Demotivating Factors in EFL Context: Examining the Nature and the Role of Socio-demographic Variables

Ebrahim Samani[1*], Raziyeh Bagheripour[2], Sara Atarzadeh[3]

[1*]Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Higher Education Complex of Bam, Iran, *samani@bam.ac.ir*

[2]Visiting Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages, Higher Education Complex of Bam, Iran, *bagheripour.r@gmail.com*

[3]Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages, Higher Education Complex of Bam, Iran, *atarzadeh@bam.ac.ir*

Abstract

The concept of demotivation has received the same attention as motivation, especially in the EFL context. However, a review of the literature in Iran's context indicates a lack of studies exploring the nature of these variables, that is internal or external, and the role of some variable especially the structure of schools, fields of study, and proficiency level. The context of the study was the schools of Bam City in Iran. Sampling technique was stratified sampling, and the students of different types of schools that are public, vocational, and private schools and school for the talented responded to the questionnaire. The analysis of the data using factor analysis, one-way analysis of variance, Pearson correlation coefficient indicated that a) three factors of "learner," "learning situation," and "teacher," were present, b) demotivated students considered themselves as the main reason for not progressing in English which emphasized the role of internal factors, and c) demotivational factors did not differ significantly among different fields of study, however, different school types were significantly different from each other in terms of these factors. The findings of this study provide necessary insight to both teachers and their students in their act of teaching and learning languages.

1. Introduction

While researchers commonly use the term "motivation" in different research contexts, in the literature, there seems to be no general definition of this concept (Dörnyei, 1998). Sucuoglu (2017) defined Motivation as "A complex social - psychological influence" that moves a person towards a desire (p. 190). According to Doughty and Long (2003), "motivation is responsible for why people decide to do something, how long they are willing to sustain the activity, and how hard they are going to pursue it" (p. 614). Motivation is an important factor in the educational setting. It is also defined as "an inner drive that propels students toward their achievement" (Dörnyei, 2001, p. 50)

Success in language learning undoubtedly depends on motivation. (Song & Kim, 2017). Gardner (1985) refers to motivation in the course of learning L2 as "the extent to which individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (p.10).

In L2 learning, research on motivation became very noticeable when Gardner and Lambert's (1972) long-term research on attitudes and motivation in L2 learning was published (Dörnyei, 1990). There are ample studies in the field of language learning motivation (Dörnyei & Al- Hoorie, 2017; Iwaniec, 2014; Klimova, 2011; Q. Li, 2014; Yousofi et al., 2017). In a study by Klimova (2011) examining the motivation of university learners in learning English in response to the first question, "whether you consider studying English to be important for your future," all 19 student participants considered English learning vital for their future. However, regarding the question of why "you study English," just six students responded by expressing their likeness and their belief that English is a crucial skill to live in the modern world. Others stated because English was a compulsory subject at school or that their parents forced them to study it. It is clear that highly motivated students are more successful than demotivated ones. However, some factors reduce students' motivation in the learning process. In fact, they demotivate students (Boonchuayrod & Getkham, 2018).

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) states that demotivation is the "dark side" of motivation. They pointed out that demotivation relates to various factors that affect negatively the existing motivation. Bekleyen (2011) described demotivation as a reduction in the amount of motivation. She argued that demotivation is not a lack of motivation. In fact, there is another concept named "amotivation" that refers to the absence of motivation, whereas demotivation is a series of external factors that negatively affect motivation level. (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). A demotivated person is defined as someone who begins a task with a plausible amount of motivation,

however, he/she gradually loses it because of some negative factors (Sugino, 2010).

A review of different studies in the literature on motivation indicates an abundance of factors affecting the process of learning English (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

There are myriad research studies on second language learning motivation, however, there is still a need for further studies on demotivation and its causes. Demotivation is an important issue in the L2 learning context; thus the responsibility of researchers, as well as teachers in this regard is very important (Dörnyei, 2001). Of the prominent causes of failure in learning a language, the role of demotivation is significant, thus to achieve greater success in L2 learning, the need to address the causes of demotivation seems necessary (Kaivanpanah & Ghasemi, 2011).

According to the nature of demotivating factors, they are of two kinds: external factors and internal factors. Some factors are internal in nature such as negative attitude and lack of confidence, and others are external and are not related to learners like textbooks, etc. (Çankaya, 2018). In his definition of demotivation, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) considered only the internal factors, but Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) argued that the earlier definition proposed by Dornyei which included external factors needs to change in a way that internal factors be included. Moreover, some other researchers have speculated about the effect of internal factors on demotivating students in the course of learning a foreign language (Arai, 2004; Falout & Maruyama, 2004; Ikeno, 2002; Tsuchiya, 2006). In this regard, Ikeno (2002) conducted a study that found both internal factors (Such as perceived deficiency in controlling the things a learner is learning) and external factors (such as teachers' inability) to be the robust factors of demotivation. The current study focused on the structure of types of demotivational factors in high school at the EFL context. It was aimed at finding these factors and determining whether they are mainly of internal or external type and further exploring their relationships with items such as school type, field of study, and proficiency.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Demotivation Studies in Different Countries

2.1.1. Studies on High School Students

Students are more prone to demotivation, where they are learning English in an EFL context. One reason for this is that in the EFL setting, English is usually a compulsory subject (Song & Kim, 2017). The other reason might be the lack of English speaking environment. Rudnai (1996)

and Dornyie were among the first researchers who investigated demotivation in the EFL field. In his seminal paper of 1998, Dornyie interviewed 50 secondary school learners, which were studying German or English as their foreign language, and recognized them as demotivated. In his study, he presented the sources of demotivation under nine categories:

1. The teachers
2. An unpleasant attitude toward L2 speakers
3. Decreased self-confidence
4. Foreign language phobia
5. L2 study as a compulsory subject
6. Negative effect of another language that is learned at the same time
7. Insufficient facilities
8. Introduced books
9. Peer affect (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 148)

The results revealed that the first category, the teacher, was the main source of demotivation (with 40 percent of the reports) among learners of this study. Similarly, in a study designed to find demotivation factors of English learners in Finland, Muhonen (2004) showed that the most frequently mentioned source of demotivation was related to the teacher and it was mentioned by nearly half of the students. Examining the relationship between the main demotivating factors and the grade level of students, she also found that teacher was the most frequently mentioned demotivating factor by the students in all grades. Dörnyei (2005) pointed out that the majority of previous studies somehow blamed the teacher for students' demotivation since, in most studies, some parts of "classroom existence owned by, or under the control of teachers" were identified as the strongest demotivating factors (p. 90).

