with moderate and high motivation.

Falout, Elwood, and Hood (2009) investigated the relationship between students' demotivation and coping strategies with respect to their proficiency level, age, and major. The results revealed that beginning, less-proficient students in non-English majors had the least control over their affective states to cope with de-motivating experiences than advanced, English learners. Hirvonen (2010) identified internal and external de-motivating factors in which the former comprised negative attitudes toward English, experiences of failure, negative perceptions of English pronunciation and grammar and the latter included simultaneous learning of languages, the teacher, learning environment, and learning material. In another study conducted by Bednarova (2011) external factors (such as teacher-related elements) were found to be more de-motivating than internal ones.

Other studies were carried out in Iranian EFL context. Kaivanpanah and Ghasemi (2011), for instance, examined the relationship among high school and university students' demotivation, gender, and educational level. Female students were more de-motivated than male pupils. Moreover, negative attitudes toward English speaking community were the main cause of de-motivation among university students than high school learners. Similarly, Alavinia and Sehat (2012) in their study demonstrated that student' experiences of failure as an internal factor and teachers' behaviour/personality as an external cause might de-motivate learners. Another study conducted by Molavi and Biria (2013) investigated the relationship between demotivation and students'

proficiency level. It was revealed that individuals with high score in their aptitude/ motivation test had also high score in proficiency test. Hosseini and Jafari (2014) in an attempt to find sources of Iranian students' demotivation found that insufficient school facilities, lack of intrinsic motivation, and inappropriate teaching materials were the most detrimental predictors of EFL learners' de-motivation.

Taken together, the above literature on de-motivators along with their most detrimental causes and ramifications toward EFL learning clearly revealed that studies on demotivation encompasses a host of dimensions. Nevertheless, to the researchers' best knowledge, no study to date has examined the Iranian EFL students' de-motivation in two different contexts within a single framework. The present paper, thus, aimed to compare the differences of students' demotivation between the two contexts of institutes and universities.

1.1 Purpose of the study

While a plethora of studies, thus far, strived to investigate the concept of motivation across diverse EFL contexts, there is still a scant body of research attempting to delve into de-motivation in two different contexts. In Iran, there are two typical channels in which EFL learning can be pursued; language institutes and universities. The previous studies regarding student demotivation have been conducted in one of the above-mentioned contexts. Consequently, their results cannot be generalizable to other channels, since the approaches and methods used by the teachers and administrators are totally distinct in these environments which lead to diverse student demotivation. Private language institutes are flexible private organizations which usually present up to date language learning methods and curriculums. Students learn English at institutes because they or sometimes their parents have chosen to be there. The books taught in private institutes are more authentic with more communicative purposes in comparison with public schools. Students have opportunities to take part in classroom activities, because the classes are not as crowded as universities. The universities, on the other hand, are not as flexible as language institutes. Individuals have to pass a prescribed list of courses; however, they are allowed to specialize in a specific major. Learners are usually intrinsically motivated, and the number of students is more than that of private institutes. As a result, enough attention may not be paid to individuals. These fundamental differences between private institutes and universities which lead to various student demotivation inspired the researchers of the present study to scrutinize student demotivation in each context. Accordingly, the purpose of the present study is to explore the EFL learners' demotivation in two different contexts of institutes and universities.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

The participants of the current study are divided into two different samples. The first sample comprised EFL students studying at language institutes, and the second sample consisted of EFL learners studying at universities. The profile of the selected participants in each setting is as follows:

Setting 1 - The first group of participants consisted of 125 EFL learners studying at language institutes. They were 61 males and 64 females whose age varied from 12 to 41 ($M=25.55$, $SD=5.70$).

Setting 2 - The second group of participants comprised 125 EFL learners studying at universities. They were 28 males and 97 females whose age varied from 19 to 36 ($M=23.39$, $SD=3.33$). They were 79 ELT students, 22 Translation students, and 24 Literature students of English.

