Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards Demotivational Factors in Najafabad Institutes

Behnaz Babadi, M.A., English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

Marzieh Rafiee*, Assistant Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

rafieemarzieh@gmail.com

Abstract

In this study, the researchers examined the sources of demotivation among adult language teachers in Najafabad language institutes. Two objectives were pursued in the process of implementing this research: 1) Determining the main sources of demotivation among adult teachers teaching in Najafabad language institutes 2) Uncovering the most significant demotivating factors among English adult teachers in Najafabad. Based on convenience sampling, seventy male and female teachers were chosen as the participants of this study. The questionnaire used in this study, Teacher Demotivation Questionnaire (TDQ), contained four parts: students' attitudes in class (SAC), teaching materials and facilities (TMF), research and working condition (RWC) and human relations (HR). Fifty copies of the questionnaire were distributed among the teachers. One-sample t-test was utilized to examine the statistical significance of the analyses. Comparing the findings, the most demotivating factors in SAC, TMF, RWC and HR were "Students are not interest in studying", "low teacher evaluation from students", "low pay" and "little appreciation from the administration", respectively. Among four subsections of the questionnaire, "students' attitude" and "research and working conditions" were more influential and regarded as more effective demotivating factors.

Keywords*: Attitude, Demotivation, Demotivating Factors, Motivation, Motivating Factors.*

Introduction

There are many factors which affect language learning and teaching process. One of the most important ones is motivation which plays a crucial role in both learning and teaching a language. Teachers and students believe that motivation is a key factor that has significant influence on rate and success of second or foreign language learning (FLL). Motivation arises from social psychology because learning a new language cannot be separated from learner's social tendency towards the target community and therefore students with higher motivation are more successful in language learning (Ely, 1986; Gardner, 2000).

Woldwoski (1985, p. 2) defined motivation as "the processes that can (a) arouse and instigate behavior, (b) give direction or purpose to behavior, (c) continue to allow behavior to persist, and (d) lead to choosing or preferring a particular behavior". Although there are different definitions of motivation (see for example, Alderman, 1990; Dornyei, 1994; Ellis, 1997), it can be said that motivation is relative. A person may have high motivation for doing an activity and low motivation for another activity.

In contrast to motivation and motivating factors, are demotivation and demotivating factors (Dornyei, 2001). Demotivation is the lack of motivation in doing an activity. A demotivated learner is someone who was initially motivated but because of some specific reasons, he/she lost the motivation. Demotives (demotivating factors) are other side of motives

(motivating factors). While a motive increases the effort and willingness to achieve a purpose, a demotive decreases it.

For doing a high qualified job, teachers need to be motivated. The quality of teaching plays a vital role in development and maintenance of an intelligent informant citizenry (MCEETYIA, 1999). Teachers' motivation is a very important phenomenon which determines the quality of teaching and student's outcome. Latham and Pinder (2005, p. 486) defined work motivation as "a set of energetic factors that originates both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration".

According to Sugino (2010), in order to have a high qualified educational system, teachers' job must be rewarding. Rewarding does not only mean high salary and economic advantages, but it means job satisfaction. Teachers feel motivated when they see students are learning and they are motivated and have progressed.

Motivation in second language (L2) learning is one of the areas of individual difference that has been investigated extensively (Ellis, 2001). Demotivation is another factor for Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research which is an important side of motivation. Many teachers complain about their relations with their students, students' parents and their colleagues, their privacy and comfort in their classes and offices, low salary and many more difficulties they may encounter every day. These difficulties put a lot of stress and pressure on them and will affect their performance and the achievement of themselves and their students.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on the issue of learners' motivation (see for example, Gardner, 1985; Williams & Burden, 1997; Dornyei, 2001; Mahmoodi, Kalantari & Ghaslani, 2014) and learners' demotivation (for example Bednarova, 2011; Kaivanpanah & Ghasemi, 2011; Atkinson, 1997). However, little research studies ever exist on the issue of teachers' motivation (Vural, 2007) and even less on teachers' demotivation (Fattash, 2013). The questions raised here are 'what are the main sources of Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' demotivation' and 'what are the possible resolutions for removing those demotivation'?. Taking previous studies in the field as a starting point, the present study aims to explore the teachers' attitude towards the demotivating factors and their suggestions for removing those determined demotives.

