

## Original Paper

# Exploring the Demotivating and Re-Motivating Factors among MA Students of TEFL at Wollega University, Ethiopia

Shibeshi Alebachew<sup>1\*</sup> & Eba Mejena<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of English Language and Literature, Mekdela Amba University, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Language Studies and Literature, Wollega University, Ethiopia

\* Shibeshi Alebachew, Department of English Language and Literature, Makdela Amba University, Ethiopia

Received: April 8, 2019

Accepted: April 28, 2019

Online Published: May 3, 2019

doi:10.22158/eltls.v1n1p14

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/eltls.v1n1p14>

### Abstract

*The present study explored the demotivating and re-motivating factors from the point of view of MA students at Wollega University. The study employed mixed method, and the quantitative data were gathered from 161 students, and to gather the qualitative data, six students were interviewed. SPSS 16 was employed to analyse the quantitative data. The qualitative data were analysed using NVivo. An explanatory factor analysis was conducted to revalidate the questionnaire and to explore the sampling adequacy and factorability of the items. Based on the result, nine demotivating factors were retained. As the result of independent t-tests revealed, there were no significant differences between male and female students and government and self-sponsor students regarding the demotivating factors. However, the one-way ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference across respondents' year of study for most of the factors except instructors' characteristics and administrative decisions. The interviews were analysed to explore the possible re-motivating factors. Three major sub-themes (curriculum revision, improving facilities and improving administrative decisions) were emerged. It was concluded that curriculum decision is the most prevalent problem for MA in TEFL students. To solve this problem, the researchers recommended the need for MA in TEFL curriculum.*

### Keywords

*demotivation, re-motivation, factors*

## 1. Introduction

English as emerged a *lingua franca* in most part of the world since it is recently used as a language of science, technology and tourism (Talebinezhad & Aliakbari, 2001). Cognizant of this fact, higher

education institutions are striving to offer successful English language teaching in order to produce competent graduates. To achieve this, learners need to be provided with motivating learning environment.

Motivation, which is a catch word in the learning and teaching process, has been over researched due to its vital role in education. Hence, learners with necessary skills, a suitable curricula and appropriate teaching cannot achieve language goals without sufficient motivation (Dörnyei, 1998). The seminal work which was conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1959) in the bilingual context of Canada is believed to be the first study on motivation. Since then, numerous studies (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994, 1996; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011) were done globally in different contexts. However, demotivation which is “another side of motivation” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Falout et al., 2009; Falout & Maruyama, 2004; Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009) has got attention only recently. Demotivation is defined as “the external factors causing a decrease in motivational level” (Dörnyei, 1994). Hence, demotivation has a negative effect on learning and outcomes in that it degrades their motivation and results in long-term negative learning outcomes (Fallout et al., 2009). It is also stated that demotivating factors “impede learners’ learning motivation” (Hu, 2011, p. 88).

Several studies were conducted abroad on the demotivating factors that affect EFL learners (Ali & Pathan, 2017; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Falout et al., 2009; Fattash, 2013; Piggot, 2008; Muhonen, 2004; Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009). However, to the best of the researchers’ knowledge, no study is conducted on demotivating and remotivating factors among EFL learners in Ethiopian context. Therefore, to fill this gap, the present study which aimed at exploring the demotivating and remediating factors among MA students of TEFL, was conducted at Wollega University.

Empirical studies on the issue of teachers’ role in motivating language learners have mostly focused on demotivating factors rather than motivating factors. Falout and Maruyama (2004), for instance, compared demotivating factors to learn English among low and high proficiency language learners. They reported that higher proficiency learners attributed demotivation to external factors, especially teachers, while lower proficiency learners attributed their demotivation to internal factors, particularly failure in performance.

Falout et al. (2009) investigated the demotivating factors in learning English as a foreign language in Japan and the relationship between EFL learners’ past demotivating experiences and present proficiencies. The findings showed that Course Level (the appropriate level of the textbooks/courses, and pace of the courses) and Teacher Immediacy (perceptions and experiences with past teachers, as being approachable or friendly) were positively related, implying that “the more learners perceive teachers as approachable, the more they perceive the level of the courses as appropriate” (p. 408).

Piggot (2008) investigated Japanese students’ perceptions of the motivating and demotivating classroom factors in learning English as a foreign language. The results of the study showed that teachers’ modelling (teacher’s persona), presentation (the way the teacher communicates the purpose and procedure of class activities), affiliative motive (the extent to which students are motivated to

please the teacher), and control (teacher-pressure) were among the important issues to motivate/demotivate students to learn English as a foreign language.

