



**British Journal of Education, Society &
Behavioural Science**
6(3): 154-164, 2015, Article no.BJESBS.2015.052
ISSN: 2278-0998



SCIENCEDOMAIN international
www.sciencedomain.org

Iranian Students' De-motivation Factors in EFL Learning

Marzieh Hemmatizad¹, Mohammad Aliakbari^{2*} and Akbar Azizifar¹

¹Department of English Language Teaching, Ilam branch, Islamic Azad University, Ilam, Iran.

²Department of English, Ilam University P.O.Box 516, Ilam 69315, Iran.

Authors' contributions

Authors MA and MH designed the study. Author MA wrote the protocol and supervised the work. Author MH wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors MA and AA edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI:10.9734/BJESBS/2015/15002

Editor(s):

(1) Iria da Cunha, University Institute for Applied Linguistics, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain.

Reviewers:

(1) Anonymous, UAE.

(2) Anonymous, Kuwait.

(3) Anonymous, Malaysia.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=820&id=21&aid=7654>

Original Research Article

Received 1st November 2014
Accepted 20th December 2014
Published 7th January 2015

ABSTRACT

De-motivation is a comparatively recent dimension in motivation research which has received little attention in Iran. To fill such a gap, the present study investigated the possible sources of Iranian students' de-motivation in EFL learning. To find the possible de-motivating factors, a questionnaire developed by [1] consisting of 35 Likert type items and one overall question in relation to students' motivation in learning English was completed by 485 Iranian secondary high school and university students at Ilam city. Based on the result of component analysis with Oblimin rotation, five de-motivation factors of Learning Contents and Materials, Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles, Inadequate School Facilities, Lack of Intrinsic Motivation, and Test Scores were identified. Descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis, and Friedman Test were employed to analyze the collected data. The results indicated that Inadequate School and University Facilities were the main sources of de-motivation for all learners and Lack of Intrinsic Motivation was the main de-motivating factor for less motivated ones.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: maliakbari@hotmail.com;

Keywords: Motivation; de-motivation; de-motivational factors; a-motivation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivation is an important internal element that establishes the evaluation and success of learning a second language (L2). As a vital component in second and foreign language learning, it has been researched widely in the past decades (e.g., [2,3,4,5]). The L2 motivation research has focused mainly on positive influences that energise the learning process, but disregarded the other side of motivation, that is de-motivation. It can be considered as the negative counterparts of motivation. There are many de-motivating factors that have important roles in the process of English language learning and teaching. When learners mislay their interest and eagerness de-motivation may emerge. De-motivation has been widely observed as a crucial issue in English classroom. But there is not a long history of study about de-motivation in language learning.

There are many factors that can make students de-motivated to study English. Dörnyei [2] stated, de-motivation is "specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioural intention or an action"(p. 143). In fact, learners become de-motivated due to many reasons such as unpleasant and difficulty in learning content and materials of foreign language and shortage of facilities in the learning process.

De-motivation has damaging influence on students' foreign language learning processes and outcomes. It is important to consider that de-motivation does not indicate that motivation has been lost completely, but there may be some other motivation influences functioning positively. When motivation has been lost completely it refers to a-motivation.

A-motivation is a term introduced by [6] for the first time. Dörnyei [7] illustrated the notion of a-motivation as "the relative absence of motivation that is not caused by a lack of initial interest but rather by the individual's experiencing feeling of incompetence and haplessness when faced with the activity" (p. 144). As [8] stated people can be a-motivated for four reasons:

Firstly, when they think they lack the ability to perform the behavior; secondly, when they do not consider the strategies to be followed effective enough; thirdly, when they think the effort

required is far too extensive, and fourthly, when they have the general perception that their efforts are inconsequential considering the task (p. 271-360).

English as an international language has recently received more attention throughout the world. English as foreign language is a mandatory language for students to learn in schools and universities in Iranian educational system. Many students do not learn successfully and it is supposed that de-motivation might be an element that can be accounted for some reasons of failure in language learning.

2. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Since the 1950s, research on motivation in second or foreign language learning (L2) has been started. The L2 motivation research has emphasize mainly on positive influences that reinforce the learning process but, the darker side of motivation known as de-motivation which can reduce or cancel out motivation [3] has not received due attention. Stated otherwise, demotivating factors can negatively influence the learner's attitudes and behaviours in learning English language. Therefore, identifying and removing obstacles can be considered as the first stage in the process of learning.

In the Iranian context, English language is taught in the first and second grades of secondary high school and is regarded as a foreign language. English is taught in classes and formal situations in which facilities are inadequate; therefore, learners might confront with very few real-life occasion and insufficient opportunity to learn and communicate in English. It can form the reasons that lead to negative attitude and damaging outcome in the process of learning English. In such conditions, learners experience uninteresting subject matter to be passed and do not regard its importance as a means of communication. Some of the students might lose their interest in learning English due to demotivating factors.

Thus, the present study aimed to probe the issue of de-motivation in Iranian high school and university level and thereby to explain major reasons of this phenomenon. The researchers strive to probe the main de-motivating factors and their respective importance in Iranian context of language learning. As well, it is

important to extract data from more and less motivated learners' answers because there may be a correspondence between learners' motivation degree and de-motivation factors. Therefore, the results can be useful for teachers to adopt certain methods to reduce de-motivating elements.

Drawing upon the issue under study, the present study seeks answer to the following questions:

- (1) What are the possible de-motivating factors in English classes among secondary high school and university students in Iranian context?
- (2) To what extent do less motivated and more motivated learners differ in identifying de-motivating factors?

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous studies stressed on motivation as a key element in language learning and its essential role for successful EFL. According to Dörnyei [3] "The L2 motivation research concentrated on positive forces that energise L2 learning and whose strength is on a continuum from zero to strong. In addition, there are negative forces that de-energise L2 learning" (p. 141). These negative impacts refer to de-motivation. It plays vital role the same as motivation in the learning process. As Sakai and Kikuchi [1] claimed "understanding the cause of de-motivation lends support to understanding theories of motivation" (p. 58). When learners become de-motivated in learning English, research on de-motivation by researchers and teachers to know the causes of this phenomenon becomes an outstanding issue.

Over the past decade, research on de-motivation in the instructional communication domain has received more attention, for example, de-motivating factors in lectures on communication at North American universities [9,10,11]. Their studies concentrated on the negative teacher behaviour that may de-motivate students in university lecture classes.

Dörnyei [7] and Rudnai [12] studied de-motivation in the field of language teaching. According to Dörnyei [3] it is necessary to say that the relationship between negative attitude to the characteristics of teacher (behaviour, personality, competence, and teaching method) and de-motivation reported in the instructional communication domain is "fully consistent with

the obtained results in the L2 field" (p. 145). Following Dörnyei [2] many researchers investigated learners' de-motivation (e.g., [13,14,15,16,17,1]).

Dörnyei [18] utilized a qualitative method and conducted one-to-one structured interviews on 50 de-motivated students of secondary school in Budapest. The analysis of collected data revealed the major de-motivating factors for each student, categorized into nine prominent negative elements. The nine de-motivating factors were: 1) Teacher characteristics such as personality, commitment, competence, and teaching method; 2) Inadequate school facilities (e.g., large class size, unsuitable classes level, frequent change of teachers); 3) Reduced self-confidence (e.g., experience of failure or lack of success); 4) Negative attitude towards the L2; 5) Compulsory nature of L2 study; 6) Interference of another foreign language being studied; 7) Negative attitude towards L2 community; 8) Attitudes of group members; 9) Course book used in class. Dörnyei's de-motivating factors have been considered as a standard pattern in developing questionnaires and interviews in conducting researches on de-motivation.

