

# **From the State of Motivated to Demotivated: Iranian Military EFL Learners Motivation Change**

**Hojjat Jodaei\***

*PhD candidate, Department of English Language and Literature, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran, Email: Jodai.hojat@gmail.com*

**Gholamreza Zareian**

*Assistant professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran, Email: g.zareian@hsu.ac.ir*

**Mohammad Reza Amirian**

*Assistant professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran, Email: smr.amirian@hsu.ac.ir*

**Seyyed Mohammad Reza Adel**

*Assistant professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran, Email: sm.adel@hsu.ac.ir*

## **Abstract**

This study aimed at investigating motivation change of Iranian military EFL learners in an intensive English course. The participants included 61 Iranian military staff aged 23-35, who took part in an intensive English course at the military university's foreign language center. The data collection was conducted using a background information questionnaire, min-AMTB (Attitude Motivation Test Battery) and an interview with the selected participants. Quantitative descriptive analysis showed that the participants were highly motivated, with relatively low anxiety and high integrative motivation. Furthermore, the qualitative content analysis showed that situation-specific factors including management problems both at macro and micro levels, class timing, lesson planning, organizational interventions, teacher-related factors, and facilities were all motivational factors that played a significant role in motivating/demotivating learners. The results also showed that the learners moved from a state of high motivation to low motivation due to context-specific demotivational factors.

**Keywords: Motivation, Motivation Change, Motivational Factors, Iranian EFL Learners.**

## **1. Introduction**

Motivation has always been considered to be one of the most influential factors in language learning due to its undeniably substantial impacts. As a broad concept, it is not easily condensable into a straightforward definition (Gardner, 2010), and with regards to language learning, it is even more complex (Williams, Burden & Lanvers, 1997). In fact, "no single individual difference factor in language learning has received as much attention as MOTIVATION" (Ellis, 2008, p. 677). As one of the key determinants of second and foreign language learning achievement, motivation provides the initial stimuli to start L2 learning and is later the driving force to sustain the long learning process; needless to say, all the other factors involved in second language acquisition (SLA) presuppose motivation to some extent (Dörnyei, 2010).

The abundance of theories in L2 motivation in the related literature has not led to a conclusive and unitary result. Shifts in focus have led to promising new conceptual themes and the evolution of new motivational theories, which, in turn, enrich our understanding of the motivational basis of language learning. Since the models of motivation might differ during the language learning process – according to gender, across age groups, learning environments, and linguistic/cultural contexts – and many factors, such as individual differences and cultural contexts, influence models of L2 motivation, potentially very different conclusions might be drawn. Hence, studying the multifaceted nature of motivation, discovering the motives language learners experience and how they prioritize between competing motives, and

extending knowledge of other motivational issues, would be useful in complementing prior research and significant in advancing SLA research.

The current study was conducted to investigate Iranian military learners' motivation change or lack of change in an intensive language learning course. The aim, furthermore, was to investigate potential influential factors affecting language learners' motivation. Since motivation is context-bound (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009), it is worthwhile to study L2 motivation in a specific language learning context such as an Iranian military context to investigate what influential factors affect learners' motivation.

## 2. Literature Review

As one of the key determinants of second and foreign language learning achievement, motivation provides the initial stimuli to start L2 learning and is later the driving force to sustain the long learning process; needless to say, all the other factors involved in second language acquisition (SLA) presuppose motivation to some extent (Dörnyei, 2010).