Muhonen (2004) examined the main demotivating factors regarding students' gender and level of achievement. The analysis of the data collected from 91 ninth-grade students five demotivating factors were identified (the teacher, learning material, learner characteristics, school environment, and student's attitude towards English). As the result further indicated, the teacher is the most demotivating factor and attitude towards second language is the least demotivating factor. Moreover, the finding showed that there was no significant difference between male and female students in terms of demotivating factors. The teacher was regarded the main demotivating factor in all grades.

Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) investigated demotivation among Japanese learners of English. Five demotivation factors extracted from their study. Teachers' competence and teaching style (teachers' explanation, respect to students, aggressive behaviour, and pace of teaching) were found to be among the most important factors that demotivated students to learn English as a foreign language.

Rahimi and Sadighpour (2011) investigated Iranian technical and vocational students' demotivating factors in learning English as a foreign language. The participants reported that teachers and their teaching quality were among the factors that demotivate them to learn English as a school subject. However, they rated teacher-related factor as the fourth demotivating factor while assessment policy, school facility and instructional materials were considered to be more important.

English language teachers of secondary schools are pursuing their postgraduate education in different Universities in Ethiopia. Despite such education opportunities, the researchers of this study observed that MA students of TEFL are being demotivated due to various factors. As a result, an attempt was made to explore the most prevalent demotivating factors. Possible solutions which can regain students' motivations were also dealt.

Wollega University was launched a decade ago and had many postgraduate programs of which the MA in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) is one. The researchers could observe some irregularities during the teaching and learning process. As a result, in order to identify potential problems which can motivate and re-motivate learners, the researchers were interested to conduct this study. Hence, the aim of this study was to explore motivating and demotivating factors among MA students of TEFL at Wollega University. Specifically, the study sought answers for the following research questions.

- 1) What are the most prevailing demotivating factors among MA students of TEFL?
- 2) Are there differences between participants' self-reported demotivating factors across their gender, sponsor type and study year?
- 3) What are the re-motivating factors among MA students of TEFL?

## 2. Objectives of the Study

### 2.1 General Objective

The general objective of this study was to investigate the demotivating and re-motivating factors of Wollega University MA students of TEFL.

### 2.2 Specific Objectives

The study has the following specific objectives:

- 1) To identify the most prevailing demotivating factors of the MA TEFL students.
- 2) To examine the differences between the students' gender, sponsor and study year in terms of the demotivating factors.
- 3) To identify the re-motivating factors of the MA TEFL students.

## 3. Significance of the Study

The result of this study will help to uncover the pitfall that might be observed in the teaching and learning of the English language. Thus, the study sheds light on the major demotivating factors that can negatively affect MA students of TEFL in the Wollega University and seeks possible solutions in terms of re-motivating factors. In this case, teacher educators or instructors can provide effective teaching and enhance their students' motivation and English language performance. The study will also indicate possible directions on how the administrative staff can support MA TEFL students.

## 4. Methods

### 4.1 Participant

The population of MA in TEFL students of Wollega University was 202 (182 male and 20 female), and out of the population, 161 (145 male and 16 female) students who filled the questionnaire were taken as the sample of this study. Out of these, 66 were government- sponsor and 95 of them were self- sponsor. In terms of level of education, 76 of them were first, 51 second and 34 third year students.

### 4.2 Instruments

A 40-item questionnaire, which was developed by Sahragard and Ansaripour (2014) and used in Iran context, was employed in this research after some modifications, deletions and additions. Hence, to adapt the questionnaire, item 11 was added, and item 10 was modified to suit to the Ethiopian curriculum, but 9 items were deleted as they were not applicable in the Ethiopian context. The modified questionnaire had 30 five-point Likert scale, with alternatives labelled *strongly disagree*, *disagree*, *undecided*, *no idea*, *agree* and *strongly disagree*. The first part of the questionnaire dealt with the background of the participants (sex, year of study and sponsor type), and the second part which has 30 items focussed on nine factors.

An interview which had four questions was also adapted from Sahragard and Ansaripour (2014) and conducted to ten MA students of TEFL at Wollega University. Thus, saturation point was gained by 10 interviewees. The purpose of the interview was to get supplementary information about the factors

which negatively affected students during their studies. The interview was also used to collect the data about the re-motivating factors which need to be considered by the University in order to alleviate motivation problems.