Dörnyei [2] described de-motivation as special external powers that diminish the level of motivation. He listed two internal factors that reduce interest to L2 learning. These both internal factors ('reduced self-confidence' and 'negative attitude towards the L2') were the two major sources of de-motivation. But, there is a conflict with his prior definition of de-motivation. As well there was not agreement among researchers about the reasons of de-motivation were only external ones. Researchers (e.g., [13,19,20,21]; as cited in [1] claimed that internal elements such as lack of self-assurance and negative attitudes towards the foreign language may also conclude in de-motivation.

In this regard, Arai [13] conducted an open-ended questionnaire on 33 high proficient students whose majors were English. The researcher gathered 105 comments of participants in which their de-motivating experiences and instant reactions related to those experiences were explained. The researcher categorized the following factors as causes of de-motivation: (a) teachers' behaviour or personality (46%), (b) classes being boring or monotonous (36.2%), (c) class atmospheres (13.3%), and others (3.8%).

In Finland, Muhonen [14] studied the major de-motivation factors in relation to students' gender and level of achievement. This study did not focus on de-motivation as one constituent of motivation. The researcher analyzed 91 ninth-grade students' comments about the issues considered as negatives elements on their motivation and interest to learn English language. Thus, the following de-motivating factors were identified: a) The teacher, b) Learning material, d) Learner characteristics, e) School environment, and f) Students' attitude towards English. The finding also indicated that 'the teacher' was the most prominent de-motivating factor and 'the attitude towards English' was considered as the least one.

Another study was conducted by Falout and Falout [15] to investigate Japanese student's de-motivating factors in English language classes through a survey of existing literature. The common de-motivating factors were: a) Teacher's behaviour; b) their sticking too much to one thing; c) focusing on abstract rules without usage, context, application; d) Incomprehensible tasks; e) inappropriate level or space that have been reported by the students as the de-motivating factors. The result also revealed that teacher behaviour was one of the most damaging factors on students' motivation.

Moreover, Trang and Baldauf [16] examined three major issues: (a) the cause of de-motivation, (b) the extent of influence of different de-motivating factors, and (c) students' experiences in overcoming de-motivation. The researchers used the case study method for this investigation and collected data from 100 university students in Vietnam. Internal and external attributions derived from data as de-motivational factors. Internal de-motives comprised students' attitudes towards English, their experiences of failure or absence of success, and events related to their self-esteem. The external factors were factors related to 'the teacher', the learning atmosphere, and other external factors. Students assigned 36% of de-motivation to internal factors and 64% of de-motivation referred to external factors. Among external elements teacher-related factors were the main sources of de-motivation whereas among internal factors, students' experiences of failure or absence of success were the most important elements.

Following Dörnyei [2] definition of de-motivation, Sakai and Kikuchi [17] conducted a study that

focused on specific external forces that Japanese high school students may experience and cause their motivation to be reduced. The researchers employed a 35-item questionnaire to collect quantitative data. One hundred and twelve learners of English took part in the study. Five factors emerged from data: 1) course books, 2) inadequate school facilities, 3) test scores, 4) Lacking of Communicative methods, and 5) teachers' competence and teaching style. The finding indicated that inadequate school facilities factor was less de-motivating than other stated factors.

In another investigation, Sakai and Kikuchi [1] investigated common de-motivating factors among 656 Japanese high school students through the same 35-item questionnaire. Based on factor analysis, five de-motivation factors extracted 1) Learning Content and Materials, 2) Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles, 3) Inadequate School Facilities, 4) Lack of Intrinsic Motivation, and 5) Test Scores. The finding demonstrated that Learning Contents and Materials and Test Scores were major de-motivating factors. Unlike their previous study, in the current study Teachers' competence and Teaching Styles were not considered as main factors. The results also revealed that there were statistically significant differences between more and less motivated groups for three factors; namely Learning Contents and Materials, Test Scores, and Lack of Intrinsic Motivation whereas for other de-motivating factors such as Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles and Inadequate School Facilities a significant difference was not found. Both groups did not perceive Inadequate School Facilities as de-motivating factor.