A number of studies have investigated motivation change of students in short term or long term period. These studies mostly have made use of questionnaire-types instruments to investigate attitude or motivation change in different points of time (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2014). An overall decrease in learners' motivational level has been reported in previous studies investigating motivation change in the process of L2 learning among university or high school students (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2006; Gardner, Masgoret, Tennant, & Mihic, 2004). The results of such studies confirmed that such changes are more evident in great environmental changes (e.g.: transfer from elementary school to high school). The most prominent studies in L2 motivational change to date were conducted by Dörnyei and his colleagues' (Dörnyei & Clement, 2001; Dörnyei & Csizer, 2002, 2006) in which the researchers investigated Hungarian language learners' motivations change over ten years. The results of these studies led to emergence of 'L2 motivational Self System'. L2 Motivational Self System provides the main dimensions of L2 motivation. The framework is influenced by the notion that foreign language learning is different from learning other academic subjects and therefore different paradigms than educational and psychological are applied. L2 Motivational Self System of includes three dimensions namely 'Ideal L2 self', 'the Out-to self', and 'L2 learning experience'. 'Ideal L2 self' refers to the ideal image a person has in learning a foreign language. This ideal image can be a powerful motivator because it has capacity to reduce the distance between the actual and the ideal self. Ideal L2 self is closely associated with traditional integrative/instrumental motivation. 'The Out-to self' "concerns the attributes that one believes one out to possess to meet expectations and to avoid negative outcomes" (Dörnyei, 2009a, p.29). For instance, if a language learner does a task for the sake of teacher's confirmation or want to please the teacher with outperforming, 'The Out-to self' is the main motivational factor behind this learning. This dimension is equal to extrinsic motivation in the tradition of L2 motivation, since it is influenced by external rewards. The 'L2 learning Experience' 'focuses on the "situated, executive motives related to the immediate environment and experience"' (Dörnyei, 2009a, p.29). It is not lined to self-image but to the context in which the learning process happen. The L2 learning Experience is correlated with traditional intrinsic motivation. The L2 Motivational Self-System was a response to move beyond the traditional dichotomies in L2 motivation (e.g.: intrinsic/ extrinsic motivation) which had dominated the L2 research for several decades. A number of studies reported the validity of L2 motivational self-system in different leaning contexts (e.g.: Csizer & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009). These studies found that Integrativeness/instrumental motivation and the Ideal L2 Self are closely correlated concepts.

A number of factors have been reported to be influential factors in learners' motivation change. Dörnyei (1998) found that teacher (personality, competence, teaching method), facilities (e.g. frequent change of teachers), and reduced self-confidence (e.g.: experience of failure) are all influential demotivational factors. Kikuchi (2009) using interviews and questionnaire in a small-scale study found teacher behaviors, grammar translation method, tests and university entrance examinations; focus on memorization, and textbooks as demotivating factors in a Japanese high school context. These studies confirm the existence of a general pattern in demotivating factors among different L2 learning context.

Although about two-thirds of the demotivating factors can be attributed to teachers, (Christophel&Gorham, 1995).Ushioda's (1998) study found a number of motivational reasons in a course of study including 'loving and enjoying the L2', 'having a positive learning history', and 'meeting desired language-learning goals'. Gardner et al. (2004) suggested that overall changes in trait-like components, such as 'interest in foreign languages', 'attitudes toward target community (French Canadians), or 'desire to learn French, were very slight, while classroom-specific variables such as, 'language learning anxiety', 'teacher evaluation', and 'language course evaluation' suggested more changes. Irie (2005) reported a relatively different results in comparison with previous studies. She found a relatively stable degree of motivation change in the motivation trajectory in an over three-year course. The skill of the classroom teacher was the main factor leading to such a result.

The conducted studies in the Iranian context mostly have mostly focused on the relationship between L2 motivation constructs (such as integrative, instrumental, anxiety) and English achievement. Most of the studies have used questionnaire (such as Attitude Motivation Test Battery) or other scales (such as autonomy questionnaire) and a number of tests measuring learners' proficiency (e.g. Author 1; et al.; Rashidi, Rahimi, Alimorad, 2013; Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012) and there was not particular study investigating Iranian EFL learners' motivation change in an intensive language learning course. Furthermore, the conducted studies in the related literature have mostly been of product oriented approach. Such a perspective toward L2 motivational studies have failed to provide the process of L2 motivation in learning another language.

### **3. Method**

#### **3.1. Participants**

The participants of this study were 61 Iranian military staff aged 23-35 who took part in an intensive English course at the foreign language center of a military university in Tehran, Iran in the first semester of 2016. All of the participants were male with Persian as their native language. The selection of the participants was primarily done by opportunity/convenience sampling. Based on a locally designed test, the learners were chosen from different units of the army throughout the country. The course is usually taught at four or five levels depending on the total number of participants. The course lasts for six months and classes meet six hours a day, five days per week. The center offers courses in foreign languages including English, Russian, Arabic, and French.

#### **3.2. Instrumentation**

Background Information Questionnaire. This researcher-made questionnaire was used to identify the participants' demographic, educational, and academic backgrounds. The items used for this purpose were the age of the participants, their experience in the army, total hours of English study per week outside the classroom, familiarity with other foreign languages, and extra English classes. An English translation of the background information questionnaire is provided in Appendix (Part A).

Mini-Attitude Motivation Test Battery (mini-AMTB). The quantitative section of the study used the international version of the Attitude Motivation Test Battery for English as a foreign language (mini-AMTB), which comprises a set of 12 test items. Likert items are statements asking for the degree of agreements or disagreements. They are typically measured based on five responses, from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The most favorable item has the highest score and the least favorable attitudes will have the lowest score (McIver & Carmines, 1981). For the present study, a contextualized and translated version of Mini-AMTB (contextualized and validated by Jodai, Mahdavi, & Danayei Toue, 2013) was used to determine the motivational factors. The mini- AMTB consists of one item corresponding to each scale on the AMTB and uses semantic differential scaling, instead of a Likert scale, to gather information from the participants.