The quantitative data collected through the questionnaire were analysed using SPSS program. Prior to the analysis of the data, the reliability of the data was calculated, and Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be reliable ( $\alpha = .83$ ). As a result, an explanatory factor analysis was conducted to revalidate the scale and to explore the sampling adequacy and factorability of the items of the questionnaire. Hence, the 30 items were subjected to the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) using SPSS. The value of Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) indicated a sampling adequacy since the value was above .6 (the result was .68), and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value was statistically significant ( $p = .000$ ) which proved the factorability of the correlation matrix. The PCA indicated the presence of 9 variables with Eigen values greater than 1, explaining 68% of the variance.

Then, descriptive statistics were employed to explore the demotivating factors, and the independent samples t-test were computed to check the existence of statistically significant differences between male and female, and between government and self-sponsor students regarding their perceptions on the demotivating factors. A one-way ANOVA was also computed to see the existence of significant differences among first, second and third year students.

The qualitative data were analysed using NVivo version10, a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software. Hence, the interview data were transcribed and imported to the software and thematically analysed. Two major themes (demotivating and re-motivating factors) were emerged; sub themes were also emerged under the two major themes.

#### *4.3 Results and Discussions*

This section focuses on the findings of the data about the demotivating and re-motivating factors. The first part deals with the most demotivating factors and the respondents' self-report differences across gender, sponsor type and year of study. The second section focuses on the analysis of the qualitative data about the prevailing re-motivating factors.

#### *4.4 Demotivating Factors*

Regarding the most prevailing demotivating factors, Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics and rank ordering of the demotivation factors according to their mean values as follow.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the Most Demotivating Factors and Their Rank Orders**

| Factor                         | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Rank of Demotivation |
|--------------------------------|-----|------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1. Instructor' characteristics | 161 | 2.79 | 0.685          | 3                    |
| 2. Syllabus design             | 161 | 2.82 | 0.659          | 4                    |
| 3. Administrative decisions    | 161 | 3.88 | 0.957          | 7                    |

|                          |     |      |       |   |
|--------------------------|-----|------|-------|---|
| 4. Facilities            | 161 | 2.68 | 0.982 | 2 |
| 5. Scoring system        | 161 | 2.84 | 0.673 | 5 |
| 6. Future pessimism      | 161 | 4.01 | 0.975 | 8 |
| 7. Economic problems     | 161 | 4.41 | 0.681 | 9 |
| 8. Classroom environment | 161 | 3.66 | 0.916 | 6 |
| 9. Curriculum decisions  | 161 | 2.61 | 0.755 | 1 |

The low mean value shows the high demotivating factor. Table 1 indicates that curriculum decision is the most demotivating factor with the least mean value (2.61). The other factors are listed down as follows based on increasing mean scores: facilities (2.68), instructors' characteristics (M=2.79), syllabus design (M=2.82), scoring system (M=2.84), classroom environment (M=3.66), administrative decisions (M=3.88), future pessimism (M=4.01), and economic problems (4.41).

To support the data collected using the questionnaire, the interview transcriptions were thematically analyzed, and five themes were emerged: curriculum decisions, future pessimism, facilities, administrative decisions and instructor' characteristics. Six interviewees were given codes from P1 to P6, and these codes are used throughout the discussion.

This result supports the quantitative data. Hence, analysis of the interview data indicated that curriculum decision was the most demotivating factor since most (67%) of the participants mentioned it, as the word frequency query outputs of the NVivo indicated (See Appendix C). Regarding this, for example, P1 said: "I also saw a curriculum problem; there is a difference between government and self-sponsor MA curriculums though MA in TEFL will be issued to both curriculums". This curriculum difference had another demotivating facet, as P5 suggested: "This is a problem because we could not be transferred to the other curriculum (harmonized) because of one course difference though some of us got a chance to be sponsored by the government after we started with the conventional curriculum". This finding is similar with Ali and Pathan (2017) in which course contents and teaching materials were emerged as the most salient demotivating factor.

Future Pessimism and Facilities were the second frequently mentioned factors (half of the interviewees mentioned them). This is due to the reason that MA graduates are "limited to only preparatory high school teachers. This is somewhat disappointing" (p. 4). Of the facility problems, internet and computer access and the crowdedness of postgraduate library were mentioned. This result gets support from Dörnyei (1998) who indicated the prevalence of inadequate school facilities in study.