There have been many studies related to teachers or students' motivation in Iran (see for example, Lashkarian & Sayadian, 2015; Zohoorian, 2015; Kazerouni & Sadighi, 2014). However, a few studies have been done on teachers or students' demotivating factors (Alavinia & Sehat, 2012; GhalibafSani, 2011). Although demotivation is a complex and new issue, it is a very helpful subject because language instructors, principals or even students may want to know and understand why the teachers or students become demotivated in their classroom and by understanding the reasons of students and teachers' demotives and removing them, teaching and learning process of second or foreign language (FL) will become more effective, exciting and interesting.

Literature Review
Sources of Demotivation

Dornyei (2005, P. 143) defines demotivation as "specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action". Deci and Ryan (1985) use a similar term (amotivation), which means, "the relative absence of motivation that is not caused by a lack of initial interest but rather by the individuals experiencing feelings of incompetence and helplessness when faced with the activity". Yan (2009) differentiates between

the two terms in the sense that amotivation is related to general outcomes and expectations that are unrealistic for some reason, whereas demotivation concerns specific external causes. He further explains that a demotivated learner is someone who was once motivated but has lost his or her commitment or interest for some reason. Demotives are counterparts of motives.

Kiziltepe (2008) conducted a study to examine sources of motivation and demotivation among teachers at a public university in Istanbul. The results showed that students are the main source of motivation and demotivation. Willos (2011) states that overcrowded classrooms have more negative effects than any positive. They cause disturbance for students, embarrassment for some to participate and in general the students' development, confidence and understanding. In addition to that it is a source of stress for the teacher.

Geitenbeek (2011) argues that overcrowded classroom can negatively affect both teachers and students. They can increase the teacher's burn-out rate, stress and exhaustion and can put strain, both physically and mentally on the teacher. Lynch (2008) lists three critical problems in English language learning and teaching. They are lack of learner motivation, insufficient time, resources and materials and finally overcrowded classrooms. Menyhart (2008) states that stress can be the most demotivating factor that can sometimes prevent teachers from adequate teaching.

Tziava (2003) contends that the more motivated the teacher is, the more he/she would be successful in giving the students the right guidelines which will lead them to the acquiring of the target language. He continues to say that a motivated teacher provides more motivating learning experiences and thus, produces more well prepared and motivated students of the target language. Csikszentmilhalyi (1997) states that only motivated teachers can produce motivated learners.

Dornyei (2001, p. 165) aptly states that "teaching is one of the most stressful professions". This is true in the case of university teachers as well. Ofoegbu (2004) concludes that motivation could be viewed as any force that could reduce tension, stress, worries and frustration arising from a problematic situation in a person's life. Further, he explains that teacher motivation could be referred to as those factors that operate within the school system which if not made available to the teacher could hamper performance, cause stress, discontentment and frustration all of which subsequently reduce classroom effectiveness and students' quality output.

Taking the studies reviewed above as the starting point, the first and the most important purpose of this study was to investigate the ideas of Iranian EFL language teachers about demotivating factors. This study aimed to find the sources of anxiety, limitation and all the intrinsic and extrinsic factors which negatively affect learners and teachers' performance and finally affect the educational system. It highlighted the teachers' worries that are related to educational setting and interfere with the process of teaching and learning. To conduct the current study two research questions have been formulated as follows:

Q1. What are the main sources of demotivation among adult teachers in Najafabad English institutes?

Q2. Which source of demotivation has the most significant effect on English adult teachers in Najafabad English institutes?