The contextualized version of AMTB questionnaire consists of four main constructs obtained from factor analysis. The constructs included Language Learning Motivation, Anxiety, Integrativeness, and Organizational influences. Instead of taking each item individually, the questionnaire considers the

aggregated variables. Experts in the field of measurement have argued that aggregated items tend to be more valid, accurate, and reliable than single items (McIver & Carmines, 1981; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). In Likert data, using individual (not summated) items as a measurement tool is problematic. It is “very unlikely that a single item can fully represent a complex theoretical concept or any specific attribute for that matter” (McIver & Carmines, 1981, p. 15).

In this study, several items, including item 4 (My desire to learn English is...), item 11 (My motivation to learn English is...), item 5 (My attitude toward learning English is...), item 3 (My interest in foreign language is...), item 6 (My attitude toward my English teacher is...), item 9 (My attitude toward my English course is...), and item 7 (My motivation to learn English for practical purposes) are amalgamated to constitute the Language Learning Motivation. In this questionnaire, the second construct is anxiety, which is measured by calculating the means score of the participants’ responses to two items, including item 8 (I worry about speaking English outside of class) and item 10 (I worry about speaking in my English class). The two items related to the third construct, Integrativeness, are item 1 (My motivation to learn English to communicate with English speaking people is...) and item 2 (My attitude toward English speaking people is...). Finally, the last item, item 12 (My organization encourages me to learn English...) represents the organizational influence on the participants’ motivation. In the original AMTB (Gardner, 2005), this item was labeled as ‘parental influence’. However, since parents play no role in the context of this research, Author 1 et al. (2013) label this construct ‘organizational influences’. The questionnaire was reported to have an acceptable reliability ( $\alpha=.70$ ) for both the total constructs and the individual constructs ( $\alpha_{\text{motivation}}=.87$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{integrativeness}}=.63$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{anxiety}}=0.72$ ).

Retrospective interview with learners: The aim of the interview was to elicit an in-depth understating of learners L2 motivation in the beginning, during, and after the intensive course. It furthermore, aimed at collecting retrospective patterns of motivational and attitudinal variations during the course. Trustworthiness was attested by expert review of the questions themselves to reduce ambiguity and increase the content validity of the instrument. The eight questions of the interview were based on the Dörnyei (1998) demotivational factor study. There was also space for the participates to make any comments regarding the topic. The researcher made use of Lynch’s (1996) general framework of an interview:

Casual questions: (to do this the researcher firstly opened the conversation with a friendly tone and explained the aims of the study).

General questions: (general questions were asked about the learners attitudes towards language leaning and the course)

Specific questions: (The researcher asked questions related to the interview guide).

Closing questions: (The researcher asked about the participants’ motivation to continue leaning the foreign language)

Casual questions: (The researcher appreciated the participation of the learners in the study).

### **3.3. Data Collection Procedures**

Data collection procedure was done at the end of the course using a cross-sectional survey and retrospective qualitative interview with participants. In the pilot study, the instruments were distributed among six volunteer students from the same course in the military university. An in-depth interview also was conducted with two of them. The participants in the pilot study were requested to provide their feedbacks regarding the study. After analyzing the results of the pilot study a number of minor changes were made to the instruments of the study. For example, the researchers added some background information variable (such as educational) and revised the wordings of ambiguous questions of the interview session. Furthermore, the feasibility of the main study in terms of administration issues such as the length of time necessary to complete the instruments was considered.

For the purpose of the main study, first, a written permission and an informed consent for the use of the collected data for the purpose of the study were collected from the head of the center and participants of the study respectilvey. As the teacher of the course, the first author distributed and

collected the questionnaires for the purpose of data analysis. The students had taken all the exams and it was ensured that the result of the study would not affect their grades. The researcher distributed the questionnaire among the 70 participants and 61 of them returned the completed questionnaire. A retrospective interview was conducted with 8 participants who agreed to take part in the interview session. The interview with learners took about 15-20 minutes and an audio recorder was used to record the interview. The researchers transcribed the interview data in Microsoft Word and translated them from Persian to English.

## 4. Analysis and Results

A qualitative and quantitative approach was adopted in the data analysis. For the purpose of qualitative analysis, content analysis was used, and for the quantitative section mean, descriptive statistics including standard deviation, frequency, and percentage were calculated. In descriptive analysis, the frequency was used to compare the means, and the standard deviation was used to investigate students' motivation. Categories uncovering the change or lack of change in their motivation were then established concerning the conceptual framework and related literature in language learner motivation.