Two interviewees (33%) responded that Administrative Decision is a demotivating factor, and only one of them mentioned Instructor' Characteristics as a demotivating factor, unlike the result of the data collected through the questionnaire which ranked Instructor' Characteristic as the third most prevalent demotivating factors.

The second research question sought answers on the existence of significant differences across

participants' gender, sponsor and year of study in relation to the nine demotivating factors. Independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA were computed. As the computed independent t-test revealed, there was no significant difference between male and female students (See Table 2).

**Table 2. Independent-Sample T-Test for the Gender Differences across the Nine Factors**

|                              | F      | T      | Df  | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|-----|-----------------|
| Instructors' characteristics | 1.472  | 1.561  | 159 | .121            |
| Syllabus design              | 8.103  | 1.184  | 159 | .238            |
| Administration decisions     | 6.329  | 1.244  | 159 | .215            |
| Facilities                   | 12.727 | 1.673  | 159 | .096            |
| Scoring system               | 9.516  | 1.182  | 159 | .239            |
| Future pessimism             | .407   | -.513  | 159 | .609            |
| Economic problems            | 2.847  | .555   | 159 | .580            |
| Classroom environment        | 4.254  | -1.533 | 159 | .127            |
| Curriculum decisions         | 1.278  | .705   | 159 | .482            |

Similarly, as the result of independent samples t-test indicated, there was no statistically significant difference between government and self-sponsor students regarding the nine demotivating factors (See Table 3). This absence of statistically significant differences across gender and sponsor type implies that respondents had almost similar views about prevalent demotivating factors.

A one-way ANOVA was computed to check the presence of a significant difference among first, second and third year students. The result indicated a statistically significant difference across respondents' year of study for most of the factors except two (instructors' characteristics and administrative decisions) (See Table 4).

**Table 3. Independent-Sample T-Test for the Sponsor Difference**

|                              | F     | T      | Df  | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------------------------|-------|--------|-----|-----------------|
| Instructors' characteristics | .422  | -.922  | 159 | .358            |
| Syllabus design              | 1.510 | -1.384 | 159 | .168            |
| Administration decisions     | .328  | -.887  | 159 | .376            |
| Facilities                   | .943  | -.990  | 159 | .324            |
| Scoring system               | 2.396 | -1.921 | 159 | .057            |
| Future pessimism             | .082  | -.395  | 159 | .693            |

|                       |      |        |     |      |
|-----------------------|------|--------|-----|------|
| Economic problems     | .008 | -.325  | 159 | .746 |
| Classroom environment | .705 | -1.654 | 159 | .100 |
| Curriculum decisions  | .015 | 1.147  | 159 | .253 |

Through a close observation on the mean values and post-hoc multiple comparison, there were significant differences between first and third year in favour of third year MA students. Hence, first year MA in TEFL students had responded that many of the factors affected their studies.

**Table 4. ANOVA Results for Differences across Year of Study**

|                      | df | Mean Squares | F     | Sig  |
|----------------------|----|--------------|-------|------|
| Instructor           | 2  | .967         | 2.09  | .127 |
|                      | 58 | .463         |       |      |
| Syllabus             | 2  | 6.938        | 19.70 | .000 |
|                      | 58 | .352         |       |      |
| Administration       | 2  | 1.201        | 1.32  | .271 |
|                      | 58 | .912         |       |      |
| Facility             | 2  | 9.707        | 9.14  | .000 |
|                      | 58 | 1.062        |       |      |
| Scoring system       | 2  | 4.985        | 12.56 | .000 |
|                      | 58 | .396         |       |      |
| Future pessimism     | 2  | 6.576        | 7.49  | .001 |
|                      | 58 | .879         |       |      |
| Economic problem     | 2  | 5.694        | 14.30 | .000 |
|                      | 58 | .398         |       |      |
| Classroom Managt     | 2  | 13.561       | 12.45 | .000 |
|                      | 58 | 1.089        |       |      |
| Curriculum decisions | 2  | 6.518        | 13.18 | .000 |
|                      | 58 | .495         |       |      |

#### 4.5 Re-Motivating Factors

In order to seek answer to the third research question, the interviews were transcribed and analysed qualitatively. The analysis of the transcription revealed three major sub-themes (curriculum revision, improving facilities and improving administrative decisions). These themes indicate some solutions of improving the most prevailing demotivating factors. That is, the interviewees indicated major ways of solving the mentioned demotivating factors.