In their investigation into demotivating factors in English classes in Japan high schools, Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) developed a 35-item questionnaire. The data were factor analyzed, and five demotivating factors were uncovered:

1. Contents and materials for learning
2. Competence and teaching styles of teachers
3. Insufficient facilities in school
4. Deficiency in intrinsic motivation
5. Exam results

According to their findings, two factors of "learning contents and materials," and "test scores" were reported by both students having more motivation and less motivation as the most demotivating factors. In contrast to some earlier findings (Dörnyei, 1998; Muhonen, 2004), according to the groups, teachers' style and competence were not the most motivating factors.

They also examined whether demotivating factors differed between learners having more motivation and less motivation. Although both groups of students reported the same demotivating factors, less motivated students considered factor 4 (deficiency in intrinsic motivation) as more demotivating than students with more motivation. Song and Kim (2017) carried out an investigation on 64 Korean high school students about factors influencing the demotivation and remotivation in learning EFL. They reached the conclusion that the students from both demotivated and remotivated groups identified external factors, including teaching methods used by their teachers, textbooks, their changed study methods, learning content, and a decrease in their test scores, more demotivating than internal factors. They also noted that both externally and internally characterized factors had a great influence on students' remotivation, although the strongest remotivational factor was "students' awareness of the necessity of English."

Another study conducted by Khouya (2018) identified the learning environment (including school facilities) as the factor that demotivated learners most.

2.1.2. Studies on University Students

Falout et al. (2009), who surveyed 900 EFL university students in Japan, identified nine factors to further investigate the most influential demotivating factor in EFL learning. The nine factors were categorized as three reactive factors, three internal factors, and three external factors. The results showed that the use of the grammar-translation method in English classes, an external factor, had the most negative influence on Japanese students. They also concluded that students with less proficiency in second language learning and less L2 learning experience, are more likely to be demotivated because they cannot regulate their emotional states when faced with demotivators.

In a study by Yadav and BaniAta (2013), carried out on 100 university students of English major in Saudi Arabia, it was revealed that English used in textbooks is among the top demotivating factors for students. Another demotivating factor for Saudi students was the rare use of technology in their English classes. It was also found that the teacher was in the view of many students as a demotivator, although the teacher was not the most demotivating factor. Bekleyen (2011) also found "insufficient technological equipment in the classroom, followed by "negative experiences in primary and high school education" as the main demotivators among Turkish university students majoring in different fields. Her research results are somewhat similar to those of Yadav and BaniAta (2013) as in both studies, technological equipment has been found to be an important

demotivator. Students of different fields of study also differed significantly in demotivating factors

Investigating the demotivation and remotivation factors of university students in Korea, Jung (2011) found external factors such as "learning situation," including "difficulty of English" and "decreased test score," as the most influential demotivators. On the other hand, she found internal factors including "awareness of the value of English" and "desire to be good at English" as the key motivators. It is worth noting that "teacher" was not the main demotivator in this study.

Comparing demotivators among Chinese and Korean college students, Li and Zhou (2013) extracted six demotivators from Chinese students and five demotivators from Korean ones. Among these demotivators, "Teacher," an external factor, was ranked as the highest demotivator for Korean students, whereas "Learning Strategies Deficiency" which was an internal factor, was the most significant demotivator for Chinese students. Categorizing demotivators, four were shared by both Chinese and Korean students: "The Teachers, Confidence Deficiency, Inadequate Facilities, and The Learning Environment." However, there were some culture-specific demotivators for Chinese students, including learning strategy deficiency and negative attitude toward target language/culture, and Korean students, including peer pressure. The results of this study were, to some extent, like that of Vidak and Sindik (2018), in that "teacher setting" was identified as a strong demotivator. Moreover, they found no statistically significant difference in demotivating factors among the university students in Croatia regarding gender, the programme of study, and the students' year of study. Likewise, Quadir (2017) studying 36 university students in Bangladesh, blamed the "teachers" as the most influential demotivator. Nguyen and Phạm (2017) also reached a similar conclusion. Through research on Vietnamese college students, he found that the negative feedback from the teacher was the main reason that depleted students of their motivation.

Zou and Xu (2016) choosing 250 vocational college students as their subjects, found the following six demotivating factors: "(1) learning content; (2) inappropriate handling of learning materials; (3) learning failures; (4) inadequate facilities and learning context; (5) teachers' competence and teaching styles; and (6) lack of intrinsic motivation" (p. 555). Their study also examined demotivating factors and learners' proficiency level for the existence of any relationship. In this regard, they found that the following four factors: learning failures, inadequate facilities and learning context, teaching style and competence of teachers, and deficiency in intrinsic motivation affected the proficiency of students in English negatively. Besides, concerning the difference between learners with more and less

motivation in terms of demotivating factors, great differences were found in factors 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The students in two groups did not differ significantly in factor 1, however, they considered it as a crucial demotivating factor. And "teachers' competence and teaching styles" was not found as a main demotivation factor for both groups.

A more recent study conducted by Çankaya (2018) identified "class characteristics," including unsuitable course contents, too much focus on grammar and university entrance exams, as well as memorizing the language, as the main demotivating factor. In contrast, the "teacher" was considered as the least demotivating factor. Examining gender across demotivating factors, difference between them was not significant. Likewise, considering the difference between demotivation factors of students across their class (first, second) and also their academic departments (Tourism, Marketing, and Food Technology), no significant differences were observed.