### 4.1. Quantitative Analysis

A large number of educational research papers using questionnaire have employed a Likert scale in the assessment of outcomes. Therefore, understanding Likert-type data analysis is crucial. There has been a lengthy argument in the field as to whether Likert data should be considered as ordinal data or interval data (Jamieson, 2004). As an ordinal scale, the responses can be rated but the distance between the responses cannot be measured. Hence, the distances between "strongly agree", "agree", "neutral" cannot be considered equal on a Likert scale. That means, if numbers are assigned to the responses, the differences between them cannot be considered equivalent. In contrast, in interval data, the distance between the attributes has meaning and is measurable. For example, in a language achievement test, the difference from 60-70 is equal to that of 80-90. Based on this argument, we analyzed Likert data as both ordinal (via frequency, percentage, and median) and interval scale (via mean and standard deviation).

#### 4.1.1. Ordinal Likert Analysis

The authors made use of frequency and percentage for data analysis in this section. The first construct of this questionnaire was 'language learning motivation' which was amalgamation of item 4,11,5,3,6,9, and 7. Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to the first construct.

TABLE 1

*The frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to the first construct*

Scale	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree (1)	22	5.15
Disagree (2)	15	3.51
No idea (3)	60	14.05
Agree (4)	127	29.74
Strongly agree (5)	203	47.54
Total	427	99.99

As Table 1 shows, the number of times that "strongly agree" and "agree" were selected by the participants in the first construct (motivation) was (N=203, 47.54%) and (N=127, 29.74%), respectively. Therefore, overall, 77.28% (47.54+29.74) of the participants were highly motivated to learn the foreign language. In other words, more than 75% of the participants' choices fall above the median (median= 3). The second construct was 'anxiety', measured by calculating the mean scores of the participants'

responses to two items, including item 8 and 10. Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to this construct.

TABLE 2

*The frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to the second construct (anxiety)*

Scale	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree (1)	24	21.81
Disagree (2)	29	26.36
No idea (3)	36	32.72
Agree (4)	13	11.81
Strongly agree (5)	8	7.27
Total	110	99.97%

As Table 2 shows, the frequency of (strongly disagree) and (disagree) was N=53 (48.17%). It also shows that the frequency of (strongly agree) and (agree) was 21 (19.08%). Hence, about half of the participants had relatively low anxiety about learning the second language. Conversely, about 20% of the participants were highly anxious about learning the second language, and over 30% had no idea what to say about their level of anxiety.

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to two items of the third construct (Integrativeness), namely item 1 and item 2.

TABLE 3

*The frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to the third construct (Integrativeness)*

Scale	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree (1)	4	3.36
Disagree (2)	7	5.88
No idea (3)	28	23.52
Agree (4)	42	35.29
Strongly agree (5)	38	31.93
Total	119	99.98
	4	3.36

As the table shows, the total frequency of items 5 and 4 is 80 (67.22%). This suggests that more than half of the participants were integrative motivated and only about 9% did not have positive attitudes towards the target community.

Finally, the last item, item 12 (My organization encourages me to learn English...) represents the organizational influence, as shown in Table 4. This construct is aimed at investigating learners' viewpoints about the role of the military organization in students' learning.

TABLE 4

*The frequency and percentage of the participants' responses to the fourth construct (organizational influences)*

Scale	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree (1)	19	31.14
Disagree (2)	13	21.31
No idea (3)	14	22.95
Agree (4)	6	9.83
Strongly agree (5)	9	14.75
Total	61	99.99

As the table shows, 32 of the participants (52.45%) selected ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’. There were only 15 participants (24.58%) who believed that the organization is supportive of learners’ language learning.

#### 4.1.2. Interval Likert analysis

In this section, the learners’ level of motivational constructs were investigated on a categorical basis. The 5-point scaling used in this study ranged from 1-5, i.e. from the lowest score (1) to the highest score (5). Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics for the total constructs of the questionnaire.

TABLE 5  
*Descriptive Statistics of the Entire Questionnaire*

Construct	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
Motivation	61	2.14	5.00	4.08	.61
Anxiety	61	1.00	5.00	2.70	.98
Integrativeness	61	1.50	5.00	3.41	.82
Organizational influence	61	1.00	5.00	2.52	1.37

Regarding the participants’ current motivational state, the first construct in the contextualized version of mini-AMT showed that, overall, the participants of the study had high motivation to learn the second language (Mean=4.08, Std. Deviation= .61).