The first theme deals with the need for curriculum revision to solve the problems curriculum and future pessimism. Four respondents (67%) mentioned curriculum revision in their own terms. Regarding this, P1 suggested: "Since the program (curriculum) is designed to serve only preparatory high school teachers, even some of the teachers who were selected refused to continue their MA studies. Some of them who certified with MA in TEFL (summer program) could not be employed in the universities. So, this should be solved". In addition, P3 said: "The other problem that needs to be solved is the curriculum which limits us to only preparatory high schools. May be, it should be revised". Similarly, P4 responded "The first solution I suggest is that the curriculum should be consistent". Again, P5 suggested: "This problem can be solved if an identical curriculum is designed in the university".

The second theme emerged under re-motivating factors is the need for improving facilities. Under this, two respondents commented that the internet and library services should be improved. P4 said: "The second one is that our computer labs should have internet access. The internet should not have limited access". P6 also mentioned the importance of internet and library services in order to resolve their problems.

Finally, the interviewees pointed out that administrative decision should be improved, especially, during registration. P3 suggested: "As soon as the regular students' program is completed, the university should do all the preparations about summer students' registration and dormitory assignments". As one interviewee (p. 2) pointed out, administrative staffs need to use English to communicate with the students when the local languages could not help them.

In sum, the respondents expressed that it is through MA in TEFL curriculum revision and improving facilities and administrative decisions that the demotivating factors can be solved.

## **5. Conclusions and Recommendations**

The present study aimed at exploring the most prevalent demotivating and re-motivating factors of MA in TEFL students at Wollega University. The result of the quantitative data revealed nine demotivating factors: Curriculum decisions, Facilities, Instructor' characteristics, Syllabus design, Scoring system, Classroom environment, Administrative decisions, Future pessimism and Economic problems. However, from the qualitative data only five themes were emerged as demotivating factors, and the result indicated that Curriculum decision is the most prevalent demotivating factor, followed by Future Pessimism, Facilities, Administrative decisions and Instructor' characteristics.

Regarding the re-motivating factors, the result of the interview transcription revealed three themes: curriculum revision, improving facilities and improving administrative decisions.

The application of two MA in TEFL curricula has a detrimental influence on students' motivation in that it could not permit the transfer of self-sponsor to government sponsor students whenever they get the chance. Besides, the existence of a separate curriculum for preparatory teachers has become a major source of demotivation because it will not allow graduates work outside preparatory schools. Hence, MA students of TEFL are pessimist about their future jobs. As a result, it seems possible to recommend

that the department has to revise MA in TEFL curriculum.

The result of this study has implications for instructors of English department and top management of Wollega University. Thus, students of MA in TEFL can be motivated and be competent if the English language instructors identify the major causes of demotivation and re-motivation factors among MA in TEFL students and devise solutions to minimize the demotivating factors. In so doing, this wane of interest during their study can be initiated by employing re-motivating mechanisms such as revising the existing curriculum, providing efficient administrative services and improving facilities like internet access, library and students services.

### Reference

- Ali, M., & Pathan, Z. (2017). Exploring Factors Causing Demotivation and Motivation in Learning English Language among College Students of Quetta, Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 81-89. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n2p81>
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 43-69.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching Motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Falout, J., & Maruyama, M. (2004). A comparative study of proficiency and learner demotivation. *The Language Teacher*, 28(8), 3-9.
- Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System*, 37, 403-417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.03.004>
- Fattash, M. (2013). Demotivating Factors of University ESL Teachers. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(19), 125-132.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0083787>
- Hu, R. (2011). The relationship between demotivation and EFL learners' English language proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 88-96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n4p88>
- Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. (1996). In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 71-80). Honolulu: The University of Hawaii.
- Muhonen, J. (2004). *Second language demotivation: Factors that discourage pupils from learning the English language* (Unpublished Thesis). University of Jyväskylä Jyväskylä Finland.
- Pigott, J. (2008). *Toward classroom-friendly models of motivation: A data-led investigation into student perception of motivating and demotivating classroom factors, and the relationship between student orientations and preferred classroom activities* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Birmingham, UK.

Sahragard, R., & Ansaripour, E. (2014). Demotivating and Remotivating Factors among MA Students of TEFL: An Iranian Case. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 2(1), 85-105.

Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37, 57-69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.09.005>

Talebinezhad, M. R., & Aliakbari, M. (2001). Evaluation and Justification of a Paradigm Shift in the Current ELT Models in Iran. *Linguistik*. Retrieved from <http://www.linguistik/Teaching and researching motivation>. (2001). Harlow, England: Longman.

## Appendix A: Questionnaire

### Dear MA in TEFL students

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about the demotivating factors which affect MA students from studying their education. Therefore, your honest responses for each question have a decisive role for the success of my research. We also assure you that the information you give will be kept completely confidential.

Thank you in advance!

**Sex:** (underline) male female **Age:** ..... years old

**Year of Study:** (circle) I II III

**Sponsor:** (underline) Government Self

To what extent do you agree with the following statements as the ones that have demotivated you? Please indicate your agreement by **circling** the numbers 1-5 under each scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, No Idea, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree).

|    | Strongly Agree | Agree | No Idea | Strongly Disagree | Disagree |
|----|----------------|-------|---------|-------------------|----------|
| 1  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 2  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 3  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 4  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 5  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 6  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 7  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 8  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 9  |                |       |         |                   |          |
| 10 |                |       |         |                   |          |

- 
- 11 Registration process and provision of ID cards are much delayed, **not** completed in time.
- 12 Our dormitory is very crowded, dirty, and in poor condition.
- 13 We do **not** have easy access to the Internet in the university.
- 14 What is taught is **not** tested in the exams. Exams incorporate unrelated questions.
- 15 Instructors are biased toward some students when it comes to scoring or assessing.
- 16 The criterion based on which scores are given is different in every course and semester.
- 17 Instructors **do not** pursue a very standard, firm, and regular scoring procedure for our courses.
- 18 Low salary after graduation makes me lose interest in my study.
- 19 For employment, there is **no** difference between low and high grades.
- 20 Rapid rise of expenses or costs make me struggle in my studies.
- 21 Due to lack of opportunities and economical problems in this country; there are only few job opportunities.
- 22 MA students of TEFL are **not** offered any part-time job outside or inside the university.
- 23 Graduated students of TEFL have a very low income in comparison to graduated students of certain professions (lawyers, doctors, dentists, businessmen).
- 24 Teachers **do not** receive much respect in this country.
- 25 Classes are formal so that students **cannot** discuss and share ideas in a friendly environment.
- 26 The arrangement of the chairs is not like a circle and it contributes to a teacher-centered environment in the classes.
- 27 We are **not** offered preliminary (introductory) courses before going through the major or obligatory courses in TEFL.
- 28 From the very beginning of the courses, we were asked to write papers without being taught how to write in academic English.
- 29 We do **not** choose our supervisors by ourselves.
- 30 We are **not** taught the practical side of TEFL.
- 

## Appendix B

### Questions of the Interview

- 1) Based on your experience of language learning in Wollega University, what has ever disappointed you?
- 2) With regards to what you have heard from friends around you, can you mention any other factors having some negative effects on your learning?
- 3) Do you think any of these factors can act as a disappointing factor? If yes, would you please provide some evidence(s) for that? (General system of education, universities, facilities, professors, curriculum, future occupation, and system of scoring, lack of a socially motivating and humane environment, disagreeable teacher personalities or pedagogies, inappropriate courses or materials, no consistency in curriculum with clear goals, coursework pressure, professors' personality and competence, number of

the students in the class, etc.).

4) What do you think can be the solutions for what you have stated as demotivating?

### Appendix C

#### Result of Word Frequency Query (Word Count and Percentage)

| Word          | Count | Weighted Percentage (%) |
|---------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Curriculum    | 22    | 2.36                    |
| Problem       | 18    | 1.93                    |
| Language      | 14    | 1.50                    |
| Learning      | 14    | 1.50                    |
| Students      | 14    | 1.50                    |
| Universities  | 13    | 1.40                    |
| Courses       | 12    | 1.29                    |
| Factors       | 12    | 1.29                    |
| System        | 12    | 1.29                    |
| Think         | 12    | 1.29                    |
| University    | 11    | 1.18                    |
| Lack          | 10    | 1.07                    |
| Future        | 8     | 0.86                    |
| One           | 8     | 0.86                    |
| Teacher       | 8     | 0.86                    |
| Around        | 7     | 0.75                    |
| Class         | 7     | 0.75                    |
| Demotivating  | 7     | 0.75                    |
| Disappointing | 7     | 0.75                    |