2.2. Demotivation Studies in Iran

2.2.1. Studies on Students of High Schools

In a study by Meshkat and Hassani (2012) on Iranian high school students, "inadequate school facilities" were found as the most demotivator of all in learning English. Two other factors of "teachers' competence and teaching styles," and "learning content and materials" followed the first factor. This study somehow resembled that of Yadav and BaniAta (2013) in which technology was a strong demotivating factor. Unlike previous studies, "Test Scores" was not perceived as a demotivator. Boys and girls differed significantly in the factors of "learning content and materials," and "Teachers' competence and Teaching Styles". In the same way, "lack of school facilities" was the strongest demotivator for Iranian students in high schools in Sahragard and Alimorad's (2013) study. The factors that were extracted in their study were "(a) Lack of Self-confidence, (b) Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles, (c) Lack of Interest in English, (d) Lack of School Facilities, (e) Learning Contents and Context, (f) Focus on English Usage, and (g) The Focus of Teaching" (p. 316). There was a comparison of the more and less motivated students in demotivating factors. According to the results, the groups differed significantly in lack of self-confidence (factor 1), however, the results of the statistical analysis was not significant for the other factors (2 to 6).

Alavinia and Sehat (2012) also found similar results in that, context of learning, including programming of class and deficiency in teaching aids and equipment, was reported as the main demotivating factor. Furthermore, regarding the effect of 'personality and behavior of teacher, experience of failure by learner and absence of success, significant differences among the classes were observed. Correspondingly, significant differences among

majors with respect to the effect of 'teacher's personality and behavior' and 'the learners' experience of failure' were found.

To explore demotivating factors affecting the speaking performance of Iranian high school learners, Afrough et al. (2014) found six demotivational factors as follows: 1. an unpleasant attitude toward L2 speakers, 2. deficiency in competence and performance of teacher, 3. insufficient facilities especially technological, 4. insufficient material for teaching, 5. the inappropriate climate of classrooms, 6. lack of enough opportunities for speaking practice.

Molaee et al. (2016) found that EFL learners identified teachers as the most demotivating/motivating factor. The results resembled that of Dörnyei (1998) and Muhonen (2004).

In another study, Rajabi and Pozveh (2016) conducted research over the students who attended extra English classes in an institute and those who didn't have such an experience. The first group considered "class material," and "class characteristics" as the most frequently mentioned demotivating factors, while for the second group "class characteristics," and "teacher" were the most demotivational factors. Class characteristics included items like insufficient speaking time in class, too much focus on grammar and translation, and memorizing.

2.2.2. Studies on University Students

Hosseinpour and Heidari Darani (2018) studying university students' perception of demotivating factors identified seven factors which were ranked from the most demotivating to the least demotivating as follows: "inadequate facilities, reduced self-confidence, class characteristics, lack of purpose, teaching methods, teachers and teaching styles, and negative attitudes" (p. 96). In terms of the most demotivating factor, the results were in line with that of Meshkat and Hassani (2012). Furthermore, different levels of proficiency did not differ in all of the factors of demotivation except "negative attitudes" and "reduced self-confidence."

Ghadirzadeh et al. (2011), unlike Song and Kim (2017), found that internal factors play a more important role in demotivating students than external factors. Using Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) questionnaire, they extracted five factors in their study demotivating university students in learning English language which were as follows: (a) insufficient facilities, (b) grammar oriented class, (c) teaching methodology and content of course, (d) deficiency in intrinsic motivation, and (e) lack of self-confidence. In addition, concerning the difference between the two groups of students with more and less motivation, in terms of demotivators in English language learning, the results showed a significant difference in two factors of "lack of perceived individual competence," and "lack of intrinsic motivation."

However, the difference between two groups was not significant in extrinsic sources of demotivation which included factors like "Focus on Difficult Grammar," "Inappropriate Characteristics of Teachers," "Inadequate Facilities," and "Teaching Methods and Course Contents." The findings of their study suggested that internal demotivating factors cannot be ignored by Iranian students.

Studying demotivating factors affecting non-English majors, Moiinvaziri and Razmjoo (2014) reported six demotivating factors as follow: "(1) lack of self-esteem and intrinsic motivation; (2) teachers 'methods and personality; (3) lack of extrinsic motivation; (4) setbacks in educational system; (5) lack of given importance in society and (6) unsuitable class environment" (p. 57). Among these factors, "setbacks in the educational system," which included 'limited time devoted to English,' 'inappropriate course books,' 'crowded classes,' and 'different proficiency levels of the students in a class,' was identified as the most important demotivating factor. In addition, examining demotivating factors in different universities, it was found that the three universities of Azad, Payame Noor, and pubic were significantly different in three factors of 1, 3, and 4. Males and females differed significantly just in factor 1, "lack of self-esteem and intrinsic motivation". Concerning the relationship between students' age and demotivating factors, only factors 1 and 5 correlated significantly and positively with age.

Using data collected from 194 students of different universities in Tehran, Pakzadian et al. (2016) extracted 18 main demotivational factors within which 'inappropriate teaching method' was the most salient demotivational factor and interestingly it was not influenced significantly by university type or gender. In their research, Soureshjani and Riahipour (2012) also identified the teacher-related factor as the most salient factor that demotivated students in learning the speaking skill. Likewise, in the study conducted by Hosseinpour and Heidari Darani (2018), the most important demotivational factor was found to be "teachers and their teaching styles." The postgraduates in their study, considered "class characteristics," "inadequate facilities," and "lack of purpose to study" as the most demotivating. Regarding the role of the field of study in demotivating factors, they considered demotivating factors with respect to external and internal dimensions. The most important demotivating factor for the students of social science and basic science was "deficiency in self-confidence" and for students of engineering was "lack of purpose," both of which are internal factors. In contrast, for the students of medicine, the top-ranking demotivating factor was "inadequate facilities," which is an external factor.