Table 6 shows the related descriptive statistics for the first construct (language learning motivation).

TABLE 6  
*Descriptive Statistics for Language Learning Motivation (LLM) construct*

Construct	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
item3	61	2.00	5.00	4.57	.64
item4	61	1.00	5.00	4.50	.78
item5	61	2.00	5.00	4.37	.75
item6	61	1.00	5.00	4.22	.88
item7	61	1.00	5.00	3.98	.99
item9	61	1.00	5.00	2.62	1.36
item11	61	1.00	5.00	4.31	1.04
LLM	61	2.14	5.00	4.08	.61

Considering the mean score of each sub-construct, the highest score was attributed to item 3 (Mean=4.57, Std=.64) suggesting that the participants were highly interested in learning English. The participants’ mean score of Item 4 (My desire to learn English is...) followed this, confirming the notion that students had high interest in learning the second language. The other scores in this category were more or less the same, except for item 9 (My attitude toward my English course is...), which showed that the participants had relatively negative attitude toward the course.

The second construct in the contextualized version of mini-AMTB aimed to assess the respondents’ level of anxiety about learning the foreign language (Table 7).

TABLE 7

*Descriptive Statistics for the second construct (anxiety)*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
item8	61	1.00	5.00	2.72	1.26
item10	61	1.00	5.00	2.68	1.13
Anxiety	61	1.00	5.00	2.70	.98

As Table 7 shows, the total mean score of anxiety (Mean= 2.70, Std. Deviation=.98) and the sub-construct of this construct (Mean<sub>item8</sub>= 2.72, Std. Deviation= 1.26; Mean<sub>item10</sub>= 2.68, Std. Deviation= 1.13) suggest are relatively low level of anxiety about learning English. Furthermore, it suggests that the learners' level of anxiety in speaking English outside of the learning context is higher than inside an instructional class.

The third construct in the contextualized version of mini-AMTB shows the participants' motivation and attitudes towards learning English in order to contact people from English speaking countries. Table 8 shows the related descriptive statistics for the construct (Integrativeness).

TABLE 8  
*Descriptive Statistics for the third construct (Integrativeness)*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
item1	61	1.00	5.00	4.13	1.08
item2	61	1.00	5.00	3.60	.95
Integrativeness	61	1.50	5.00	3.41	.82

As the mean score of Integrativeness (Mean= 3.41, Std. Deviation=.82) shows the participants have relatively positive attitudes toward the target language community. However, the related score for motivation to learn English to communicate with English-speaking people was higher than that of the learners' attitude toward English speaking people.

The last construct in the contextualized version of mini-AMTB showed the effect of a contextual factor, namely organizational influence, on learner attitudes and motivation. Table 9 shows the descriptive statistics for the fourth construct (organizational influence).

TABLE 9  
*Descriptive Statistics for the fourth construct (organizational influence)*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
item12	61	1.00	5.00	2.52	1.37
Valid (listwise)	N 61				

As table 9 suggests, the score is the lowest score among all sub-constructs (Mean=2.52, Std. Deviation= 1.37), suggesting that the participants agree on the notion that the organization does not play an effective role in enhancing learners' motivational level.

## 4.2. Qualitative content analysis

Textual content analysis of the collected qualitative data revealed further influential factors, which included motivation at the beginning of the course, influential motivation/demotivation factors, and motivation change during the course, and motivation state after the course.



In total, 52 themes related to the motivational state of the learners at the start of the course were found (Table 10).

**TABLE 10**  
*Motivating at the beginning of the course in terms of frequency and percentage*

Theme	Frequency	Percentage%
High motivation	45	86
Low motivation	7	13
Total	52	100

As Table 10 shows, of these 52 themes, 45 themes (86%) involved high motivation, and only 7 themes (13%) included low motivation levels at the beginning of the course (Table 10). Those participants who were highly motivated at the beginning of the course described the initial state of motivation as “very high”, “really willing to learn the second language”, and “with great enthusiasm”. The other learners who made such a comment had more or less the same opinion regarding their level of motivation at the beginning of the course. On the other hand, those who believed they were not motivated highly at the beginning of the course, argued that “they had no motive and just forced to come to the center”, “it was low and even became lower”, and “I did not have motivation at the beginning because I came here for my personal reasons”.

A number of key motivational and demotivational themes (268 themes in total) were extracted from the qualitative part of the data. The following themes were identified based on the learners’ comments (Table 11).

**TABLE 11**  
*Frequency and Percentage of the motivational/demotivational themes*

Themes	Frequency	Percentage%
Management	78	30.70
Facilities	57	22.44
Context	47	18.50
Planning	33	12.99
Teachers	26	10.23
Exam	13	5.11
Total	254	100%

As Table 11 suggests, problems related to the center’s management system were the most mentioned theme by the course participants (N=78, 30.70%). The reasons for such a view can be traced in one of the student’s written diaries:

“Management and command system are critical, the lack of proper management is the result of using a head who is not an expert in language teaching”.

The participant also commented that in that center there was management problems. From his point of view, the ‘proper management’ means using a person who is an expert in the field. The attitudes of stakeholders and teachers towards the learners’ capabilities, and their humanistic values play an important role in learners’ motivation. Some participants considered background education to be an influential factor affecting the stakeholders’ attitudes toward the learners.

A 35 years old language learner argued that he was highly motivated at the beginning of the course, but his motivation changed dramatically because of lack of proper management. The learner was

highly motivated to learn the language to communicate with target culture people (integrative motivation). His motivation was also mostly instrumental motivation, as he had a high score for item 4 of the questionnaire (My attitude towards language learning), but his lowest score was for item 9, which asked learners' to rate their attitudes toward that particular context. The participant stated:

“We should have a head who is familiar with the process language learning and teaching so he can understand us”.

Facilities were another distinguishable concept that emerged from the content analysis of the respondents' comments. In-class facilities related to the educational equipment available inside a language class (e.g. audio-visual aids). Out-of-class facilities related to non-educational materials available to the learners (e.g.: accommodation, welfare conditions, and non-educational materials). Of the total number of themes that emerged relating to facilities (N=56), the number of in-class facilities was 38 (67.85%), and the number of out-of-class facilities was 18 (32.14%).

Analysis of the qualitative data determined the number of related themes to contextual factors (N=47, 18.50%). Contextual factors also included rules and regulations particular to the learning environment. Because of the nature of the context, a number of rules were applied, such as, ‘students should be present at a particular time in the center and can leave the class only at a specified time’, or ‘the learners have to wear uniforms when they come to the center’. A motivating environment, according to the participants' comments, is defined as an environment with a “lack of mental pressure on students”, that is “calm and appropriate environment”, that has “less stress”, is “less threatening”, and is characterized by a “lack of punishment”. The learners commented that the atmosphere of the center should have fewer strict military rules; it should be less of a military-like unit and more of an educational unit.

“The center should not look like a military place, goals, and planning should not be sacrificed to regulations and circulars, and implementing strict military conducts in training environment cause loss of motivation.”

Planning (N=33, 12.99%), teachers (N=26, 10.23%), and exams (N=13, 5.11%) were the other related concepts that emerged from the analysis of the study. Lack of appropriate training programs, weekly changes in educational programs, exam-based planning, and a high volume of books but a short time period, contributed to low-level motivation among learners. Considering timing, some of the learners mentioned that the hours of the class were boring and long, non-standard, and intense. The test and score systems were other influential concepts proposed by the learners. “Tests cause stress,” “students with different levels have the same test,” “not having an entrance exam for the course”, “score/test orientedness of the center,” were some notes made by the participants regarding the role of tests and scores in the center. Teachers' efforts are appreciated from the learners' point of view. A number of the participants mentioned that the center offers qualified and experienced teachers who understand learners and use motivating teaching. However, some learners identified the absence of a uniform teaching method, caused by changing of teachers, as a problem that made it difficult for them to learn, as they struggled to adapt to different teaching methods.

## **5. Discussion and Conclusion**

Overall, the study showed a great decline in students' motivational level from the beginning of the course to the end of it. The qualitative and quantitative findings furthermore showed that the study participants were highly motivated to learn the second language at the beginning of the course. Situation-specific factors (management issues, facilities, learning context, teacher related factors, intervention of organizational regulations, the timing of the course, assessment, and planning) was the most influential in the students' progress from a state of motivated to unmotivated in the motivation trajectory. From the participants' points of view, problems relating to the management system had the highest impact. This may be the result of using non-expert in the administrative level, which requires an understating of learning and teaching process. The results of the study are in line with other prominent studies conducted in the related literature. An overall decrease in learners' motivational level has been reported in previous