Methodology

Participants

Twenty five female and male teachers were chosen randomly from a number of ninty English language teachers who were teaching English in a private institute in Najafabad. Nine male teachers were in their twenties, fifteen male teachers were in their thirties and one male teacher was in his forties. Thirteen female teachers were in their twenties, ten in their thirties and two female teachers were in their forties. All the teachers except one were from Najafabad and

suburb and living there, teaching adults at different levels from basic to advance. Thirty three teachers had B.A. or studying B.A., fifteen teachers M.A. or studying M.A. and two teachers were studying PhD.

Instrument

For the purpose of answering the research questions, a questionnaire has been used in this study. This Teacher Demotivation Questionnaire (TDQ) was developed by Sugino (2010) and it was adopted from Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) designed by Hughes (2006) and consists of four subcategories as: students' attitudes in class, teaching materials and facilities, research and working condition and human relationships. Items related to students' attitudes in class were driven from a study which was taken from the sixteen participants in open-ended questions by Sugino (2010). The internal consistency measure for the different parts of the questionnaire (students' attitudes in class, teaching materials and facilities, research and working condition and human relationships) were .85, .92, .78, and .83, respectively. To establish the validity of the questionnaire, five TEFL and Psychology professors were consulted prior to the distribution of the questionnaires.

Procedure

First, fifty copies of the questionnaire were distributed among the teachers. The researcher explained the study's goal and answered teachers' questions about the questionnaire's subcategories and the possible resolution to remove the demotivating factors. Also the way of scoring was explained (All the scales were scored from five (strongly demotivate) to one (least demotivate) and for the items that participants skip, zero was put). The participants were asked to highlight the most demotivating factor from their own point of views. After one week, the researcher collected the questionnaires and data was tabulated and entered into SPSS. Descriptive and inferential statistics for all the questions were reported and analyzed.

Data analysis and results

To find the answers to the research questions of the study, both descriptive and inferential statistics were exploited. More specifically, the frequency counts and percentages of the choices for each questionnaire item were counted and subsequently a mean score for each item was calculated. One-sample t-test was utilized to examine the statistical significance of the analyses. Moreover, to compare female and male teachers with respect to demotivating factors, a series of independent-samples t-test was conducted.

The first research question

The first research question of the current study was formulated to investigate what the main sources for teacher's demotivation of adult teachers in Najafabad institutions were. Accordingly, a questionnaire was employed for this purpose. The results of the questionnaire are displayed in the following. Since each choice in this Likert-scale questionnaire carried a point (Strongly demotivative = 5, Pretty demotivative = 4, Neutral = 3, Not so much demotivative = 2, and Least demotivative = 1), the mean score of each questionnaire item was compared against the average score of the choices (that is 3). This would mean that if the mean score of a questionnaire item was less than 3, the teachers believed that factor was less demotivative. On the other hand, a mean score more than 3 showed the higher degrees of demotivation. The results obtained from each of the four parts of the questionnaire, i.e. students' attitudes in class (SAC), teaching

materials and facilities (TMF), research and working conditions (RWC), and human relations (HR), are presented in separate tables.

Table 1. *Results of Teacher Demotivation Pertinent to the SAC*

No.	Statements	Frequency/Percent	Strongly demotivative	Pretty demotivative	Neutral	No so much demotivative	Least demotivative	Mean
1	Students talk to each other	Frequency Percent	3 6%	13 26%	25 50%	9 18%	0 0%	3.20
2	Students use cell-phones	Frequency Percent	12 24%	11 22%	17 34%	7 14%	3 6%	3.44
3	Students forget to do homework	Frequency Percent	13 26%	21 42%	11 22%	5 10%	0 0%	3.84
4	Students forget to bring textbooks/dictionaries	Frequency Percent	3 6%	15 30%	21 42%	11 22%	0 0%	3.20
5	Students sleep	Frequency Percent	17 34%	20 40%	1 2%	11 22%	1 2%	3.82
6	Students are not interested in studying	Frequency Percent	25 50%	18 36%	3 6%	1 2%	3 6%	4.22
7	Students are not interested in foreign languages	Frequency Percent	19 38%	17 34%	12 24%	1 2%	1 2%	4.04
8	Students take a rebellious attitude	Frequency Percent	19 38%	21 42%	3 6%	7 14%	0 0%	4.04
9	Students give negative comments	Frequency Percent	8 16%	23 46%	11 22%	3 6%	5 10%	3.52
10	Students do not do group work	Frequency Percent	10 20%	23 46%	12 24%	0 0%	5 10%	3.66
11	Students show different attitudes toward female/male teachers	Frequency Percent	12 24%	13 26%	11 22%	7 14%	7 14%	3.32