In another study conducted by Kaivanpanah and Ghasemi (2011), a sample of 327 students who were studying in different grades of schools and

university, responded a 32-item questionnaire. According to their answer, the following items were identified as demotivating factors: 1) attitude toward second language learning, 2) experience of failure, 3) teacher, 4) attitude toward the community of English speakers, 5) learning contents, materials, and facilities. From these factors, "learning contents, materials, and facilities" was the most important demotivator. Regarding demotivational factors across gender, two factors of "experience of failure," and "teacher" demotivated females more than they did males.

As it is mentioned, motivation is a very crucial factor in individuals' success in learning, especially learning English. Obviously, demotivation is a major obstacle to learning and teaching English, especially in Iran, which is an EFL environment. Although much research has been done so far on students' motivation to learn a foreign/second language around the world, there is still little research on different aspects of demotivating factors, especially in Iran. As it can be seen, in various studies, different items have been mentioned as the prominent source of demotivation, the reason for this may be due to the effect of other variables such as the difference in age, level of education, gender, the field of study, type of school, or different school facilities, etc. Furthermore, the results of these studies are not still conclusive regarding the nature of the factors, whether they are internal or external. Thus, as the first aim of this study, there was an attempt to find out factors of demotivation among high school students. And in the second place, since Iranian schools, and in particular Bam schools, are divided into different types, and this fact has not been addressed in previous researches, demotivating factors across different types of schools (public, private, vocational, and school for the talented) were examined. Meanwhile, differences in the perception of demotivating factors among students of different fields of study and different classes with different proficiency levels were also investigated. In addition, the relationship between students' grades in English and students' self-reported motivation status was explored. The following research questions were addressed.

1. What is the level of different demotivating factors stated in percentage in the English classes for the motivated and demotivated Iranian high school students?

2. Is there any difference between demotivating factors among motivated and not motivated students?

3. Is there any significant difference in the perceptions of demotivating factors in learning EFL by students of humanities, vocational, and natural sciences?

4. Is there a relationship between students' grades in English and students' self-reported demotivation?

5. Is there any significant difference in the structure of demotivating factors in learning EFL as perceived by the students of public schools, private schools, vocational schools, and schools for the talented?

3. Method

3.1. Participants

According to Jung (2011), students tend to lose their motivation of studying English during high school years. The exam-oriented nature of classes where students have to prepare themselves for the college entrance exam gradually burns out any motivation for learning English. That is the reason, the selected sample in this study represented the structure of high schools in the city of Bam, which are made of public schools, schools for talented students, vocational, and private schools. This kind of sampling technique follows the principles of a stratified random sampling technique. Random sampling technique was used to select one school from every type of school, and all the students in the selected schools participated in the study. As Table 1 indicates, the sample consisted of 244 female students from four high schools.

Table 1

Characteristics of Participants in Terms of Year and Field of Study

School type	Year of study			total	field			total
	grade 10	grade 11	grade 12		humanities	natural sciences	vocational	
public schools	43	50	0	93	50	44	0	94
school for the talented	37	35	0	72	0	71	0	71
vocational schools	35	2	9	46	0	0	47	47
private schools	8	22	0	30	8	22	0	30
Total	123	109	9	241	58	137	47	242

According to Table 1, the number of the students in grade 11 in public schools was higher than the other grades. In schools for the talented, there were no students from grade 12, and all of the participants were related to grade 10 and grade 11. In vocational schools, the participants were mainly from grade 10 (n=35), and in private schools, grade 11 students outnumbered the students of the other grades (n=22). Distribution of the participants across different fields of study also showed that in all of the school types except public and vocational schools, participants mostly belonged to the natural science field of study (71, 22 respectfully).

3.2. Instrument

In order to collect data in this study, a questionnaire by Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) was used. There were 35 Likert type questions consisting of 5

points which were as follow in descending order 5: strongly agree; 4: agree; 3: no idea; 2: disagree, and 1: strongly disagree. The questionnaire also included the question "How do you evaluate your motivation to learn English?" The students selected one of the two options of "motivated," and "demotivated". According to their answers to this question, the researchers of this study assigned them to two groups of "motivated," and "demotivated". The questionnaire items were translated into Farsi to facilitate the comprehension of the items by the students. The researchers distributed the questionnaire in the selected schools after obtaining the necessary permission, and they explained any difficulty to the students.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results

This study used principal components analysis (PCA) which is one of the statistics included in SPSS 18 in order to examine the structure of the factors. As a requirement for PCA, data were assessed for suitability. As a result of this preliminary step, matrix of correlation showed the existence of a sufficient number of coefficients with a value of 0.3 and above. Also, the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin was 0.87 which is higher than the required value of 0.6. (Kaiser, 1970, 1974). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) also yielded a significant result which indicates that the correlation matrix is factorable. According to the results of performing PCA, eight components had the eigenvalues of more than 1 and explained 27.7%, 7.7%, 5.7%, 5.1%, 4%, 3.7%, 3.3%, and 3% of the variance respectively. In addition, the scree plot showed the existence of a clear break between the fourth and the fifth components. According to the information from the scree plot as well as Catell (1966) scree test, a decision regarding keeping four components was made. Table 2 (See Appendix 1) indicates the structure of demotivating factors for the students in the study.

The results of factor analysis, as demonstrated in Table 2, were in correspondence with the results of Parallel Analysis, which indicated that only four components with eigenvalues more than 1 in factor analysis exceeded corresponding criterion values in a randomly generated data matrix of the same size (35 variables × 244 respondents). The total variance that a four-component solution explained was 46.47%. Component 1 explained 27.75% of the total variance, component 2 contributed 7.75% to the total variance, 5.79% of the total variance was attributed to component 3, and 5.16% of the variance was related to component 4. Then in order to facilitate the interpretation of these four components, oblimin rotation was performed.

As a result of rotated solution, the presence of a simple structure became evident in a way that all the components showed a number of strong loadings and all variables loaded considerably on only one component

(Thurstone, 1974) (explanation about inconsistency with previous research and combining the factors should be added). The correlation between the four factors was a weak negative one (r = 0.19, -0.28, 0.18, respectively).