studies (Dörnyei, 2006; Gardner et al., 2004; Inbar et al. 2001). Although the context of the current study was different from other typical learning contexts, the results revealed the same general patterns reported in the previous studies. The demotivating factors reported in this study has some common factors with Dörnyei's (1998) study in which the teacher (personality, competence, teaching method), facilities (e.g. frequent change of teachers), and reduced self-confidence (e.g.: experience of failure) reported to be the key demotivational factors. Kikuchi (2009) using interviews and questionnaire in a small-scale study found teacher behaviors, grammar translation method, tests and university entrance examinations; focus on memorization, and textbooks as demotivating factors in a Japanese high school context. These studies confirm the existence of a general pattern in demotivating factors among different L2 learning context. Although about two-thirds of the demotivating factors can be attributed to teachers, (Christophel & Gorham, 1995) The current study found that factors related to the administrative level have more influential role in learners' motivation/demotivation than teachers. This relatively opposite findings may be referred to the context specific factors related to military rules interventions, which had great impact on learners' demotivation. The results of the study are also in line with other prominent studies conducted in Iran. In an investigation of the various socio-psychological orientations of Iranian EFL learners, Chalak and Kassaian (2010) found that the participants were highly motivated to learn the second language and did so for both integrative and instrumental reasons.

This study showed that regardless of L2 learning context, the learners are likely to lose their motivation, so teachers and stakeholders need to be aware of this general trend and take a proper action. One possible way to do this is the application of the framework of motivational teaching practice in the L2 classroom proposed by Dörnyei (2000) which considered the four key units of creating the basic motivational condition, generating student motivation, maintaining and protecting motivation, and encouraging positive self-evaluation. A number of motivational strategies can be used by teachers to create the basic motivational conditions including appropriate teacher behaviors, establishing a good relationship with the learners, and construing cohesive learning groups. Furthermore, initial motivation can be enhanced by creating realistic goals, increasing the students' expectancy of learning, and creating a positive attitude for learners. After creating the basic motivational conditions and generating initial motivation, teachers can maintain and protect learners' motivation by setting achievable goals, presenting in motivating way, working on students' self-confidence, encouraging autonomous learning, and making learners to develop self-motivational strategies. Finally, self-evaluation can be promoted by providing more feedbacks to learners, increasing students' stratification by using reward and punishment system. By using such a framework, the effective use of context specific motivational strategies can be set in each phases of language learning process in an L2 context. Another way is using a number of motivation marinating strategies, such as setting attainable goals. Irie (2005) study on 84 junior high school Japanese student showed that most of the learners kept a stable degree of L2 motivation over the 3 years since they and their teachers used a variety of strategies to enhance and keep learners motivation.

The study had a number of limitations. First of all, we acknowledge the limitation that such a case study may not represent all the Iranian EFL learners since the participants were just 61 military EFL learners. Further studies can take into account more participants to have a more comprehensive understanding of motivation change and influential motivational or demotivational factors affecting such changes. Furthermore, a cross-sectional retrodictive design may not provide a comprehensive undersigning of L2 motivation change, further researchers can take a process oriented approach which investigate learners' motivation and attitude at the several phases of language learning process. Then, the researchers could make use of other research methods such as ecological observation in which the learners motivation in real time of learning are observed. This could add triangulation in data collection, which was likely to add more depth to the study.

The study may have some micro and macro pedagogical implications. In a micro sense, this study's results can be applied directly to similar language learning and teaching contexts. The stakeholders can benefit from the results of this study by considering the motivational and demotivational factors affecting learners' L2 motivation. In a macro sense, this study can also pave the way for other

researchers to conduct similar studies in other contexts to determine the context-specific motivational factors affecting language-learning motivation among learners. Further studies may undertake a closer investigation of each of the influential motivational factors affecting language learning. For a more comprehensive understanding, future studies may motivation change form a complex dynamic approach using retrodictive qualitative modeling as introduced by Dörnyei (2014). The effect of teachers' motivational behavior on learners' motivation and achievement – especially teachers' – and of learners' dynamic motivational interaction have not yet been adequately researched. As Dörnyei and Ushioda (2014) stated, “Until very recently, the issue of teacher motivation ha[s] received rather little attention in educational psychology” (p. 158). This issue is important, as we note that if a teacher is motivated to teach, there is a good chance that his or her students will be motivated to learn. Since teachers also play an important role in students' language learning, an analysis of teachers' views can also provide useful insight.