|    |       |       |         |       |       |        |
|----|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| 8  | 1.191 | 3.972 | 64.917  | 1.191 | 3.972 | 64.917 |
| 9  | 1.061 | 3.538 | 68.455  | 1.061 | 3.538 | 68.455 |
| 10 | .989  | 3.296 | 71.751  |       |       |        |
| 11 | .823  | 2.744 | 74.495  |       |       |        |
| 12 | .791  | 2.635 | 77.130  |       |       |        |
| 13 | .735  | 2.450 | 79.580  |       |       |        |
| 14 | .708  | 2.359 | 81.939  |       |       |        |
| 15 | .644  | 2.146 | 84.085  |       |       |        |
| 16 | .583  | 1.944 | 86.029  |       |       |        |
| 17 | .512  | 1.708 | 87.737  |       |       |        |
| 18 | .450  | 1.499 | 89.236  |       |       |        |
| 19 | .411  | 1.370 | 90.606  |       |       |        |
| 20 | .401  | 1.335 | 91.942  |       |       |        |
| 21 | .388  | 1.292 | 93.234  |       |       |        |
| 22 | .363  | 1.211 | 94.445  |       |       |        |
| 23 | .311  | 1.038 | 95.483  |       |       |        |
| 24 | .270  | .900  | 96.383  |       |       |        |
| 25 | .234  | .781  | 97.164  |       |       |        |
| 26 | .228  | .760  | 97.924  |       |       |        |
| 27 | .191  | .637  | 98.562  |       |       |        |
| 28 | .172  | .572  | 99.134  |       |       |        |
| 29 | .148  | .492  | 99.626  |       |       |        |
| 30 | .112  | .374  | 100.000 |       |       |        |

Extraction Method: Principal Component analysis.

## Appendix G

### Total Variance Explained

| Compon<br>ent | Initial Eigen values |               |              | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |               |              |
|---------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
|               | Total                | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total                               | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1             | 5.672                | 18.907        | 18.907       | 5.672                               | 18.907        | 18.907       |
| 2             | 3.248                | 10.828        | 29.735       | 3.248                               | 10.828        | 29.735       |

---

|    |       |       |         |       |       |        |
|----|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| 3  | 2.753 | 9.178 | 38.913  | 2.753 | 9.178 | 38.913 |
| 4  | 1.920 | 6.401 | 45.314  | 1.920 | 6.401 | 45.314 |
| 5  | 1.739 | 5.795 | 51.109  | 1.739 | 5.795 | 51.109 |
| 6  | 1.578 | 5.259 | 56.369  | 1.578 | 5.259 | 56.369 |
| 7  | 1.373 | 4.577 | 60.946  | 1.373 | 4.577 | 60.946 |
| 8  | 1.191 | 3.972 | 64.917  | 1.191 | 3.972 | 64.917 |
| 9  | 1.061 | 3.538 | 68.455  | 1.061 | 3.538 | 68.455 |
| 10 | .989  | 3.296 | 71.751  |       |       |        |
| 11 | .823  | 2.744 | 74.495  |       |       |        |
| 12 | .791  | 2.635 | 77.130  |       |       |        |
| 13 | .735  | 2.450 | 79.580  |       |       |        |
| 14 | .708  | 2.359 | 81.939  |       |       |        |
| 15 | .644  | 2.146 | 84.085  |       |       |        |
| 16 | .583  | 1.944 | 86.029  |       |       |        |
| 17 | .512  | 1.708 | 87.737  |       |       |        |
| 18 | .450  | 1.499 | 89.236  |       |       |        |
| 19 | .411  | 1.370 | 90.606  |       |       |        |
| 20 | .401  | 1.335 | 91.942  |       |       |        |
| 21 | .388  | 1.292 | 93.234  |       |       |        |
| 22 | .363  | 1.211 | 94.445  |       |       |        |
| 23 | .311  | 1.038 | 95.483  |       |       |        |
| 24 | .270  | .900  | 96.383  |       |       |        |
| 25 | .234  | .781  | 97.164  |       |       |        |
| 26 | .228  | .760  | 97.924  |       |       |        |
| 27 | .191  | .637  | 98.562  |       |       |        |
| 28 | .172  | .572  | 99.134  |       |       |        |
| 29 | .148  | .492  | 99.626  |       |       |        |
| 30 | .112  | .374  | 100.000 |       |       |        |

Extraction Method: Principal Component analysis.

---