After the factor analysis of the results of the questionnaire, the proposed structure of the original factors in the questionnaire was not repeated. According to the results of the factor analysis, the structure of the factors in this study, as well as their related questions was as follows:

Factor 1: Learner [experiences of failure (7-9, 27), lack of interest (31-34)]

Factor 2: Teacher (11, 12, 13, 15)

Factor 3: Learning situation [characteristics of the class (1-5, 19) class environment (21-25)]

In order to answer the first research question in this study, descriptive analysis was conducted, the result of this analysis is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Each Factor and its Descriptive Statistics (N=158)

No.	Factor	K	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	Learner	8	3.69	0.69	0.52	-0.20
2	Teacher	4	1.95	0.90	1.27	1.67
3	learning situation	11	3.51	0.95	0.04	-0.78

As Table 3 represents, according to the students who considered themselves demotivated in the questionnaire, the list of factors from the most demotivating to the least demotivating was learner, learning situation, and teacher accordingly (M=3.69, SD= 0.69), (M=3.51, SD=0.95), and (M=1.95, SD= 0.90).

The list of demotivating factors was also reported for both groups of the demotivated and motivated students. Table 4 reports the list of demotivating factors for both the demotivated and motivated students.

Table 4

List of Demotivators for both Motivated and not Motivated Students

	learner	teacher	learning situation
motivated	1.87	1.58	3.27
not motivated	3.69	1.95	3.51

As Table 4 indicates, the difference in the ranking of the factors for both groups was different. Motivated students reported learning situations as the most demotivating. However, the most demotivating factor for the

demotivated students was the "learner factor." Meanwhile, they were similar in the least demotivating factor, and both groups considered teachers as the least demotivating factor.

A multivariate analysis of variance was also conducted to examine whether the motivated and demotivated students differed in terms of demotivating factors. Table 5 represents the results of this analysis.

As Table 5 represents, the dependent variables used included: learning situation, teacher, and learner. The independent variable was the level of motivation. As a preliminary step before the analysis, the assumptions like linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity were checked. The results showed no violation of these assumptions. According to the results, the difference between motivated and not motivated students on the combined dependent variables was significant F (3, 154) = 43.96, p= 0.00; Wilks' Lambda = 0.54; partial eta squared = 0.46. In order to further examine where the difference exactly lies between the factors, As Table 6 represents, the results for the dependent variables were considered separately.

Table 5

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Effect			Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
	dimension1	Pillai's Trace	.954	1063.254[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.954
		Wilks' Lambda	.046	1063.254[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.954
		Hotelling's Trace	20.713	1063.254[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.954
		Roy's Largest Root	20.713	1063.254[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.954
motivationst		Pillai's Trace	.461	43.958[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.461
		Wilks' Lambda	.539	43.958[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.461
		Hotelling's Trace	.856	43.958[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.461
		Roy's Largest Root	.856	43.958[a]	3.000	154.000	.000	.461

According to Table 6, in order to adjust alpha level prior to the separate analysis of dependent variables, Bonferroni alpha level which was adjusted was set at 0.017. According to the results, statistical significance was related to "teachers" F (1, 156) =11.94, p=0.001 and "learner" F (1,156)

= 129.34, p=0.00. An examination of the mean scores showed that not-motivated students reported slightly higher levels of demotivation related to the factors of "teacher" (M = 2.07, SD = 1.00) and "learner" (M = 3.66, SD = 1.01) than motivated students related to the same factors respectively (M = 1.57, SD = 0.77) and (M = 1.84, SD = 0.88.

Table 6

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

	Dependent Variable		Type III Sum of Squares	f	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model		learningsituation#	1.992[a]	1	1.992	3.872	.051	.024
	dimension1	teacher#	8.484[b]	1	8.484	11.939	.001	.071
		learner#	109.445[c]	1	109.445	129.342	.000	.453
		learningsituation#	1479.757	1	1479.757	2876.529	.000	.949
dimension1		teacher#	437.978	1	437.978	616.327	.000	.798
		learner#	998.294	1	998.294	1179.777	.000	.883
motivationst		learningsituation#	1.992	1	1.992	3.872	.051	.024
	dimension1	teacher#	8.484	1	8.484	11.939	.001	.071
		learner#	109.445	1	109.445	129.342	.000	.453

In order to explore different factors of demotivation across different fields of study, a one-way between - groups analysis of variance was conducted. The result is given in Table 7.

Table 7

One-Way Between- Groups Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	25.456	2	12.728	3.636	.035
Within Groups	154.022	44	3.501		
Total	179.478	46			

a. motivationst = 2 not motivated

According to Table 7, participants who considered themselves as demotivated were divided into three groups according to their fields of study at high school. The difference among different fields of study in terms of motivation was not statistically significant. F (2, 44) = 3.64, p=0.03. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, for the factor of "teacher" was 0.14, which is considered as a large effect size.

In order to further delve into this question and examine the difference between different fields of study in terms of different factors consisting of demotivation, a series of one-way analyses of variances were performed, which are presented in Table 8.

As Table 8 represents, the difference was statistically significant at the p < 0.05 level just in the factor of "teacher." F (2, 71) = 7.236, p=.001. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, for the factor of "teacher" was 0.17, which is considered as a large effect size.

Table 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Different Fields of Study (ANOVA)

Teacher	mean	std. Deviation	F	DF	Sig
humanities	1.88	.870	7.236	71	.001
natural sciences	1.70	.695			
vocational schools	2.70	1.043			
Learner					
humanities	3.68	1.045	.362	61	.723
natural sciences	3.62	.986			
vocational schools	3.88	.752			
learning situation					
humanities	3.32	.636	1.268	59	.289
natural sciences	3.60	.706			
vocational schools	3.63	.754			

In addition, in order to examine the relationship between the demotivated students' grades in English (as measured by the record of their previous year) and how they perceived different factors as demotivating (as measured by their scores in demotivation questionnaire) Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed. Prior to the conducting of the analysis, as a preliminary step, data were examined to make sure that the assumptions of linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity were not violated. The correlation between the two variables was strong and negative, $r = –0.41$, $n = 104$, $p=.00$, with high grades in English associated with lower scores in the demotivation questionnaire. Table 9 represents the results of this analysis.