| 1 2 | Students do not verbally respond | Frequency Percent | 14 28% | 22 44% | 9 38% | 2 4% | 3 6% | 3.84 |

The mean score for the first questionnaire item was 3.20, indicating that there was a marked tendency among the teachers to consider "students' talk in class" as a demotivating factor. The fact that the mean score of the second item was greater than the average of the five choices (i.e. 3.44 > 3.00) paved the way for making a conclusion implying that most of the teachers were of the opinion that students' use of cell phones in class was also a demotivating factor. Thirteen (26%) teachers also considered the third questionnaire item, which stated students forget to do homework, as strongly demotivate and 21 teachers (42%) deemed it to be pretty demotivative; this was also verified through the mean score obtained for this item (M = 3.84). In fact, all the other questionnaire items related to SAC (items 4 t0 12) had mean scores well above 3.00, which shows that all the factors therein (e.g. students forget to bring textbooks/dictionaries, students sleep, students are not interested in studying/foreign languages, students take a rebellious attitude, students give negative comments, students do not do group work, students show different attitudes toward female teachers, and students do not verbally respond) were considered to be demotivative. Among these factors, items 6, 7 and 8 received the highest mean scores (M = 4.04) and (4.22), and thus it could be inferred that for the teachers under investigation, students' lack of interest in studying and foreign languages and their rebellious attitudes were more demotivating than any other factor listed in items 1 – 12.

Table 2. *Results of Teacher Demotivation Pertinent to the TMF*

No.	Statements	Frequency/Percent	Strongly demotivative	Pretty demotivative	Neutral	No so much demotivative	Least demotivative	Mean
1 3	Discrepancy between teacher's expectation and students'	Frequency Percent	5 10%	25 50%	9 18%	7 14%	4 8%	3.40
1 4	Low teacher evaluation from students	Frequency Percent	14 28%	22 44%	10 20%	3 6%	1 2%	3.90
1 5	Abilities differ greatly in one class	Frequency Percent	3 6%	26 52%	18 36%	2 4%	1 2%	3.56
1 6	Large class size	Frequency Percent	2 4%	5 10%	13 26%	15 30%	15 30%	2.28
1 7	Classroom facilities are poor	Frequency Percent	5 10%	15 30%	24 48%	6 12%	0 0%	3.38
1 8	Problems with audio visual equipment	Frequency Percent	5 10%	18 36%	16 32%	9 18%	2 4%	3.30

1 9	Teaching material is fixed	Frequenc y Percent	6 12%	17 34%	18 36%	7 14%	2 4%	3.36
2 0	Teaching material is NOT fixed	Frequenc y Percent	2 4%	9 18%	8 16%	15 30%	16 32%	2.32
2 1	Teaching method is fixed	Frequenc y Percent	6 12%	22 44%	10 20%	12 24%	0 0%	3.44
2 2	Changing teaching material often	Frequenc y Percent	0 0%	15 30%	13 26%	9 18%	13 26%	2.60
2 3	No consistency in curriculum with clear goals	Frequenc y Percent	14 28%	16 32%	9 18%	8 16%	3 6%	3.60

Casting a look at the mean scores of the items 13 – 23, one can understand that from among the 11 items related to TMF, 8 items were considered to be demotivative and three items were not deemed to be so. Item 16 (M = 2.28), which related to large class size, item 20 (M = 2.32), which stated teaching materials were not fixed, and item 22 (M = 2.60), which stated teaching materials change often, were not found to be demotivating factors. On the other hand, all the other 8 factors in the TMF section of the questionnaire were thought to be demotivative, and the most demotivative ones were items 14 (M = 3.90), 23 (M = 3.60), and 15 (M = 3.56), which respectively stated low teacher evaluation from students, no consistency in curriculum with clear goals, and great ability differences among the students in one class.