### References

- Chambers, G. (1993). Taking the 'de' out of demotivation. *Language Learning Journal*, 7(1), 13-16. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571739385200051>
- Chalak, A., & Kassaian, Z. (2010). Motivation and attitudes of Iranian undergraduate EFL students towards learning English. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 10(2), 37-56.
- Cheng, H., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 153-174. doi:10.2167/illt048.0
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00690.x
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x
- Dörnyei, Z. (2006). Individual differences in second language acquisition. *AILA review*, 19(1), 42-68. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.05dor>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(4), 519-538. doi: 10.1348/000709900158281
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self (Vol. 36): Multilingual Matters*.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Researching complex dynamic systems: 'Retrodictive qualitative modelling' in the language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 47(1), 80-91.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2014). *Teaching and researching motivation*. London: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(4), 421-462. doi:10.1093/applin/23.4.421
- Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System*, 37(3), 403-417. doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.03.004
- Gardner, R. C. (2005). *Integrative motivation and second language acquisition*. Retrieved from [publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf](http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf)
- Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A. M., Tennant, J., & Mihic, L. (2004). Integrative motivation: Changes during a year-long intermediate-level language course. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 1-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00247.x
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1992). Students' perceptions of teacher behaviors as motivating and demotivating factors in college classes. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(3), 239-252. doi: [doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369839](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369839)
- Irie, K. (2005). *Stability and flexibility of L2 motivation: A multimethod study of Japanese junior high school students*. Dissertation: Temple University Japan, Japan.

- Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (ab) use them. *Med Edu*, 38(12), 1217-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.02012.x
- Jodaei, H., Mahdavi Zafarghandi, Danayei Tous, M. (2013). Motivation, Integrativeness, Organizational Influence, Anxiety, and English Achievement. *Glottology (The international journal of theoretical linguistics)*, 4, 3-25. doi: 10.1524/lot.2013.0012
- Kikuchi, K. (2009). Listening to our learners' voices: what demotivates Japanese high school students? *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 453-471. doi: 10.1177/1362168809341520
- Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 229-247). Bristol: *Multilingual Matters*.
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*: Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Masgoret, A., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53(S1), 167-210. doi:10.1111/1467-9922.00227
- McIver, J. P., & Carmines, E. G., (1981). *Unidimensional scaling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H., (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Rashidi, N., Rahimi, M., & Alimorad, Z. (2013). Iranian EFL Learners' Motivation Construction: Integrative Motivation Revisited. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 2(1), 101-124.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2003). Motivation and classroom learning. In W. M. Reynolds & G. E. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology*. (pp. 103–122). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37(1), 57-69. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2008.09.005
- Sasaki, M. (2011). Effects of varying lengths of study-abroad experiences on Japanese EFL students' L2 writing ability and motivation: A Longitudinal Study. *Tesol Quarterly*, 45(1), 81-105. doi: 10.5054/tq.2011.240861
- Shoaib, A., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Affect in lifelong learning: Exploring L2 motivation as a dynamic process. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 22-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215-228). Bristol: *Multilingual Matters*.
- Williams, M., Burden, R. and 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: 503–528. doi:10.1080/0141192022000005805
- Williams, M., Burden, R., & 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(4), 503-528. doi: 10.1080/0141192022000005805
- Yang, J. S. (2003). Motivational orientations and selected learner variables of East Asian language learners in the United States. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(1), 44-56. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2003.tb01931.x
- Yu, B., & Watkins, D. A. (2008). Motivational and cultural correlates of second language acquisition. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 17-1. doi:10.2104/ara10817

## Appendix

The contextualized version of mini-AMTB questionnaire

### Part A:

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose of the survey is to investigate your feelings about different aspects of learning English. Part A of this questionnaire involves information asking for your demographic, educational, and academic backgrounds. Part B includes a number of items designed to measure your attitudes towards each item. Each item is followed by a scale that has a label on the left and another on the right and the numbers 1 to 5 between two ends. For each item, please circle any one of the numbers from 1 to 5 that best describes you. The second part includes a few questions regarding language learning motivation, the researcher appreciated if they are answered thoroughly.

**Part B:**

Mini-Attitude Motivation Test Battery (mini-AMTB).

1. My motivation to learn English to communicate with English speaking people is:  
WEAK.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 STRONG
2. My attitude toward English speaking people is:  
UNFAVORABLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 FAVORABLE
3. My interest in foreign language is:  
VERY LOW.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 VERY HIGH
4. My desire to learn English is:  
WEAK.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 STRONG
5. My attitude toward learning English is:  
UNFAVORABLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 FAVORABLE
6. My attitude toward my English teacher is:  
UNFAVORABLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 FAVORABLE
7. My motivation to learn English for practical purposes (e.g., to get a good job) is:  
WEAK.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 STRONG
8. I worry about speaking English outside of class:  
VERY LITTLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 VEY MUCH
9. My attitude toward my English course is:  
UNFAVORABLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 FAVORABLE
10. I worry about speaking in my English class:  
VERY LITTLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 VEY MUCH
11. My motivation to learn English is  
VERY LITTLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 VEY MUCH
12. My organization encourages me to learn English:  
VERY LITTLE.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5 VEY MUCH