Table 9

Pearson Product- Moment Correlation Coefficient

		gradepy	demotivationtotal1
gradepy	Pearson Correlation	1	-.430[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005
	N	70	41
demotivationtotal1	Pearson Correlation	-.430[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	
	N	41	47

[**]. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
a. motivationst = 2 not motivated

According to Table 9, preliminary analyses were performed to make sure that there was no violation of the assumptions of linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity. The Correlation between the two variables was negative, $r=-0.43$, $n=117$, $p<0.00$. In other words, there was an association between higher grades in the English language and lower level of demotivation.

In order to answer the final question of this study about the existence of any difference among the demotivated students of different schools in this

study, a one-analysis of variance was performed for different schools separately. Table 10 represents the results of this analysis.

Table 10

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Different School Types

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	43.540	3	14.513	4.550	.008
Within Groups	133.972	42	3.190		
Total	177.513	45			

a. motivationst = 2 not motivated

According to Table 10, participants who considered themselves as demotivated were assigned into three groups regarding their school type. The difference was statistically significant at the $p < 0.00$ level. $F(3, 42) = 4.550$, $p=0.00$. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, for the factor of "teacher" was 0.24 which is considered as a large effect size.

In order to further delve into this question and examine the difference between school-types in terms of different factors consisting of demotivation, a series of one-way analyses of variances were performed, which are given in Table 11.

Table 11

One-Way Analyses of Variances for Different Types of Schools in Terms of Different Demotivation Factors

Teacher	mean	std. Deviation	F	DF	Sig
public schools	1.68	0.61	5.55	69	0.00
schools for the talented	1.69	0.82			
vocational schools	2.70	1.04			
private schools	2.08	1.04			
Learner					
public schools	3.68	1.04	1.08	59	0.36
schools for the talented	3.34	0.84			
vocational schools	3.88	0.75			
private schools	4.00	0.80			
learning situation					
public schools	3.60	0.751	0.961	57	.42
school for the talented	3.25	0.659			
vocational schools	3.63	0.754			
private schools	3.36	0.278			

According to Table 11, the only demotivational factor in which schools differed significantly was related to the "teacher" factor. In other words, the mean of "teacher" as a demotivational factor was higher among vocational school students than the mean among public school students and

schools for talented students. The means of both vocational and private schools (M= 2.70, M=2.08 respectably) were not significantly different.

4.2. Discussion

In recent years the interest in studying demotivational factors has grown, but despite the importance of the issue, there is still a need for new studies in different contexts. This current study was conducted to contribute to the literature related to motivation and demotivation. According to the results, the students reported the factor of "learner" as the most important demotivator of learning English. The findings of this study contradict Muhonen (2004), and Quadir (2017) in that students' demotivation was mainly attributed to "teacher." It also contradicts the findings of Dörnyei (1998) and Molaee et al. (2016), who reported that "teacher factor" was the top demotivator for students in high school. The findings of this study support the findings of Çankaya (2018) in that teacher's competence was not considered as an important reason for demotivation compared to class characteristics and lack of interest. The findings are also in agreement with Kim (2009) in that "teachers' competence and teaching style" had the lowest correlation with the students' demotivation. It is also in accordance with Sakai and Kikuchi (2009), L. Li and Zhou (2013), and Jung (2011) in that competence of a teacher and their style were one of the demotivating factors in learning English but not the primary one.

According to the results in this study, the most demotivating factor for not-motivated students was "learner"; however, this factor for the motivated students was "learning situation." This finding partially supports the findings of Zou and Xu (2016) in that not- motivated students reported higher levels of demotivation concerning the factors of 'teacher' and 'learner' than motivated students related to the same factors. However, it contradicts Sahragard and Alimorad's (2013) study in that two groups did not differ significantly in terms of most demotivating factors. There is ample evidence that internal factors provide the necessary motivation for any task including learning of English language and at the same time, they can act as significant demotivators along with external factors (Arai, 2004; Falout et al., 2009; Ghadirzadeh et al., 2011; Ikeno, 2002; Tsuchiya, 2006).

Another finding was the presence of a statistically significant difference between the motivated and not motivated students in terms of demotivating factors. Examining demotivational factors between motivated and demotivated students indicated that motivated students believed in external factors such as learning situation as the most important demotivational factor. However, for the demotivated students, the situation was completely reverse, and they ranked internal factors such as "learner" as the most important demotivator. The findings in this study accord with the findings of L. Li and Zhou (2013), who reported the diminishing role of

external factors such as teacher and gaining importance of such factors as confidence deficiency. However, the result of this study contradicts the results of Jung's (2011) study in that the external factors were much more influential as demotivating factors in learners of English. This finding was also different from Muhonen (2004) which found no difference between the motivated and demotivated students regarding the most demotivating factor.

This study also examined the existence of any significant difference in demotivation among school types. According to the finding, schools differed significantly in this regard. The finding of this study contradicts Çankaya (2018), who found no specific difference among students at different departments concerning demotivating factors. This finding also supports Alavinia and Sehat (2012), who found a significant difference among majors and classes in terms of motivation factors. Furthermore, the study explored the demotivation level across different fields of study. It was found that different fields of study, namely natural sciences, humanities, and vocational studies differed significantly in only teacher factor. This finding is, to some extent, consistent with Alavinia and Sehat (2012), who found that demotivational factors were not significant across different majors under study except for the factors of "the learners' experience of failure," and "teachers' personality and behavior." Vidak and Sindik (2018) reported no statistically significant difference in demotivating factors among university students in Croatia regarding gender, the programme of study, and the students' year of study.