Table 3. *Results of Teacher Demotivation Pertinent to the RWC*

No.	Statements	Frequenc y/Percent	Strong ly demoti vative	Pretty demoti vative	Neutr al	No so much demoti vative	Least demoti vative	Me an
24	Commuting problems	Frequenc y Percent	16 32%	16 32%	15 30%	3 6%	0 0%	3.90
25	Employment system is unstable	Frequenc y Percent	32 64%	5 10%	7 14%	3 6%	3 6%	4.20
26	Low pay	Frequenc y Percent	26 52%	20 40%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	4.36
27	No bonus	Frequenc y Percent	24 48%	15 30%	7 14%	2 4%	2 4%	4.14
28	Lacking research fund	Frequenc y Percent	3 6%	20 40%	19 38%	5 10%	3 6%	3.30

29	Lacking research time	Frequency Percent	0 0%	16 32%	17 34%	14 28%	3 6%	2.92
30	Long meeting hours	Frequency Percent	0 0%	16 32%	13 26%	13 26%	8 16%	2.74
31	Much paperwork	Frequency Percent	2 4%	14 28%	20 40%	11 22%	3 6%	3.02

The mean score of item 24 (M = 3.90) implied that commuting problems really demotivated teachers. Moreover, the teachers felt that the instability of the employment system was instrumental in the reduction of their motivation (M = 4.20). Item 26, i.e. low pay, (M = 4.36) was found to be the most demotivating factor related to RWC. Likewise, item 27, no bonus, (M = 4.14) was one of the items with a high mean score under RWC, and thus one of the most demotivating factors. Items 28 (M = 3.30) and 31 (M = 3.02), which referred to a lack of research fund and the existence of much paperwork respectively, were seen to be demotivating. In contrary, lacking research time (item 29, M = 2.92) and long meeting hours (item 30, M = 2.74) were not supposed to be demotivative.

Table 4. *Results of Teacher Demotivation Pertinent to the HR*

No.	Statements	Frequency/Percent	Strongly demotivative	Pretty demotivative	Neutral	No so much demotivative	Least demotivative	Mean
32	Lacking communication among the full time faculty	Frequency Percent	3 6%	22 44%	17 34%	5 10%	3 6%	3.34
33	Lacking communication between full time and part time faculty	Frequency Percent	4 8%	19 38%	20 40%	5 10%	2 4%	3.36
34	Negative comments by colleagues	Frequency Percent	14 28%	12 24%	13 26%	5 10%	6 12%	3.46
35	Little appreciation from the administration	Frequency Percent	22 44%	15 30%	8 16%	2 2%	3 6%	4.02
36	Colleagues do not give straight opinions	Frequency Percent	0 0%	14 28%	25 50%	7 14%	4 8%	2.98

Out of the 5 items pertinent to HR in the questionnaire, four items contained demotivating factors. These items were item 32 (M = 3.34), item 33 (M = 3.36), item 34 (M = 3.46), and item

35 (M = 4.02), which respectively stated that there was a lack of communication among full time faculty, there was a lack of communication between full-time and part-time faculty, colleges gave negative comments, and administration does not appreciate the teachers adequately. The only item in HR part which had a mean score lower than 3.00 was item 36 (M = 2.98), which said colleagues did not give straight opinions. This factor was, surprisingly, not conceived to be demotivating.