Along the same line, Alavinia and Sehat [22] studied the common de-motivating factors of EFL learners of Iran. The researchers utilized a questionnaire developed by [1,23,14]. The second questionnaire was an open-ended question about what factors contribute to de-motivation of students and was completed by teachers. The results of the study suggested that both internal and external factors could de-motivate learners. The findings of the study revealed that there is no significant difference among the classes except for items related to the teacher's personality and behaviour and also learner's experience of failure, and learner's lack of success. The results also indicated that there were no significant differences among majors except for the items attending to the effect of

teacher's personality and behaviour and the learners' experience of failure.

In addition, another study was conducted by Moiiinvaziri and Razmjoo [24]. The researchers investigated the de-motivating factors influencing Iranian university students. Thirty undergraduate students were interviewed and a 35-item questionnaire was extracted from interviews. Five factors emerged from data: a) setback in system of education, b) lack of extrinsic motivation, c) methods and personality of teachers, d) lack of self-esteem and intrinsic motivation, and e) lack of given importance in society. The results indicated that setback in education system was the most influential and lack of extrinsic motivation was the least influential factor on learners' de-motivation.

A review of the available literature on de-motivation proposed a need for further research in this field. In Iranian context, the research on de-motivation does not seem to be enough and researchers have recently started investigating it. The previous related literature review indicated that many studies conducted on university students and few studies included secondary high school. Thus in the current study both university and secondary high school students were approached for the study.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Participants

The study included 485 Iranian students of university and secondary high school. This sample included both male and female with different majors, and different levels of education. All the participants who took part in the present study were selected through convenience sampling, sometimes called accidental or opportunity sampling which involves choosing the nearest individuals or those who happen to be available and accessible at the time. The high school participants in the study included 309 students (161 male and 148 female) across 9 secondary high schools (4 secondary high schools for girls and 5 secondary high schools for boys) with different majors such as Humanities, Experimental Sciences, and Mathematics. The university participants included Bachelor degree students (54 male and 122 female) across 3 prominent universities (Ilam University, Payam-e-nour, and Institute of Applied Science Technology of Ilam) with four different educational fields; Biology, Social

Sciences, Chemistry, and Law. See Table 1 for further details.

4.2. Instruments and Materials

The main instrument in the study was the EFL de-motivational questionnaire were designed to measure five categories derived from study of [1]: (a) Learning Contents and Materials, (b) Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles, (c), Inadequate School Facilities, (d) Lack of Intrinsic Motivation), and (e) Test Scores. The second part of questionnaire included one general question related to motivation in learning English. "How motivated are you to learn English?" The participants were asked to select one of the options: 1. I have almost no motivation; 2. I have a little motivation; 3. I have moderate motivation; 4. I have high motivation. According to the participants' answers less and more motivated learners were identified. The reliability coefficients of the instrument ranged from .77 to .83 indicating reasonably high internal consistencies. In this study, the reliability coefficients for the five factors (Learning Contents and Materials, Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles, Inadequate School and University Facilities, Lack of Intrinsic Motivation, and Test Scores) was computed by Cronbach's alpha. The result indicated reliability of these factors was .89. Since the questionnaire was developed for a different context, it was validated through experts' judgment. That is, Iranian university professors were consulted and they approved its appropriacy for Iranian context as well.

4.3 Data Collection Procedure

Prior to the study, the questionnaire was translated to Persian to ease the process of responding. Three EFL students read the translated items and provided feedback on their comprehensibility. The study started after gaining the agreement of Education office of Ilam city and Ilam University, Payam-e-nour University, and Institute of Applied Science Technology of Ilam. The second two weeks of April 2014 was allocated to administering the questionnaire. Before the administration of the questionnaire in classes, the participants were informed of the objectives and instructions for completing questionnaire. One researcher was present for clarifying any ambiguity the instructions.