2.2 Instrument

To determine EFL students' de-motivation, the researchers used the Persian version of 'de-motivation scale' designed and validated by Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) and translated to Persian by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh

(forthcoming). The de-motivation questionnaire comprises 35 statements evaluating six constructs of de-motivation: teachers (6 items), characteristics of classes (7 items), experiences of failure (5 items), class environment (7 items), class materials (6 items) and lack of interest (4 items). The scale measures the six constructs via a 5-point Likert-type response format (1: not true, 2: to some extent not true, 3: not either true or untrue, 4: to some extent true, and 5: true). Validity evidence for construct interpretation was investigated through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). A GFI of .91 and a RMSEA of .06 were indicative model fit. Item response theory was used to evaluate the adequacy of the definition of each construct including how well the 5-point frequency response scale worked for the items and respondents. Sample items for each subscale are as follows:

- **Teachers:** 1) The teacher ridicules students' mistakes, and 2) Teachers' explanations were not easy to understand.
- **Characteristics of classes:** 1) I seldom have chances to communicate in English, and 2) Most of the lessons focus on grammar.
- **Experiences of failure:** 1) I get low scores on test, and 2) I get lost in how to self-study for English lessons.
- **Class environment:** 1) The computer is not used, and 2) Visual materials (such as videos and DVDs) were not used.
- **Class materials:** 1) Topics of the English passages used in lessons are not interesting, and 2) English passages in the textbook are too long.
- **Lack of interest:** 1) I have lost my interest in English, and 2) I have lost my goal to be a speaker of English.

The Persian version of the questionnaire translated and validated by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (forthcoming) enjoyed acceptable validity and reliability estimates. The validity indices computed via CFA were as follows: the chi-square/df ratio= 2.1, the RMSEA= .062, NFI=.90, GFI= .89 and CFI= .91. The Cronbach's alpha estimate for all six de-motivators was found to be .95 regarding 35 items. The reliability of the subscales ranged from .72 to .87 (teachers= .87, characteristics of classes= .72, experiences of failure= .84, class environment= .72, class materials= .82, and lack of interest= .87). All items had accepted factor loadings and ranged from .42 (item 21 measuring classroom environment) to .86 (item 33 measuring lack of interest). The original version of the questionnaire is partially reproduced in the appendix.

2.3 Procedure

The present study was undertaken in two language institutes and two universities in Mashhad, Iran. Convenience sampling was utilized to collect data and all the participants kindly accepted to take part in the current study. The researchers explained the purpose of completing the questionnaire for the participants and asked them not to write their names. The data collection was done between January and February 2015.

3. Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of EFL student demotivation among language institute learners (Setting 1). Throughout this study, TEA stands for *teachers*, COC for *characteristics of classes*, EOF for *experiences of failure*, CEN for *classroom environment*, CMA for *classroom materials*, and LOI for *lack of interest*.

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics of Student Demotivation in Setting 1*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
TEA	125	6.00	25.00	19.42	5.30
COC	125	12.00	33.00	25.13	3.94
EOF	125	6.00	22.00	16.62	4.18
CEN	125	10.00	31.00	24.34	4.70
CMA	125	6.00	27.00	20.20	4.53
LOI	125	4.00	18.00	12.70	3.57
Demotivation	125	56.00	146.00	118.39	22.81
Valid N (list wise)	125				

As the table demonstrates, among the six constructs of student demotivation in setting 1 (language institute), *characteristics of classes* receives the highest mean ($M= 25.12$, $SD= 3.94$) followed by *classroom environment* ($M= 24.33$, $SD= 4.69$).

Table 2 indicates descriptive statistics of EFL student demotivation among university students (Setting 2).

Table 2*Descriptive Statistics of Student Demotivation in Setting 2*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
TEA	125	6.00	26.00	16.10	5.61
COC	125	11.00	32.00	22.53	4.43
EOF	125	5.00	22.00	14.01	4.34
CEN	125	8.00	32.00	22.47	5.21
CMA	125	6.00	26.00	17.01	4.56
LOI	125	4.00	18.00	9.41	4.30
Demotivation	125	52.00	145.00	101.52	22.50
Valid N (list wise)	125				

According to this table, among the six dimensions of demotivation in setting 2 (university), *characteristics of classes* and *classroom environment* receive the highest means which obtain almost equal means: *characteristics of classes* ($M= 22.52$, $SD= 4.42$), and *classroom environment* ($M= 22.47$, $SD= 5.21$). *Lack of interest* obtains the lowest mean ($M= 9.40$, $SD= 4.29$).

As it can be seen, student demotivation levels are different across the two contexts. To see whether these differences are statistically significant, an independent sample t-test was utilized. Table 3 displays the results of the independent-samples *t*-test among the participants of the two groups.

Table 3*The Results of Independent Samples T-test for Determining Differences between the two settings*

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
TEA	4.808	248	.000	3.32	.69045
COC	4.905	248	.000	2.60	.53007
EOF	4.837	248	.000	2.61	.53921
CEN	2.970	248	.003	1.86	.62759
CMA	5.522	248	.000	3.19	.57940
LOI	6.580	248	.000	3.29	.49972
Demotivation	5.888	248	.000	16.87	2.86567

As can be seen, there is a statistically significance between the two groups in terms of six demotivation constructs, i.e., *teachers* ($t=4.80$, $p<0.05$). The same finding was also obtained for *characteristics of classes* ($t= 4.90$, $p<0.05$), *experiences of failure* ($t= 4.83$, $p<0.05$), *classroom environment* ($t=2.97$, $p<0.05$), *classroom*

materials ($t=5.52, p<0.05$), and *lack of interest* ($t=6.58, p<0.05$). In other words, institute students experienced higher levels of demotivation in comparison with university learners.

4. Discussion

As mentioned before, the current study sought to examine whether EFL students' levels of demotivation vary according to the context in which they study in two different contexts of EFL learning in Iran, i.e., language institutes and universities. Although previous studies have been carried out in just one of the above mentioned channels to examine student demotivation, the primary differences between the two contexts stimulated the researchers of the present study to evaluate students' demotivation toward language institutes and universities as separate contexts. The results revealed that, student demotivation is different across the two contexts, i.e., there are significant differences between the two channels regarding six demotivators; teachers, characteristics of classes, experiences of failure, classroom environment, classroom materials, and lack of interest in which students learning English in language institutes experienced higher levels of demotivation than university learners. Individuals study English in language institutes have various inspirations to attend classes such as; enjoying learning English, improving English knowledge, living abroad, finding a related job, comprehending English movies, magazines, newspapers, or scientific texts, and having financial purposes.

Communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching are the two most common methods used in language institutes which are believed to be among best approaches of teaching English in an EFL context due to their characteristics such as; focusing on communication goals and discovery learning, holding learner-centered classes, and using authentic language and materials. It may be inferred that the two methods are inevitably the best ways of teaching English, but some studies revealed that there are many problems using the two methods in an EFL context. Ashari and Zarrin (2014), for instance, conducted a study to see whether or not CLT is an appropriate way of teaching English and found many problems regarding using communicative language teaching in EFL context of Iran. Political and cultural issues, lack of authentic materials, denial of communicative competence, time limit, chosen topics, and teacher-centered classes were among the boundaries regarding adapting CLT in language institutes.

Another controversial issue is that these approaches (designed based on learning preferences of Western culture) do not seem to be in harmony with learning styles and mindsets of students from Eastern culture. Higher levels of demotivation among institute learners can be justified by such constraints. University students on the other hand, are provided with the opportunity to choose the time and the professor of their classes. Most of them are intrinsically motivated to choose one of the three majors regarding English, i. e., ELT, Translation, and Literature.

A study done by Jahedizadeh, Ghanizadeh, and Ghapanchi (forthc.) to compare levels of EFL students' burnout in two contexts of institutes and universities revealed that institute learners experienced higher levels of burnout than university learners. High levels of burnout can lead to students' demotivation which was considered in the present study, but due to the best knowledge of the present researchers, no study to date has been done to explore student demotivation disparities in two different contexts mentioned here. Another study examined EFL learners' perceptions of classroom activities across three different channels of English learning in Iran, namely, high schools, universities, and language institutes (Jahedizadeh, Ghonsooly, Ghanizadeh, & Akbari, 2015). To gauge these perceptions, the researchers made use of the Persian version of the Gentry and Gable's (2001) Students Perceptions of Classroom Activities scale translated and validated by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (2015). The scale measured four perceptions, interest, challenge, choice, and joy. The results indicated that there were significant differences in most perceptions across the three contexts. In particular, it was found that there is a significant difference between interest level of students at universities and institutes.

5. Conclusions and implications

The current study highlighted the role of two different EFL contexts of Iran in having noticeable bearings on students' demotivation regarding the six demotivators; teachers, characteristics of classes, experiences of failure, class environment, class materials, and lack of interest. The results of this study revealed that students' levels of demotivation are significantly different between the two channels. Considering the first demotivator, teachers can adapt methodologies suitable to the context in which they tend to teach in order to enhance students' intrinsic motivation and regarding the second demotivator, characteristics of classes, teachers can provide more opportunities for their students to cooperate in learner-centered classes focusing on the ultimate goal of English as a foreign language context, i. e., being able to communicate in English.

The third demotivator is concerned with internal aspect of demotivation, experiences of failure, which can be used to encourage students toward more attempts with respect to foreign language learning. Teachers can inform students that their past failures are the signs of their future success and help them to utilize such experiences to find weak points in their learning and not to get disappointed after each minor failure which can be considered natural and necessary. The fourth demotivator, class environment, is also another factor which should be taken into account in designing courses for EFL students. Visual and audio facilities as well as internet and computer can facilitate learning and enhance learners' motivation by providing authentic supplementary materials. As far as class materials are concerned, teachers and administrators can adapt more communicative sources of learning which caters students' needs especially in language institutes. Lack of interest as the last demotivator is related to the learners themselves rather than external sources; nevertheless, teachers can motivate or even remotivate their students by providing learner-centered classes, adapting a reflective approach toward teaching English, and using more authentic materials in the classroom.

The present study was carried out to explore different students' levels of demotivation in two EFL contexts of Iran. A few suggestions can be made regarding future study. First, sample sizes in each context larger than those mentioned in this study are recommended to enhance the validity and generalizability of results. Second, no qualitative method such as interview was utilized to collect data. So, other approaches can be employed to collect more reliable data. Third, more demographic variables such as students' gender, age, achievement, and educational level can be considered to have a deeper look into EFL students' demotivation. Finally, the data collection was carried out in only one city in Iran. Data collection from other parts of the country is recommended ensuring more generalizable findings.

6. References

- Alavinia, P., & Sehat, R. (2012). A probe in to the main de-motivating factors among Iranian EFL learners. *Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 15(6), 9-35.
- Arai, K. (2004). What 'demotivates' language learners? Qualitative study on demotivational factors and learners' reactions. *Bulletin of Toyo Gakuen University* 12, 39-47.
- Ashari, N., & Zarrin, N. (2014). Problems in using communicative language teaching in Iran and possible solutions for the degree of M.A. in teaching English as a foreign language. *Technical Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 4(4), 257-266.
- Bednarova, N. (2011). *De-motivating influences for learning English among students on lower stages of 8-year Grammar School*. Diploma thesis, University of Masaryk.
- Chambers, G. N. (1999). *Motivating language learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Longman: Harlow.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom* (p. 143). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667343>
- Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System*, 37, 403-417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.03.004>
- Falout, J., & Maruyama, M. (2004). A comparative study of proficiency and learner demotivation. *The Language*

- Teacher*, 28, 3–9.
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2015). An exploration of EFL learners' perceptions of classroom activities and their achievement goal orientations. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 4(3), 33-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2015.1032>
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (forthcoming). Validating the Persian version of de-motivation scale among Iranian EFL learners and examining its association with burnout and language achievement.
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1992). Students' perceptions of teacher behaviours as motivating and de-motivating factors in college class. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 239-252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369839>
- Gorham, J., & Millette, D. (1997). A comparative analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and de-motivation in college classes. *Communication Education*, 46, 245-261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379099>
- Hasegawa, A. (2004). Student demotivation in the foreign language classroom. *Takushoku Language Studies* 107, 119–136.
- Hirvonen, M. (2010). *Demotivation in learning English among immigrant pupils in the ninth grade of comprehensive school*. Masteral Thesis, University of Jyväskylä.
- Hosseini, S. A., & Jafari, S. M. (2014). Possible de-motivating factors for secondary school students. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 5(3), 188-201.
- Ikeno, O. (2002). Motivating and demotivating factors in foreign language learning: A preliminary investigation. *Ehime University Journal of English Education Research*, 2, 1–19.
- Jahedizadeh, S., Ghanizadeh, A., & Ghapanchi, Z. (forthcoming). An analysis of EFL students' burnout with respect to their gender and educational level. *International Journal of English and Education*.
- Jahedizadeh, S., Ghonsooly, B., Ghanizadeh, A., & Akbari, O. (2015). A cross-contextual analysis of EFL learners' perceptions of classroom activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(4), 322-336.
- Kaivanpanah, Sh., & Ghasemi, Z. (2011). An investigation into sources of De-motivation in second language learning. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 89-110.
- Kikuchi, K., & Sakai, H. (2007). *Japanese learners' demotivation to study English: A survey study*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Molavi, A., & Biria, R. (2013). EFL learning among motivated and de-motivated Iranian seminary. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 6(1), 55-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2013.6.1.4>
- Muhonen, J. (2004). *Second language demotivation: Factors that discourage pupils from learning the English language*. Unpublished Thesis, University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Oxford, R. L. (1998). *The unravelling tapestry: Teacher and course characteristics associated with de-motivation in the language classroom*. *De-motivation in foreign language learning*. Paper presented at the TESOL 98 Congress. Seattle, USA.
- Rudnai, Z. (1996). *Demotivation in learning English among secondary school students in Budapest*. Unpublished Masteral thesis, Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest, Hungary.
- Trang, T. T. T., & Baldauf, R. B. (2007). Demotivation: understanding resistance to English language learning – The case of Vietnamese students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4(1), 79–105.
- Tsuchiya, M. (2006a). Factors in demotivation of lower proficiency English learners at college. *The Kyushu Academic Society of English Language Education (KASELE)*, 34, 87–96.
- Tsuchiya, M. (2006b). Profiling of lower achievement English learners at college in terms of demotivating factors. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan (ARELE)*, 17, 171–180.
- Ushioda, E. (1998). Effective motivational thinking: A cognitive theoretical approach to the study of language learning motivation. In E. A. Soler & V. C. Espurz (Eds.), *Current Issues in English Language Methodology* (pp. 77-89). Spain: Universita Jaume I.
- Williams, M., Burden, R. L., & Lanvers, U. (2002). 'French is the language of love and stuff': student perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28,

504-528. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141192022000005805>

Zhang, Q. (2007). Teacher misbehaviours as learning de-motivators in college classrooms: A cross cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan and the United States. *Communication Education*, 56, 209-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634520601110104>

Appendix

The Sakai and Kikuchi's (2009) Demotivation Scale (Partial reproduction of the scale representing the 10 first items)

NO	factors	True	To some extent true	Not either true or untrue	Mostly not true	Not true
1	I seldom had chances to communicate in English.					
2	Most of the lessons focused on translation.					
3	Most of the lessons focused on grammar.					
4	Most of the lessons were entrance examination oriented.					
5	I was expected to use (or speak and write) grammatically correct English.					
6	I was forced to memorize the sentences in the textbooks too often.					
7	I had difficulty memorizing words and phrases.					
8	I got low scores on tests (such as mid-term and final examinations).					
9	I got lost in how to self-study for English lessons.					
10	The pace of lessons was not appropriate.					