The second research question
The second research question of the study asked "Which source has the most significant effect on teachers' demotivation on English adult teachers in Najafabad institutes?" In order to find out whether the four sources of demotivation (that is, SAC, TMF, RWC, and HR) had significant effects on teacher demotivation and to unearth which source had the most significant effect, one-sample t-test was conducted. This statistical test compared the total mean score of each part of the questionnaire against 3.00, which was the mean score of the options, and showed whether each total mean score was significantly different from 3.00 or not. The results are presented below.

Table 5. *One-Sample Descriptive Statistics for the TDQ*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SAC	12	3.67	.34	.09
TMF	11	3.19	.54	.16
RWC	8	3.57	.64	.22
HR	5	3.43	.37	.16

In Table 5. , it could be seen that the mean scores of each of the components in the TDQ questionnaire, that is, SAC (M = 3.67), TMF (M = 3.19), RWC (M = 3.57), and HR (M = 3.43) were larger than the average value (i.e. 3.00) of the options. Mean scores above 3.00 imply that teachers considered a factor (or a set of factors) demotivating. The findings thus revealed that all of the four factors of SAC, TMF, RWC, and HR were demotivating, but the crucial point to know is whether these factors were significantly demotivating or not. Table 6 provides the answer to this question.

Table 6. *One-Sample t Test Results for the TDQ*

	Test Value = 3					
				Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)		Lower	Upper
SAC	6.84	11	.000	.67	.46	.89
TMF	1.19	10	.260	.19	-.16	.55
RWC	2.49	7	.041	.57	.03	1.11
HR	2.57	4	.062	.43	-.03	.89

The values of interest in Table 6. are the p values under the Sig. (2-tailed) column. If a p value is smaller than the significance level (that is .05), it would imply that the difference between the mean score of that part of the questionnaire and the average value of the options reached statistical significance. Thus, in the case of SAC, the p value (p = .000) was found to be less than .05. Consequently, the obtained mean score for SAC was significantly larger than 3.00, and SAC was found to be a significantly demotivating factor.

However, in the case of TMF, there was not a significant difference between the mean score of the items and the average value of the options (p = .260). As for the RWC part of the questionnaire, the Sig. value was.041, and this p value was less than .05; it thus could be concluded that was a significantly demotivating factor. Finally, the total mean score of the HR part of the questionnaire (M = 3.43) was not significantly above 3.00 since the p value for this comparison appeared to be greater than the significance level (.062 > .05).

Discussion

Addressing research question one

In order to answer the first research question and specify the demotivating factors for EFL teachers, the results of the administered questionnaires were statistically analyzed using frequency and percentages. As a reminder, it should be mentioned that the questionnaire contained four parts: students' attitudes in class (SAC), teaching materials and facilities (TMF), research and working conditions (RWC), and human relations (HR).

The analysis of the first section, namely, students' attitudes in class revealed that students' talk in class was a demotivating factor. In addition, most of the teachers believed that students' use of cell phones in class was also a demotivating factor. Another strong demotivating factor was students' forgetting to do homework. In fact, all the other questionnaire items related to SAC (items 4 to 12) were considered to be demotivative. Finally, the comparison of the obtained means pointed to the fact that for the teachers of the current study, students' lack of interest in foreign languages and their rebellious attitudes were more demotivating than any other factor listed in items 1 – 12.

The second part of the questionnaire contained items dealing with teaching materials and facilities. The data obtained from the analysis of the items included in this section of the questionnaire uncovered that the demotivating factors were low teacher evaluation from students, no consistency in curriculum with clear goals, and great ability differences among the students in one class. Among the less demotivating factors, one can refer to teaching materials not being fixed, the frequent change of the teaching materials and large class size.

Eight other items in the third section of the questionnaire asked about the research and working conditions. The findings indicated that the demotivating factors were commuting problems, the instability of the employment system, low pay, no bonus, lack of research fund and the existence of much paperwork.

The last part of the questionnaire including 5 items dealt with human relations. Four out of five items could be regarded as significant demotivating factors: a lack of communication among full time faculty, a lack of communication between full-time and part-time faculty, colleagues giving negative comments, and administration not appreciating the teachers adequately.