4.4 Data Analysis Procedure

The current study employed the survey method that included quantitative method for gathering data. To do the quantitative analysis, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were utilized to analyse the obtained data. Descriptive statistics were processed to calculate the frequency and per cent of each variable of the study and options selected by students in relation to de-motivation factors. To answer the research questions, inferential statistics of non-parametric Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal Wallis, and Friedman tests were computed.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table (1) illustrates the descriptive statistics including frequency and percentage of students based on gender, educational level, major, and educational field.

Analysis of the data indicated that 485 participants took part in this study. These participants comprised 215 males (44.3%) and 270 females (55.7%) in both secondary high school and university. Findings revealed that of 485 participants, 309 (63.7%) participants were students of secondary high school and 176(36.3%) participants were university students. After categorizing the educational level of participants in the secondary high school into sophomore 137(28.2%) and junior 172(35.5%) and Bachelor degree 176(36.3%) in the university, the frequency and percentage of each category were computed. The obtained results also indicated that out of 309 participants in the secondary high school, 121 (24.9%) participants studied Experimental Science , 101 (20.8%) participants studied Mathematics, and 87 (17.9%) studied Humanities. As well as out of 176 participants in the university, 26 (5.4%) participants studied Biology, 50 (10.3%) participants studied Chemistry, 62 (12.8%) studied Law, and 38 (7.8%) studied Social Science.

5.2 Inferential Statistics

In this section, different statistical tests were employed to statistically respond research questions of the study. Since the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated that de-motivating factors do not follow the normality

distribution, to investigate this question non-parametric Friedman test was employed.

5.2.1 De-motivating factors in English class among secondary high school and university students in Iranian context

The first research question of the study was: "What are the possible de-motivating factors in English classes among secondary high school and university students in Iranian context?" To answer this question, the researchers subdivided it into three sections. In fact, de-motivating factors were investigated among university students, secondary high school students, and total groups.

As Table (2) illustrates, based on the obtained mean rank in total groups (university and school students), Inadequate School and University Facilities, Learning Contents and Materials, Lack of Intrinsic Motivation, Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles, and Test Scores respectively were identified as de-motivating factors. The significance level of this analysis equals 0.000, which is lower than $p < 0.05$. As a result, there was a statistically significant difference among de-motivating factors in learning English of university and school students. The second research question in the study was: "To what extent do less motivated and more motivated learners differ in identifying de-motivating factors?" To investigate this research question, two sections were provided in which differences in de-motivating factors were analysed between less and more motivated students in university and secondary high school that are respectively discussed in the following sections.

5.2.2 Differences in de-motivating factors among less motivated students in the university and secondary high school

To analyse whether five de-motivating factors differ among less motivated learners, Mann-Whitney U test was run. The participants who answered *I have almost no motivation or I have a little motivation* were grouped as less motivated learners.

As Table (3) reveals the obtained significance level of all factors except factor Lack of Intrinsic Motivation is higher than $p < 0.05$, so, there is a statistically significant difference for the factor Lack of Intrinsic Motivation that is why it was

perceived as de-motivation factor among less motivated learners.

5.2.3 Differences in de-motivating factors among more motivated students in the university and secondary high school

To examine whether five de-motivating factors differ among more motivated learners, Mann-Whitney U Test was also run. Based on the

answers to the question about motivation to study English, more motivated learners were those who responded *I have moderate motivation or I have high motivation.*

As can be observed in Table (4), the obtained significance level for all factors is higher than $p < 0.05$. Therefore, there were not significance differences among more motivated students in total groups in relation to de-motivating factors.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage of students based on gender, educational level, and major in secondary high school and university

		F	Percent
Gender	Male	215	44.3
	Female	270	55.7
Level of education	Sophomore	137	28.2
	Junior	172	35.5
	Bachelor Degree	176	36.3
Major	Secondary high school	Experimental sciences	121 24.9
		Humanities	101 20.8
		Mathematics	87 17.9
Educational Field	University	Biology	26 5.4
		Chemistry	50 10.3
		Law	62 12.8
		Social Sciences	38 7.8

Table 2. Friedman Test to investigate university, school, and Total students' view in identifying de-motivating factors

	De-motivating factors	N	Mean rank	Std. deviation	Chi-square	Df	Sig
University	Learning contents and materials	176	3.40	.69660	106.053	4	0.000
	Teachers' competence and teaching styles	176	2.72	1.01928			
	Inadequate university facilities	176	3.87	.97750			
	Test Scores	176	2.48	1.00103			
	Lack of intrinsic motivation	176	2.53	1.18777			
Secondary High School	Learning contents and materials	309	3.48	.68121	225.038	4	0.000
	Teachers' competence and teaching styles	309	2.41	.98074			
	Inadequate school facilities	309	3.93	.98074			
	Test scores	309	2.48	1.08934			
	Lack of intrinsic motivation	309	2.70	1.36156			
Total	Learning contents and materials	485	3.45	.68636	325.182	4	0.000
	Teachers' competence and teaching styles	485	2.52	.99638			
	Inadequate school and university facilities	485	3.91	.96560			
	Test scores	485	2.48	1.05979			
	Lack of intrinsic motivation	485	2.64	1.30004			

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U Test for less motivated students in both groups

De-motivating factors		N	Mean rank	Sum of rank	St. Deviation	Mann-Whitney u	Z	Sig
Learning contents and materials	Pupils	83	63.22	5247.50		1724.50	-0.097	0.923
	College Students	42	62.56	2627.50				
	Total	125			.66390			
Teachers' competence and teaching styles	Pupils	83	60.82	50.48		1562	-0.948	0.343
	College Students	42	67.31	2827				
	Total	125			.88106			
Inadequate school and university facilities	Pupils	83	62.63	5198		1712	-0.163	0.871
	College Students	42	63.74	2677				
	Total	125			.81166			
Test scores	Pupils	83	63.67	5284.50		1687.50	-0.291	0.771
	College Students	42	61.68	2590.50				
	Total	125			.83645			
Lack of intrinsic motivation	Pupils	83	67.49	5602		1370	-1.968	0.049
	College Students	42	54.12	2273				
	Total	125			1.04701			

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Test for more motivated students in both groups

De-motivating factors		N	Mean rank	Sum of rank	St. deviation	Mann-Whitney u	Z	Sig
Learning contents and materials	Pupils	226	182.60	41268.50		14666.50	-0.499	0.618
	College Students	134	176.95	23711.50				
	Total	360			.67065			
Teachers' competence and teaching styles	Pupils	226	174.93	39534		13883	-1.321	0.187
	College Students	134	189.90	25446				
	Total	360			1.00428			
Inadequate school and university facilities	Pupils	226	184.86	41778.5		14156.50	-1.036	0.300
	College Students	134	173.15	23201.5				
	Total	360			1.01256			
Test scores	Pupils	226	172.67	39023		13372	-1.857	0.063
	College Students	134	193.71	25957				
	Total	360			1.06515			
Lack of intrinsic motivation	Pupils	226	172.83	39059		13408	-1.822	0.068
	College Students	134	193.44	25921				
	Total	360			1.21263			

6. DISCUSSION

As observed in the Result section, the mean ranks of five de-motivating factors were provided. The Inadequate school and university facilities and Test scores had the highest and the lowest

mean rank respectively. This implies that the 'Inadequate School and University Facilities' factor is the most prominent factor in L2 learning and the lowest degree belonged to the 'Test Scores' factor. In other words, computer equipment, visual material (such as videos and

DVDs), Internet, Learning Language (LL) equipment, and audio materials (such as CDs and tapes) were facilities which supposed to be inadequate and were the main sources of de-motivation. The findings supported the study conducted by Dörnyei [18] and Sakai and Kikuchi [1] in which inadequate school facilities were reported as one of the major de-motivating factors.

'Learning contents and materials' was the second source of students' de-motivation. This indicates that lack of chances to communicate in English, focusing on translation and grammar, forcing to memorize the sentences in the text books, uninteresting and old topics of the English passages, and difficulty in interpreting English sentences were considered as de-motivated elements in L2 learning. This finding is in line with the studies conducted by [18,19,14,1] which considered students' de-motivation in relation to the learning contents and materials.

'Lack of Intrinsic Motivation' was the third source of de-motivation in the students' English learning experiences. In fact, English as a compulsory lesson, losing the purpose of studying English, and lack of interest in English formed students' negative attitude towards foreign language learning in the present study. The compulsory nature of language learning reduced the students' motivation because they are forced to learn the language to pass examination rather than learning interaction with the second language community.

Unlike the previous studies, in this study it was found that 'Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles (teachers' methods and behaviours) was the fourth source of de-motivation. In the studies of [18,14,1] 'The teacher' (teachers' lack of Competence, Teaching Styles, personality, behaviours, and teaching methods) was found as the prominent factor of de-motivation in learning a second or foreign language but, for Iranian language learners, Inadequate School and University Facilities was important element.

Finally, 'Test Scores' was the last source of de-motivation. This de-motivating factor comprised the items such as difficulty in memorizing words and phrases as well taking low marks in examinations. Therefore, unsuccessful experiences in language learning negatively affected students' motivation. In current study 'Test Scores' was not considered as an influential

element in the process of EFL learning in Iranian context.

Moreover, as illustrated in Table (3), there were not statistically significant differences between less motivated and more motivated learners for four factors (Learning Contents and Materials, Teachers' Competence and teaching styles, Test Scores, and Inadequate School Facilities), whereas there was a statistically significant difference for the other factor (Lack of Intrinsic Motivation) among less motivated students. It can be argued that participants with almost no or a little motivation found the 'Lack of Intrinsic Motivation' to be more de-motivating factor than participants with moderate and high motivation. 'Lack of Interesting Motivation' may be considered as internal element that is consistent with findings of [1] study in which they claimed that "internal forces cannot be ignored as de-motivating factors"(p. 67). Also their study revealed that this factor was as a main source of de-motivation for less motivated learners. As can be seen in Table (4), the results of analysis revealed that none of the five de-motivating factors were considered as de-motivating factors for more motivated students in both groups.

7. CONCLUSION

To conclude, the current study intended to investigate students' de-motivation factors in EFL learning in Iranian context. In line with Sakai and Kikuchi [1] study, the result of factor analysis with Oblimin rotation showed that de-motivating questionnaire consisted of five factors: Learning contents and materials, Teachers' competence and teaching styles, Inadequate School Facilities, Lack of Intrinsic Motivation, and Test Scores. The findings of the existing study indicated that the essence of de-motivation in EFL learning among Iranian learners supported the repeating of five de-motivating factors structure of de-motivating questionnaire of [1] study.

The results indicated that 'inadequate school and university facilities' is the primary sources of students' de-motivation. Thus, the educational system of Iranian context should provide the facilities that seem to be insufficient in secondary high school and university to help students feel better about learning language. The finding also indicated that 'Lack of Intrinsic Motivation' was identified as an important de-motivating factor for learners with low motivation and more motivated learners did not perceive five factors as de-

motivating elements. Therefore, teachers should provide some strategies such as encouragement or setting goals for future tests for students with low motivation to cope with their de-motivation.