The findings of this study indicated that two variables of students' proficiency as measured by the record of their previous year's grade in the final exam and demotivation were negatively related. In other words, students who reported to have lower proficiency in English were the most demotivated. The same findings were reported in Tabatabaei and Molavi (2012) and Zou and Xu (2016), where low proficiency were associated with high level of demotivation. In a study conducted by Meshkat and Hassani (2012), just in two factors of "negative attitude," and "reduced self-confidence" the students of higher and lower proficiency differed significantly from each other. Falout et al. (2009) concluded that students with lower proficiency more likely lose their motivation in learning English than the students with higher proficiency.

5. Conclusion and Implications

This study aimed at exploring demotivational factors among the students of different high schools in an EFL context. Furthermore, it examined these factors across variables like the field of study and school type. In addition, the relationship between proficiency in English and the students' demotivation was examined. According to the findings, the most

important demotive for the demotivated students was "learner", which is an internal factor. In addition, the motivated and demotivated students differed significantly in terms of two factors of "teacher," and "learner." Difference was also significant between school types in terms of demotivational factors. However, this difference was not significant regarding the field of study. And finally, the relationship between demotivation and students' proficiency as a measured by the record of their previous year's grade in English exam was negative.

It seems that for the current students who mostly considered internal factors such as lack of interest and experience of failure as demotivating, the ministry of education needs to address this issue by alleviating the educational standards at the primary and secondary levels. At the same time, admission and registration authorities should instruct the students by appropriately investigating their background and existing knowledge of the subject. Only then the chasm between the level of the students and the syllabus can be bridged up.

As one of the limitations of this study, the number of 12-grade students was underrepresented in our sample because the data collection happened toward the end of the school year, and they had finished their classes earlier to prepare for the university entrance examination. This study was also limited in that construct validation of an already established questionnaire was the primary data collection tool, and the other techniques like interviewing the students about their demotivational factors were not used.

It needs to be further explored why students lack the necessary interest to learn English. Future research is warranted to make a series of in-depth inquiries into the cause of interest lack among these students. This study focused on female students, in order to draw a clear picture of the situation, it is suggested that future studies expand their focus by including male students.

References

Afrough, T., Rahimi, A., & Zarafshan, M. (2014). Foreign language learning demotivation: A construct validation study. *Procedia-social and Behavioral Sciences, 136*, 49-53.

Alavinia, P., & Sehat, R. (2012). A probe in to the main de-motivating factors among Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 5*(6), 9-35.

Arai, K. (2004). What 'demotivates' language learners?: Qualitative study on demotivational factors and learners' reactions. *Bulletin of Toyo Gakuen University, 12*(3), 39-47.

Bekleyen, N. (2011). Demotivating factors in the EFL environment. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching, 2*, 151-156.

Boonchuayrod, P. & Getkham, K. (2018). Why were English major students demotived in English Language learning? *International Journal of Management and Applied Science, 4*(3), 51-55.

Çankaya, P. (2018). Demotivation factors in foreign language learning. *Journal of Foreign Language Education and Technology, 3*(1), 1-17.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning, 40*(1), 45-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 31*(3), 117-135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 43-59.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrene Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. (2017). The motivational foundation of learning languages other than Global English: Theoretical issues and research directions. *The Modern Language Journal, 101*(3), 455-468.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Motivation (2nd ed.)*. Longman.

Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. H. (2003). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Blackwell.

Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System, 37*(3), 403-417.

Falout, J., & Maruyama, M. M. (2004). A comparative study of proficiency and learner demotivation. *The Language Teacher, 28*(8), 3-9.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*: Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Newbury House Publishers.

Ghadirzadeh, R., Hashtraudi, F., & Shokri, O. (2011). Factorial analysis of the Farsi version of demotivation questionnaire for English language learning among university students. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences, 4*(4), 194-207.

Hosseinpour, N., & Heidari Darani, L. (2018). Disparities in students' perceptions of demotivating factors in learning English across educational levels and fields of study. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(1), 35-48.

Ikeno, O. (2002). Motivating and demotivating factors in foreign language learning: A preliminary investigation. *Ehime University Journal of English Education Research, 2*, 1-19.

Iwaniec, J. (2014). Motivation of pupils from southern Poland to learn English. *System, 45*, 67-78.

Jung, S. K. (2011). Demotivating and remotivating factors in learning English: A case of low level college students. *English Teaching, 66*(2), 47-72.

Kaivanpanah, S., & Ghasemi, Z. (2011). An investigation into sources of demotivation in second language learning. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 89-110.

Khouya, Y. B. (2018). Students demotivating factors in the EFL classroom: The case of Morocco. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 9*(2), 150-159.

Kim, K. J. (2009). Demotivating factors in secondary English education. *English Teaching, 64*(4), 249-267.

Klimova, B. F. (2011). Motivation for learning English at a university level. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, 15*, 2599-2603.

Li, L., & Zhou, C. (2013). Different faces of demotivation: A comparative study on Chinese and Korean college EFL learners' demotivators. *Journal of Applied Sciences, 13*(6), 800-809.

Li, Q. (2014). Differences in the motivation of Chinese learners of English in a foreign and second language context. *System, 42*, 451-461.

Meshkat, M., & Hassani, M. (2012). Demotivating factors in learning English: The case of Iran. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, 31*, 745-749.

Moiinvaziri, M., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2014). Demotivating factors affecting undergraduate learners of non-English majors studying general English: A case of Iranian EFL context. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 32*(4), 41-61.

Molaee, Z., Dortaj, F., & Sadipour, E. (2016). Unmotivated motivating: Toward motivating L2 learning, based on demotivating factors. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, 217*, 9-15.

Muhonen, J. (2004). *Second language demotivation: Factors that discourage pupils from learning the English language.* University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis.

Nguyen, B. H., & Phạm, T. T. V. (2017). English-major students' perceptions of demotivating factors in learning reading. *International Journal of Advanced Research, 5*(8), 200-207.

Pakzadian, S. S., Elaheh, S., & Iravani, H. (2016). University students' demotives for studying in general and learning English. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 8*(1), 53-90.