According to Bednarova (2011), during the learning process, students or teachers may become negatively influenced, and such negative feelings have negative effects on motivation. As Dornyei and Ushioda (2011) stated, the negative influences may relate to particular learning-related experiences (e.g. public humiliation, poor test results) or social learning events (e.g. the

personality and the behavior of the teacher, the classroom community). While motivational factors have positive outcomes, demotivating factors stop the learning process and "lead to unsuccessful mastery of English proficiency" (Hu, 2011, p. 88). Therefore, it is important to identify the factors that negatively affect learners' or teachers' ability to learn or teach a second or foreign language. Identification of learners and teachers' demotivating factors is crucial in the beginning of a language course because it is quite instrumental in making decision about "the choice of language to be learned, the kinds of activities that learners are more inclined to engage in, the types and extent of proficiency that learners expect to attain, the degree of external intervention needed to regulate learning and the extent of engagement in the long run" (Abu Baker, Sulaiman & Rafaai, 2010, p. 72).

Because motivation is the central element in the field of education, the only systematic line of research on demotivation is found in the classroom, which is a place where interactions between teacher and students take place (Christophel & Gorham, 1995). Thus, the findings of this study are in line with the majority of the previous studies focusing on the determination of demotivating factors. One of such studies whose results are in agreement with those of this study was conducted by Sugino (2010). In a pilot study, he investigated 16 language teachers. The researcher identified five factors that may demotivate the teachers: students' attitudes, teaching materials, teaching method, working conditions including facilities and human relationships. The results showed that students' attitudes such as sleeping in class and forgetting homework were the most crucial factors for demotivating the teachers. Specifically sleeping in class and forgetting homework were the main sources for demotivating teachers.

The findings of this study are also in agreement with those conducted in Iranian context. For instance, Ghalibaf Sani (2011) has done a study in which she investigated the effects of demotivating factors on English speaking skill. The data were collected by qualitative and quantitative analysis. For analyzing the data, the researcher codified the answers.

Addressing research question two

In order to answer the second research question, and figure out which of the four sources of demotivation (i.e. SAC, TMF, RWC, and HR) had the most significant effect on teacher demotivation, a one-sample t-test was utilized. The results of the statistical analysis revealed that all of the four factors, namely, students' attitudes in class, teaching materials and facilities, research and working conditions, as well as human relations were effective. However, the results of inferential statistics uncovered that students' attitude in class and research and working conditions were more significantly influential and could be regarded as more effective demotivating factors.

Based on different aspects of L2 motivation, different theories of L2 motivation have been proposed. The most influential motivation theory has been proposed by Robert Gardner (Vural, 2007). According to Gardner, an individual's attitude towards the L2 and the L2 community is very important because people's attitudes towards a target have an impact on their response to the target, and learning L2 involves taking on the behavioral characteristics of the L2 cultural group (Dornyei, 2001; Gardner, 2001a). Therefore, students' attitude in class could be a motivating/demotivating factor.

On the one hand, we should encourage teacher motivation; on the other, we should understand the relationship between teacher motivation and student motivation and make the best use of it. Deci (1975, p. 68) states, the relationship between students and faculty is an "interactive one that can be either positive or negatively synergistic". Students affect the teachers' motivation

and behavior just as teachers affect the students. Thus, as the results of this study indicated students' attitude in class can clearly affect the motivational behavior of teachers.

The results of this study are also in line with the one done by Kiziltepe (2008). He conducted a study to examine sources of motivation and demotivation among teachers at a public university in Istanbul. The results showed that students are the main source of motivation and demotivation. In another study by Lynch (2008), three critical problems in English language learning and teaching have been detected: lack of learner motivation; insufficient time, resources and materials and overcrowded classrooms.

Conclusion

Demotivating factors or demotives are "negative counterparts of motives" (Yan, 2009, p. 109). Therefore, it is important to identify the factors that negatively affect learners or teachers' ability to learn or teach a second or FL. According to Dornyei (2001), demotivation and its influences are more significant in EFL contexts than ESL contexts because of the lack of opportunity to communicate with native speakers. In these contexts, considering demotives of language learning and teaching for learners and teachers is very crucial. He argues that demotivating factors for teachers can be seen as the most serious obstacle in teaching. Thus, discovering teachers' demotivating factors is as important as those of learners. Hence, this study was an attempt to determine the demotivating factors for L2 teachers teaching EFL in Najafabad, one of the cities in Iran, language institutes. As the findings indicated, the demotivating factors were students' attitude in class (SAC), teaching materials and facilities (TMF), research and working conditions (RWC), and human relations (HR), among the four major factors under analysis, Students' attitude in class, and research and working conditions were found to be the most effective demotivating factors. The findings of this study have some practical and pedagogical implications for FL learners, teachers, and administrators. The same research could be replicated in other cities or provinces of the country to understand about other demotivating factors. Other studies could be done considering age and teaching experience of the teachers. To more profoundly interpret the ideas and comments of the teachers, an interview could be run with the teachers, and learners' demotivating factors could also be explored in the same institutes to compare the ideas of teachers and students.

References

Abu Baker, K.A., Sulaiman, N.F., & Rafaai, Z.A.M. (2010). Self-determination theory and motivational orientations of Arabic learners: A principal component analysis. GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 10(1), 71-86.

Alderman, M. K. (1990). Motivation for at-risk students. Educational Leadership, 48(1), 27-30.

Bednarova, N. (2011). De-motivating influences for learning English among students on lower stages of 8-year Grammar School. Diploma thesis. University of Masaryk. Retrieved July 25, 2012 from: http://is.muni.cz/th/237053/pedf_m/Bednarova_diploma_thesis.pdf

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). Intrinsic motivation and effective teaching. Flow analysis. In DES.J.L. (Ed). Teaching well and linking it: Motivating Faculty to Teach Effectively. Baltimore: Hopkins University Press

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal 78(3), 273-284.

Dornyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2001). Teaching and researching motivation. Harlow, Longman.

Ellis, R. (1997). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2001). The study of second language acquisition (8th ed.). Oxford: oxford university press.

Ely, C.M. (1986). Language learning motivation: A descriptive and causal analysis. Modern Language Journal, 70(1), 28-35.

Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation, and second language acquisition. Canadian Psychology/PsychologieCanadienne, 41(1), 10.

Hu, R. J. S. (2011). The relationship between demotivation and EFL learners' English language proficiency. English Language Teaching, 4(4), 88.

Kiziltepe, Z. (2008). Motivation and demotivation of university teachers. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14(5-6), 515-530.

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. Annual Review of Psychology, 56, 485-516.

Mceetya,(1999).The Adelaide declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century. Melbourne: Ministerial Council on Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA).

Menyhart A. (2008). Teachers or lecturers? The motivational profile of university teachers of English. WoPaLP, 2, 119-137.

Ofoegbu, F. I. (2004). Teacher motivation: A factor for classroom effectiveness and school improvement in Nigeria. Business Library. Retrieved 2012 from: www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi

Sugino, T. (2010). Teacher/students motivational/demotivational factors in a framework of SLA motivational research. Journal of National Defense Academy (Humanities and Social Sciences), 100, 1-16.

Tzaiva, K. (2003). Factors that motivate and demotivate Greek EFL teachers. Masters dissertation: the University Of Edinburg, Moray House School of Education.

Vural, S. (2007).Teachers' and students' perceptions of teacher motivational behavior (unpublished master thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara,

Willows, M. (2011). Effect of overcrowded classrooms. Retrieved July 25, 2015 from http://www.helium.com

Woldwoski, R. J. (1985). Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A guide to improving instruction and increasing learner achievement. San Francisco, California: Jossey- Bass.

Yan, H. (2009). Student and teacher de-motivation in SLA. Asian Social Science, 5(1) 109