The results of this research can be useful for teachers who observe students becoming de-motivated in learning EFL in their classrooms. In addition, the obtained results can provide a policy for relevant authorities such as Ministry of Education, university instructors and students themselves to reduce de-motivation. Regarding the limitations, the current research is limited to the EFL context in Ilam, so it can be replicated to other regions. Likewise, the researchers included less and more motivated learners in the study, so it is better to exclude the participants who may not be de-motivated in EFL learning which may influence the results of the study. In the present study, de-motivating factors were investigated by applying a de-motivating questionnaire restricted to 35 items, future studies can discover the other de-motivating elements similar to instruments such as writing task and interview can be utilized. To survey the wide dimension, it is proposed to be considered other orientations which have not been regarded in the study such as the relationship between learners' de-motivation and their age, proficiency levels, anxiety, and motivation levels.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Sakai H, Kikuchi K. An analysis of de-motivators in the EFL classroom System. *An International Journal of Educational Technologies and Applied Linguistics*. 2009;37:57-69. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.09.005>
2. Dörnyei Z. *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
3. Dörnyei Z. *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman. 2001;141-155.
4. Gardner RC. *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold; 1985.
5. Oxford RL, Shearin J. *Language learning motivation; expanding the theoretical framework*. *Modern Language Journal*. 1994;78:12-28. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/329249>
6. Deci EL, Ryan RM. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum; 1985.
7. Dörnyei Z. *Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom*. *Modern Language Journal*. 1994;73(3):273-284.
8. Vallerand RJ. *Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation*. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic. 1997;271-360.
9. Gorham J, Christophel DM. *Students' perceptions of teacher behaviors as motivating and de-motivating factors in college class*. *Communication Quarterly*. 1992;40:239-252. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369839>
10. Gorham J, Christophel DA. *Test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher immediacy and perceived sources of motivation in college classes*. *Communication Education*. 1995;44:292-306.
11. Gorham J, Millette D. *A comparative of analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and de-motivation in college classes*. *Communication Education*. 1997;46:245-261. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379099>
12. Rudnai Z. *De-motivation in learning English among secondary school students in Budapest*, (Unpublished M.S. thesis), Eötvös Lorand University, Budapest, Hungary; 1996.
13. Arai K. *What 'de-motivates' language learning? Qualitative study on de-motivational factors and learners' reactions*. *Bulletin of Toyo Gakuen University*. 2004;12:39-47.
14. Muhonen J. *Second language de-motivation: Factors that discourage pupils from learning the English language*. (Unpublished pro graduate thesis); 2004.
15. Falout J, Falout M. *The other side of motivation: Learner De- motivation*. Tokyo. *JALT*. 2004;280-289.
16. Trang TTT, Baldauf RB. *De-motivation: Understanding resistance to English language learning- the case of Vietnam students*. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. 2007;4(1):79-105.

17. Sakai H, Kikuchi K. Japanese learners' de-motivation to study English: A survey study. *JALT Journal*. 2007;31(2):183-204.
18. Dörnyei Z. Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*. 1998;31:117-135. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X>
19. Falout J, Maruyam M. A comparative study of proficiency and learner de-motivation. *The Language Teacher*. 2004;28(8):403-417.
20. Kojima S. English learning de-motivation in Japanese EFL students: Research in de-motivational patterns from the qualitative research results of three different types of high schools (Unpublished Master Thesis). Kwansai Gakuin University, Hyogo, Japan; 2004.
21. Tsuchiya M. Profiling of lower achievement English learners at college in terms of de-motivating factors. *Annual Rev. English Language Education*. Japan. 2006;17:171-180.
22. Alavinia P, Sehat R. A probe in to the main de-motivating factors among Iranian EFL learners. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education. 2012;15(6):9-35. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n6.p9>
23. Warrington S. The passivity de-motivation inventory. Centre for English Language Education, Asia University; 2007.
24. Moinvaziri M, Razmjoo SA. De-motivating factors affecting undergraduate learners of non-English majors studying general English: A case of Iranian EFL context. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*. 2014;5(4):41-61.

© 2015 Hemmatizad et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=820&id=21&aid=7654>