Quadir, M. (2017). Let us listen to our students: An analysis of demotivation to study English in Bangladesh. *The English Teacher*, *3*, 128-141.

Rajabi, B., & Pozveh, S. M. H. (2016). A Quantitative analysis of demotivating factors for Iranian intermediate high school EFL Learners. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(5), 124-131.

Rudnai, Z. (1996). Demotivation in learning English among secondary school students in Budapest. *Unpublished MS thesis, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary*.

Sahragard, R., & Alimorad, Z. (2013). Demotivating factors affecting Iranian high school students' English learning. In M. Cortazzi & L. Jin (Eds.), *Researching Cultures of Learning: International perspective on language learning and education* (pp. 308-327). Palgrave Macmillan.

Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System, 37*(1), 57-69.

Song, B., & Kim, T.-Y. (2017). The dynamics of demotivation and remotivation among Korean high school EFL students. *System, 65*, 90-103.

Soureshjani, K. H., & Riahipour, P. (2012). Demotivating factors on English speaking skill: A study of EFL language learners and teachers' attitudes. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 17*(3), 327-339.

Sucuoglu, E. (2017). Analysis of motivational strategies used by English language teachers teaching at secondary schools. *Procedia computer science, 120*, 189-195.

Sugino, T. (2010). Teacher demotivational factors in the Japanese language teaching context. *Procedia-social and Behavioral Sciences, 3*, 216-226.

Tabatabaei, O., & Molavi, A. (2012). Demotivating Factors Affecting EFL Learning of Iranian Seminary Students. *International Education Studies, 5*(1), 181-190.

Thurstone, L. L. (1974). *Multiple factor analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tsuchiya, M. (2006). Factors in demotivation of lower proficiency English learners at college. *The Kyushu Academic Society of English Language Education, 34*, 87-96.

Vidak, N., & Sindik, J. (2018). English language learning demotivation at university students *Collegium Antropologicum, 42*(2), 111-116.

Yadav, M., & BaniAta, H. (2013). Factorizing demotivation, finding motivation: A constructive approach to quality enhancement. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, 70*, 120-130.

Yousofi, N., Ebadi, S., & Saedi, D. M. (2017). Investigating the L2 Motivation of the Undergraduate Students from the Perspective of the "L2 Motivational Self System". *Jornal of Research in Teaching, 5*(3), 1-21.

Zou, L., & Xu, B. (2016). On demotivating factors for English learning of vocational college students in Leshan City, Sichuan, China. *US-China Foreign Language 14*(8), 552-558.

Appendix

Table 2

Factor Analysis of the Students' Response to the Demotivation Questionnaire to Find Out the Structure of Demotivating Factors for the Students in our Study

	structure coefficients				structure coefficients				communalities
	c 1	c 2	c 3	c 4	c 1	c 2	c 3	c 4	
q33	**.849**	-.094	-.093	-.185	**.824**	.071	-.297	-.035	.379
q34	**.837**	-.139	-.070	-.128	**.807**	.024	-.267	.014	.358
q18	**.776**	-.018	.021	-.030	**.777**	.174	-.161	.253	.351
q32	**.771**	.029	.072	.120	**.762**	.125	-.192	.104	.207
q9	**.754**	.102	.091	.027	**.753**	.232	-.144	.161	.247
q8	**.745**	.033	.073	-.057	**.747**	.216	-.394	.165	.469
q31	**.704**	-.048	-.002	.048	**.720**	.157	-.138	.071	.500
q27	**.680**	.044	-.192	.024	**.704**	.219	-.253	.190	.597
q7	**.666**	.076	-.045	.061	**.704**	.093	-.196	.169	.582
q14	**.643**	-.110	.129	.229	**.672**	.356	-.487	.249	.473
q17	**.637**	.097	.010	.088	**.668**	.226	-.196	.209	.555
q35	**.575**	.143	-.209	-.116	**.641**	.285	-.389	.017	.600
q6	**.534**	.185	-.291	.113	**.626**	.010	-.051	.322	.477
q10	**.506**	.187	-.257	-.071	**.602**	.329	-.431	.058	.594
q29	**.473**	.062	.019	.049	**.489**	.154	-.131	.137	.523
q30	**.344**	.027	-.245	.264	**.465**	.165	-.370	.349	.334
q26	.194	.179	-.076	.084	.265	.239	-.173	.141	.464
q24	.017	**.831**	.111	-.102	.128	**.803**	-.049	-.034	.623
q23	.003	**.783**	.164	-.209	.071	**.733**	.027	-.152	.421
q22	-.009	**.705**	-.006	.114	.148	**.715**	-.152	.177	.295
q21	-.018	**.616**	-.084	.270	.172	**.653**	-.224	.330	.507
q25	.109	**.429**	-.169	.227	.279	**.504**	-.304	.300	.524
q12	-.034	-.068	**-.769**	.146	.195	.090	**-.759**	.201	.610
q15	-.289	.194	**-.720**	-.059	.332	.080	**-.688**	.225	.667
q11	.138	-.090	**-.654**	.151	-.059	.275	**-.671**	-.030	.366
q13	.304	.155	**-.466**	.061	.476	.311	**-.587**	.170	.119
q20	.219	-.021	**-.446**	-.140	.316	.096	**-.491**	-.064	.509
q28	.303	-.087	**-.410**	-.143	.377	.039	**-.465**	-.062	.310
q16	.218	.302	**-.304**	-.204	.326	.386	**-.407**	-.112	.245
q3	.104	.105	.134	**.550**	.184	.149	.036	**.566**	.347
q1	.268	-.095	.084	**.526**	.319	-.012	-.019	**.558**	.528
q19	.189	-.014	-.257	**.490**	.345	.118	-.350	**.545**	.582
q2	-.186	.077	-.047	**.485**	.369	.085	.009	**.509**	.727
q5	.326	.009	.143	**.463**	-.072	.095	-.052	**.463**	.689
q4	-.101	-.037	-.252	**.384**	.031	.028	-.250	**.385**	.488

Bibliographic information of this paper for citing: