Japanese Learners' Demotivation to Study English: A Survey Study

Keita Kikuchi
Tokai University
Hideki Sakai
Shinshu University

Following Dörnyei's (2001a) definition of demotivation, this paper focused on specific external forces that Japanese high school students may experience and that might cause their motivation to be reduced. On the basis of Kikuchi's (in press) qualitative study and other former studies, we developed a 35-item questionnaire to gather quantitative data. The participants were 112 learners of English from three private universities in Tokyo and Shizuoka, Japan. They were asked to complete the questionnaire on the Internet. Using factor analysis, five factors were extracted: (a) Course Books, (b) Inadequate School Facilities, (c) Test Scores, (d) Noncommunicative Methods, and (e) Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles. Based on these results, we discuss possible demotivating factors in English classrooms in high schools in Japan.

Dörnyei (2001a) の動機減退の定義に基づき、本研究では、日本人高校生が経験する学習動機を減退させる外的要因を扱う。Kikuchi (印刷中) の質的研究やその他の先行研究に基づき、量的データを収集するために35項目から成るアンケートを作成した。東京・静岡の私立大学に通う112名の英語学習者がインターネットを使用し、高校時の経験についてアンケート記入を行った。因子分析を行った結果、(a) 教科書、(b) 不十分な教室施設、(c) テストの得点、(d) コミュニカティブでない教授法、(e) 教員の能力や指導スタイル、という5因子が抽出された。これらの結果に基づき、日本国内の高校での英語クラス内での動機減退要因に関して考察された。

JALT Journal, Vol. 31, No. 2, November 2009

Learners' motivation is an important factor in language learning, and many researchers (e.g., Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 2001a; Oxford, 1996) have investigated how students can be motivated. For instance, there are several influential theories such as attribution theory (Weiner, 1992), self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1993), self-worth theory (Covington, 1992), goal-setting theories (Locke & Latham, 1990), and self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) which attempt to explain the complex concept of motivation. Among these researchers, Dörnyei, in particular, has done extensive research on practical aspects of motivation such as the question of how teachers can help to improve learner motivation in classrooms (Dörnyei, 2001b).

Dörnyei (2001a) has defined demotivation as "specific *external* [italics added] forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action" (p. 143). Following Dörnyei's definition of demotivation, which only concerns external forces that reduce or diminish learners' motivation, this paper focuses on external forces that may cause Japanese high school students to lose motivation.

In the United States, demotivation has been investigated mainly in the field of instructional communication (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Gorham & Christophel, 1992; Gorham & Millette, 1997; Kearney, Plax, Hays, & Ivey, 1991; Zhang, 2007). About a decade ago, demotivation began to draw attention from researchers in L2 learning and teaching as well. Dörnyei (2001a) presented the main demotivating factors identified in an unpublished study (Dörnyei, 1998, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001a) which questioned 50 secondary school students in Budapest, Hungary, studying either English or German as a foreign language. In this study, conducted through structured 10-30 minute interviews with participants who were identified by their teachers or peers as being demotivated, nine areas of concern emerged. These areas are presented based on Dörnyei (2001a, p. 151) in order of their frequency below:

1. Teachers' personalities, commitment, competence, teaching methods.
2. Inadequate school facilities (very big group, not the right level, or frequent change of teachers).
3. Reduced self-confidence due to their experience of failure or lack of success.
4. Negative attitude toward the foreign language studied.
5. Compulsory nature of the foreign language study.
6. Interference of another foreign language that pupils are studying.

7. Negative attitude toward the community of the foreign language spoken.
8. Attitudes of group members.
9. Course books used in class.

Dörnyei identified these nine categories from a subset of 75 comments that concerned demotivating factors in the interview transcripts. Moreover, he found that 30 occurrences (40% of the total) concerned the first category, related to teachers.

Recently, several survey studies have been reported concerning Japanese learners who study English as a foreign language (Arai, 2004; Falout & Maruyama, 2004; Hasegawa, 2004; Kikuchi, in press; Tsuchiya, 2004a, 2004b, 2006a, 2006b). In her exploratory study, Arai asked 33 university students, most of whom majored in English and were considered to be highly proficient in English, to report whether they had had demotivating experiences in foreign language classrooms and to describe the experiences and their immediate reactions to those experiences. Of the 33 students, two reported that they had not had such demotivating experiences. The remaining 31 students' reports (N = 105) covered English classes in their elementary school, junior high school, senior high school, university, and private cram school. Arai collected 105 comments and categorized them into the following four areas: (a) Teachers, (b) Classes, (c) Class Atmosphere, and (d) Others. She found that the number of reports about the first category, Teachers, accounted for 46.7% of total reports, followed by Classes (36.2%), the second category. The third category, Class Atmosphere, was the least reported (13.3%).

To investigate the sources of demotivation, Hasegawa (2004) administered a questionnaire with open-ended questions to 125 junior high school students and 98 senior high school students. She carried out qualitative analyses of both junior and senior high school students' responses. She reported that teachers were the subject of student-report focus. Thus, she suggested that inappropriate teacher behaviors may make "the strongest impact" on student demotivation, amongst other factors (p. 135). Whereas most of the previous studies used retrospective methods and asked university students to reflect on past experiences, Hasegawa's research is significant for having interviewed junior and senior high school students directly. However, her participants came from only one public junior high school and only one private senior high school, and therefore, it may be difficult to generalize her findings to other junior or high school students.

Falout and Maruyama (2004) attempted to examine whether demotivating factors before entering college differ between lower proficiency and higher proficiency learners of English. They administered a 49-item questionnaire, developed mainly on the basis of categories presented in Dörnyei (2001a), to 164 university students from two science departments. The participants were selected from two different levels of proficiency as measured by an in-house institutional test. Their major findings were (a) that the areas of demotivation for the lower proficiency group were self-confidence, attitudes toward the L2 itself, courses, teachers, and attitudes of group members (in descending order); (b) that for the higher proficiency group, self-confidence was the most important determinant with the other factors being relatively neutral; (c) that both the higher and lower proficiency groups reported that they had been demotivated before; and (d) that the lower proficiency group started to develop negative attitudes towards English earlier than the higher proficiency group. One point to be made is that although they aimed at finding the difference between students at higher and lower proficiency levels, it seems that the actual proficiency levels of the two groups did not differ much, judging from their description of the students' proficiency:

> LP [lower-proficiency group] and HP [higher-proficiency group] averages were 49 and 78 points [out of 100 possible scores for the institutional placement test] respectively, with corresponding TOEIC score averages at 300 and 347 (Falout & Maruyama, 2004, p. 4).

Both the lower and higher proficiency groups may have had little interest in studying English from the beginning. In other words, the researchers did not distinguish between demotivated and motivated learners. Thus, it is not clear that they explored what diminished the motivation of students who at one time had had some motivation to study English.

In order to understand the cause of demotivation, especially among college students who think they are not good at English and whose motivation is low, Tsuchiya (2004a, 2004b) developed a 26-item questionnaire based on literature in educational psychology (e.g., Ichikawa, 2001; Sakurai, 1997) to explore demotivating factors among college students. She administered the questionnaire to three groups of students: 204 freshmen majoring in engineering and considered to be low-proficiency learners of English (2004a), and both 90 freshmen majoring in engineering with high proficiency, and 163 freshmen or sophomores majoring in English or international relations who were considered to be highly motivated and proficient (2004b). She did not state the precise time of administration, but it can be inferred that the

questionnaire was administered soon after the students entered university. A factor analysis showed a six-factor solution: (a) Sense of English Uselessness, (b) Sense of Incompetence, (c) Little Admiration, (d) Inconsistent Way of Studying, (e) Sense of Discouragement, and (f) Lack of Acceptance.

Combining her own studies (Tsuchiya, 2004a; 2004b) with categories presented in Dörnyei (2001a) and the findings of Falout and Maruyama (2004), Tsuchiya (2006a; 2006b) listed nine areas of demotivation: (a) teachers, (b) classes, (c) compulsory nature of English study, (d) negative attitude toward the English-speaking community, (e) negative attitude toward English itself, (f) lack of self-confidence, (g) negative group attitude, (h) lack of a positive English speaking model, and (i) ways of learning. In order to investigate how lower proficiency English learners can be divided into different types of learners, she developed a 37-item questionnaire based on these nine categories and administered it to 129 freshmen (2006a) soon after they entered university. Based on the results of an English proficiency test, she divided the students into two groups: low-proficiency group (n = 72) and high-proficiency group (n = 57). The results showed that significant differences were found between the two groups in all nine factors of demotivation. The low-proficiency group rated higher than the high-proficiency group on every factor. In addition, the rank order of demotivating factors differed between the groups. Tsuchiya (2006b) analyzed the data from the low-proficiency group with a cluster analysis and showed that the group was divided into four subgroups with different characteristics in terms of demotivation. Using ANOVA, she found that the mean scores for the factors, except "compulsory nature of English study," were significantly different among the four groups. Especially, she found a large difference in two factors ("lack of a positive English speaking model" and "negative attitude toward the English-speaking community"). In summary, Tsuchiya (2004a, 2004b, 2006a, 2006b) demonstrated that the motivational state of low-proficiency learners of English is different from high-proficiency learners and that there are distinct groups even among the lower proficiency learners of English.

Considering the above studies, it is arguable that one of the most salient demotivating factors may be teacher related and that demotivating factors may be different for learners with different proficiency levels. However, because the number of studies is quite small, further research on demotivating factors is necessary. Particularly, the following points remain unclear. First, most of the previous studies, except for Arai (2004) and Hasegawa (2004), did not address the issue of time of demotivation. Second, some instruments used in the previous studies were not constructed so as to elicit demotivating instances; instead,

they asked about environmental conditions surrounding the learners. For example, in the Tsuchiya study (2006a), students were first asked whether or not they liked studying English and then were asked to answer 37 questions about their English learning experiences. One of these 37 items asked respondents if their teacher was good at teaching. Although this information was useful for comparing characteristics of students who liked English with students who did not, it is not clear from the way the survey was structured whether or not the teacher's teaching skills were directly connected with learner demotivation. In other words, she did not ask the students to clarify what caused them to be demotivated. Thus, it is necessary for prompts to more clearly elicit students' responses about demotivating experiences. Third, most studies were based on Dörnyei's (1998, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001a) nine categories of demotivation or on psychological models such as self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2002). The applicability of these frameworks to Japanese learners of English has not yet been successfully demonstrated. Thus, questionnaires developed based on these frameworks may or may not produce valid scores for Japanese learners of English.

The current study was an attempt to overcome the foregoing problems. To do this, we first focused on demotivating experiences at senior high schools. Second, we devised the questionnaire with clear instructions before the questionnaire items so that we could elicit demotivating instances more directly (see the Materials section for instructions in Japanese). Third, we followed Brown's (2001, p. 78) suggestion for survey research regarding the sequential use of interviews and questionnaires in developing instrumentation designed for the Japanese population. Before our study, an exploratory and qualitative study was conducted (Kikuchi, in press). Kikuchi examined demotivating factors for students in Japanese public and private high schools by asking university students to reflect on their experience in high school. In his study, he conducted interviews with five university students from three different colleges and administered a questionnaire with open-ended questions to 47 university students of a public university in Japan. By using matrices as a method for reduction and display of the qualitative data (Brown, p. 216), he found the following five categories to be salient: (a) teachers' behavior in the classroom, (b) grammar translation method used, (c) tests/university entrance exam related, (d) memorization nature of class/vocabulary related, and (e) textbook/reference book related. On the basis of Kikuchi's findings, we developed a 35-item questionnaire to gather quantitative data to answer the following research questions:

(a) What are salient demotivating factors for Japanese high school students?

(b) Which factors are the most demotivating for this population?

In addition, we collected qualitative data to augment the quantitative data.

Method

Participants

To explore demotivating factors for high school students in Japan, we chose university students who had had at least 6 years of English study at junior and senior high schools and asked them to report their high school experiences. The participants in this study were 112 learners of English (38 males and 74 females) from three private universities in Japan (School A, School B, and School C). They were students in classes taught by one of the authors in the spring semester of 2006. Originally, 117 students participated, but responses from five participants were discarded because they did not provide consent. Forty-eight participants (27 males and 21 females) from School A, which is located in Shizuoka, were majoring in international relations. Forty-one participants from School B, a women's college located in a suburban area of Tokyo, were females majoring in English literature. Twenty-three (11 males and 12 females) participants from School C, a college located in central Tokyo, were economics and management majors. Unfortunately, English proficiency levels were not available; however, because most of the participants (n = 89) majored in international relations and English literature, motivation was assumed to be moderately high.

The participants' ages were 18 (n = 57), 19 (n = 38), 20 (n = 16), and 21 (n = 1). Fifty participants indicated graduation from public high schools and 62 participants indicated graduation from private high schools. Of the 112 participants, 11 participants reported that they had had experience living outside Japan for more than one year. These 11 participants were not excluded from the analysis because they reported that they had graduated from high schools in Japan.

Instrumentation

We developed the 35-item questionnaire for this study (see Appendixes A and B) based mainly on the learners' responses to questions in Kikuchi (in press). In addition, referring to Arai (2004) and Tsuchiya (2006a; 2006b), items concerning ways of learning (Item 9) and relationships of learners in

classrooms (Items 28 and 29) were added. Furthermore, because Tsuchiya (2004a; 2004b; 2006a; 2006b) and Falout and Maruyama (2004) included several items operationalizing possible internal factors, we decided to include three items related to internal factors (Items 32, 33, and 34).

Following Brown (2001, p. 62), we piloted the questionnaire with 15 university students to check the wording of the items. The final version of the questionnaire consisted of three parts: questions about learners' backgrounds, questions about demotivating factors, and open-ended questions about their experiences of being motivated and demotivated. For the 35-item questionnaire, a 5-point Likert scale was applied: 1. *not true for me,* 2. *not true for me so much,* 3. *cannot say either "true" or "not true,"* 4. *true for me to some degree,* and 5. *true for me.* Thus, the greater the number, the stronger the demotivating factor. For the open-ended questions, the following two items were made: "Write your experiences about situations in which your motivation to study English was heightened" and "Write your experiences regarding times when your motivation to study English was decreased." All instructions and items in the questionnaires were written in the participants' first language, Japanese. The survey website, Surveymonkey (Surveymonkey.com, 2006), was used to administer the questionnaire.

Procedure

Participants filled in the questionnaire in April and July 2006 during English class time. It took 20 to 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Responses were stored on the server, and the data was then imported from the server into an Excel spreadsheet format for the analysis.

Results

Salient Demotivating Factors

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for each item. Most of the means, except for items 1, 7, 13, and 14, were lower than 3.00.

Before performing factor analysis, we checked the assumptions for the method (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) in terms of normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, absence of multicollinearity and singularity, and factorability of R. Regarding normality, several items were extremely positively skewed. Thus, to check for floor and ceiling effects, we examined whether the mean scores minus or plus one standard deviation fell within the range of the Likert scale. Because floor effects were found for eight items

(15, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, and 34), these eight items were excluded from the factor analysis.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for University Students' Questionnaire Responses (*N* = 112)

No	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.30	1.31	-0.36	-0.83	14%	9%	31%	23%	22%
2	2.77	1.27	0.10	-1.08	24%	23%	24%	23%	9%
3	2.96	1.28	-0.05	-1.12	21%	23%	21%	28%	12%
4	2.68	1.32	0.26	-1.11	21%	25%	21%	20%	11%
5	2.78	1.26	0.10	-0.97	13%	21%	29%	20%	10%
6	2.93	1.39	-0.04	-1.32	23%	21%	16%	28%	14%
7	3.06	1.28	-0.09	-1.09	23%	23%	21%	28%	14%
8	2.66	1.33	0.32	-1.15	15%	30%	14%	21%	11%
9	2.67	1.25	0.17	-0.97	15%	21%	29%	19%	8%
10	2.88	1.22	0.03	-1.01	36%	26%	24%	26%	9%
11	2.84	1.21	0.13	-0.87	13%	26%	29%	21%	10%
12	2.41	1.38	0.57	-0.97	9%	23%	16%	14%	11%
13	3.12	1.35	-0.06	-1.31	42%	29%	13%	28%	19%
14	3.34	1.25	-0.25	-0.91	14%	17%	28%	24%	22%
15*	2.13	1.26	0.92	-0.24	18%	27%	14%	10%	7%
16	2.99	1.26	0.02	-0.94	16%	21%	29%	21%	14%
17	2.81	1.23	0.04	-1.07	21%	25%	23%	26%	8%
18	2.96	1.23	-0.15	-1.00	27%	20%	26%	29%	9%
19	2.55	1.20	0.44	-0.73	37%	33%	22%	16%	7%
20	2.29	1.04	0.47	-0.36	21%	32%	29%	9%	3%
21	2.14	1.09	0.61	-0.43	36%	26%	27%	8%	3%
22	2.65	1.18	0.07	-1.00	32%	23%	29%	22%	4%
23	2.14	1.06	0.58	-0.35	27%	26%	29%	6%	3%
24	2.39	1.16	0.18	-1.04	40%	16%	35%	14%	3%
25	2.37	1.11	0.45	-0.40	30%	28%	32%	9%	4%
26*	2.16	1.19	0.66	-0.65	66%	23%	21%	13%	4%
27	2.49	1.28	0.32	-1.09	54%	22%	21%	20%	6%
28*	1.46	0.71	1.40	1.06	42%	23%	10%	1%	0%
29*	1.77	0.98	1.07	0.29	41%	23%	17%	5%	1%
30*	2.05	1.12	0.82	-0.27	31%	27%	19%	10%	3%

No	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis	1	2	3	4	5
31*	2.01	1.05	0.83	0.07	44%	28%	23%	5%	3%
32	2.38	1.32	0.68	-0.72	46%	32%	13%	13%	10%
33*	2.07	1.20	0.95	0.05	23%	23%	21%	5%	6%
34*	1.98	1.12	0.97	0.11	0%	25%	19%	7%	4%
35	2.47	1.12	0.33	-0.58	0%	28%	32%	13%	4%

Note. The standard error of skewness is 0.23; the standard error of kurtosis is 0.45; the asterisk (*) indicates an item removed from the following factor analysis.

The dimensionality of the 27 items was analyzed using principal axis factor analysis. To determine the number of factors to rotate, two criteria were used: the scree plot and the interpretability of the factor solution. Six factors were rotated using the direct oblimin rotation procedure.[1] For interpretations of factor loadings, we used the criterion of .40 or above on the basis of Field (2005, p. 638) and Stevens (2002, p. 395). Because one of the six factors contained only one item (Item 25) with a factor loading above .40, the factor was eliminated. The rotated solution is shown in Table 2. A detailed examination of the statements loading on each factor suggested the following factor labels: (a) Course Books, (b) Inadequate School Facilities, (c) Test Scores, (d) Noncommunicative Methods, and (e) Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles. Table 2 also indicates which items had a loading of .40 or higher on each factor and the reliability coefficients as measured by Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients ranged from .71 to .85 indicating reasonably high internal consistencies (see Field, 2005, p. 668).

Table 2. Factor Analysis of Demotivation

No	Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
Factor 1: Course Books (α = .73)						
17	English passages in the textbooks were too long.	.646				
16	Topics of the English passages used in lessons were not interesting.	.635				

No	Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
18	English sentences dealt with in the lessons were difficult to interpret.	.499				
Factor 2: Inadequate School Facilities (α = .85)						
21	Computer equipment was not used.		-.888			
23	The Internet was not used.		-.788			
22	Visual materials (such as videos and DVDs) were not used.		-.697			
24	LL equipment was not used.		-.576			
Factor 3: Test Scores (α = .79)						
8	I got low scores on tests (such as mid-term and final examinations).			-.894		
27	I could not do as well on tests as my friends.			-.809		
7	I had difficulty in memorizing words and phrases.			-.468		
Factor 4: Noncommunicative Methods (α = .77)						
4	Most of the lessons were entrance examination oriented.				.689	
1	I seldom had chances to communicate in English.				.599	
19	A great number of textbooks and supplementary readers were assigned.				.469	
3	Most of the lessons focused on the grammar.				.427	
13	Teachers made one-way explanations too often.				.420	
Factor 5: Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles (α = .71)						
14	Teachers' explanations were not easy to understand.					-.617

No	Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
11	Teachers' pronunciation of English was poor.					-.581
12	Teachers ridiculed students' mistakes.					-.522
10	The pace of lessons was not appropriate.					-.428

Comparison of Demotivating Factors

To examine whether the five factors differ in terms of the participants' responses, the mean scores of items loading on the five factors were calculated and compared using a one-way repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). Table 3 indicates the descriptive statistics for each factor. Before performing the ANOVA, we checked that all assumptions underlying ANOVAs were met (Green & Salkind, 2005, p. 230). Regarding normality, as Table 3 shows, the *z* score of kurtosis for the mean score of items loading on factor 3 (Test Scores) was -2.10, obtained by dividing the value for kurtosis (-0.95) by the standard error (0.45). The value was significant at $p < 5\%$ (Field, 2005, p. 72). This indicates violation of the assumption of normality for factor 3; however, because the sample size was substantially larger (N = 112) than the recommended value of 30 by Green and Salkind (p. 230), we decided to continue performing the ANOVA. Moreover, since the sphericity assumption was found to be violated, the degrees of freedom were corrected using the Greenhouse-Geisser method.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Each Factor (*N* = 112)

Factor		*K*	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis
1.	Course Books	3	2.92	1.00	-0.10	-0.51
2.	Inadequate School Facilities	4	2.33	0.93	0.38	-0.27
3.	Test Scores	3	2.74	1.09	0.18	-0.95
4.	Noncommunicative Methods	5	2.92	0.93	-0.05	-0.54
5.	Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles	4	2.87	0.92	0.19	-0.32

Note. The standard error of skewness is 0.23; the standard error of kurtosis is 0.45.

The ANOVA results showed a statistically significant difference among the five factors (F [3.71, 411.21] = 12.03, p = .00). The effect size measured as partial η^2 was .10 which was considered to be medium (Green & Salkind, 2005, p. 178). For a post-hoc analysis, paired-samples *t*-tests were performed. The alpha level was set at .005 using a Bonferroni adjustment. The combinations of factor 2 and the other factors showed statistically significant differences whereas the other combinations did not yield statistically significant differences. Thus, factor 2 (Inadequate School Facilities), with a mean item score of 2.33, differed from the other factors in that the participants considered this factor to be less demotivating. On the other hand, the mean scores of the items loading on the other four factors ranged from 2.74 to 2.92, which is close to the midpoint of a 5-point scale. Thus, although these four factors were considered to be more demotivating than factor 2, the mean scores did not show that these factors were strong demotivators.

An Analysis of Students' Comments

The five factors extracted through factor analysis were generally supported by the protocols regarding demotivating experiences obtained from the participants. Of the 112 participants, 51% (n = 57) provided their experiences, all of which were written in Japanese. We divided qualitative data into categories based on the five factors. Thirty (53%) of the 57 protocols were coded into single categories while 16 (28%) were coded into multiple categories. Eleven (19%) were coded as others. The breakdown of the 30 protocols (those coded into single categories) was as follows: 13 for factor 3 (Test Scores), 9 for factor 4 (Noncommunicative Methods), and 8 for factor 5 (Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles). Similarly, the multiply coded protocols mostly concerned factors 3, 4, and 5. No one made comments about factors 1 and 2 (Course Books and Inadequate School Facilities).

As for factor 3, participants made some comments about difficulty in memorizing words and phrases as in Item 7 ("I had difficulty in memorizing words and phrases") and about low scores on tests as in Item 8 ("I got low scores on tests"). In addition, participants referred to difficulty in such skills as reading and writing. Examples of comments related to Factor 3 were as follows (the square brackets indicate student identification numbers):

- *When I couldn't get good results because I couldn't memorize vocabulary easily.* [S49]
- *When I can't get a good score on tests. I start to feel that I'm not talented.* [S38]

- *The experience that I didn't understand English sentences.* [S69]
- *When I couldn't compose since I couldn't use grammar well or apply basic knowledge.* [S9]

The original comments were written in Japanese, but were translated into English by the authors for display in this study.

As for factor 4, most of the comments focused on the noncommunicative nature of the lessons as in Items 3 ("Most of the lessons focused on the grammar") and 4 ("Most of the lessons were entrance examination oriented"). One participant remarked on a one-way type of teaching as in Item 13 ("Teachers made one-way explanations too often."). Examples of comments on Factor 4 were as follows:

- *Since we focused on grammar not on communication in high school.* [S62]
- *I started to have a hard time in English study once I got into high school. I felt a big change from lessons focusing on communicating in English in junior high schools to lessons focusing on grammar in senior high schools, which was boring.* [S68]
- *Studying for university entrance examinations.* [S42]
- *"teachers' noninteractive lessons." I hate this.* [S52]

As for factor 5, comments on teachers' pronunciation, the pace of lessons and teachers' attitudes toward students were reported. These comments are related to Items 11 ("Teachers' pronunciation of English was poor") and 10 ("The pace of lessons was not appropriate"). It is interesting that one respondent noted teachers' demotivated attitudes toward teaching. Examples of these comments are as follows:

- *I became demotivated when the teacher's pronunciation was very much like reading katakana.* [S33]
- *Since the teacher was just keeping up the pace of the lesson by himself.* [S66]
- *Teacher's demotivation toward teaching classes.* [S41]

Some comments coded as "others" were related to the number of assignments, preparation for examinations, and lessons. These comments were similar to Item 19 ("A great number of textbooks and supplementary readers were assigned."), but the participants not only commented on the material for the assignment (see the comments by S82), but also mentioned

the amount of test preparation and number of lessons (see the comments by S81 and S85).

- *When there were many assignments the teacher was too scary.* [S82]
- *I started not to care about learning because there was a lot to memorize (vocabulary, idioms, sentences) for mid-term/final exams.* [S81]
- *I got demotivated when I had two English classes a day because of the type of the universities that I wanted to go to when I was in my 3rd year.* [S85]

Other comments were not dealt with in the questionnaire. They concern (a) comparison with other students, (b) study environments at home, (c) teachers' use of English, and (c) attendance of additional lessons.

- *I was compared with other students when I was studying for university entrance examinations.* [S51]
- *When I was forced to participate in supplementary lessons.* [S28]
- *When I feel tired. When my room is dirty.* [S47]
- *I just couldn't get along with the teacher.* [S80]
- *The fact that teacher uses English.* [S91]

In addition, some comments concerned internal states such as "I felt burdened." These comments were not useful because we were interested in what caused such internal states of demotivation.

Discussion and Conclusion

Concerning the first research question, the factor analysis indicated a five-factor solution. The five factors extracted were (a) Course Books, (b) Inadequate School Facilities, (c) Test Scores, (d) Noncommunicative Methods, and (e) Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles. Although no one made comments about Course Books or Inadequate School Facilities, three of these factors (Test Scores, Noncommunicative Methods, and Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles) were supported by the participants' comments. As to the second research question, the second factor, labeled Inadequate School Facilities, was found to be less frequently demotivating than the others for the participants.

We discuss the findings mainly in terms of comparisons of the factor structure with Dörnyei's (2001a) nine categories. With respect to these categories of demotivation, four factors (Course Books, Inadequate School

Facilities, Test Scores, and Teachers' Competence and Teaching Styles) observed in this study overlapped with Dörnyei's list, although there were slight differences. For example, the factor of Inadequate School Facilities in Dörnyei (2001a) referred to class size or allotments of teachers whereas the factor of Inadequate School Facilities in this study is related only to multimedia learning environments. One factor (Noncommunicative Methods) is unique to this study. Of the nine categories proposed by Dörnyei (2001a), five categories (negative attitude toward the foreign language studied, compulsory nature of the foreign language studied, interference of another foreign language that pupils are studying, negative attitude toward the community of the foreign language spoken, and attitudes of group members) were not observed in Kikuchi (in press) or in this study. One of these differences (attitudes of group members) was discussed above, and it is possible that the proficiency levels of the participants may have influenced the results. These differences may be attributed to the English-language learning context in Japan. For example, in Japan, English is taught as a foreign language; in other words, most students rarely have opportunities to use English for communicative purposes outside classrooms. Thus, it is possible that attitude toward the community of the foreign language spoken may not be an influential demotivating factor. In addition, most Japanese senior high school students study only English as a foreign language; therefore, interference of another foreign language may be considered to be unrelated with respect to Japanese learners of English. Furthermore, although the 2003 Course of Study (the official guideline of the curricula issued by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology) stipulates that the goal of the study of foreign languages is "to develop students' practical communication abilities such as understanding information and the speaker's or writer's intention, and expressing their own ideas, deepening the understanding of language and culture, and fostering a positive attitude toward communication through foreign languages" (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Technology, 2003, ¶1), the reality seems to be that most lessons still focus on explicit grammar instruction and preparation for university entrance examinations. On the basis of our finding that Factor 4, Noncommunicative Methods (which focuses on grammar learning or university entrance examination preparation without a communicative use of English), was perceived to be demotivating by many participants, we have inferred that such emphasis on grammar and examinations may function as a demotivating factor for Japanese learners of English.

Dörnyei (2005) has stated that, "past motivation research has typically overlooked the negative motives" (p. 89). This study has thus tried to explore negative aspects of student motivation to learn English. Following Brown's (2001) guidance for survey research, we found five external demotivating factors for Japanese learners of English. However, there are several limitations to this study. First, we examined relatively successful learners of English in a limited number of universities in Japan. Future studies need to involve a variety of learners in terms of motivational states and proficiencies in English. Second, we followed Dörnyei's definition of demotivation, and focused on external forces. Thus, this study has not investigated how internal factors such as lack of self-confidence or learners' attitudes toward English would influence demotivation. To overcome these limitations, it is necessary to examine the influences of internal factors as well as external factors on demotivation and to investigate the relationships among the internal and external factors. Third, this study was cross-sectional in its design. As such, it was beyond the scope of this study to explore how L2 learners change in their motivation over time, which can only be examined by a longitudinal approach. Taking these issues into consideration, it will be necessary to accumulate more research in the future to deepen knowledge about L2 learners' demotivation and obtain practical implications for teachers in Japan.

Note

1. Direct oblimin, one type of oblique rotation, maximizes the interpretability of a model whose factors show inter-correlations with one another (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 639). We selected direct oblimin on the assumption that factors would be related to each other.

Keita Kikuchi teaches in the Foreign Language Center at Tokai University. He holds an M.A. in ESL from University of Hawai'i at Manoa. *Hideki Sakai* teaches at Shinshu University. His current research interests include classroom second language acquisition and psycholinguistic aspects of listening and speaking.

References

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

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*, 117-148.

Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christophel, D., & Gorham, J. (1995). A test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher immediacy and perceived sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. *Communication Education*, *44*, 292-306.

Covington, M. (1992). *Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*, 469-512.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivation strategies in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. (1992). Students' perception of teacher behaviors as motivating and demotivating factors in college classes. *Communication Quarterly*, *40*, 239-52.

Gorham, J., & Millette, D. (1997). A comparative analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. *Communication Education*, *46*, 245-261.

Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hasegawa, A. (2004). Student demotivation in the foreign language classroom. *Takushoku Language Studies, 107*, 119-136.

Ichikawa, S. (2001). *Manabu iyoku no shinrigaku* (Psychology of learning motivation)*.* Tokyo: PHP Shinsho.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Hays, E. R., & Ivey, M.J. (1991). College teacher misbehaviors: What students don't like about what teachers say and do. *Communication Quarterly*, *39*, 309-324.

Kikuchi, K. (in press). Listening to our learners' voices: What demotivates EFL high school students? *Language Teaching Research, 13*(4).

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory or goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Technology (2003). The course of study for foreign languages. Retrieved February 25, 2007 from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/shotou/030301.htm

Oxford, R. (Ed.). (1996). *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3-33). New York: University of Rochester Press.

Sakurai, S. (1997). *Gakushu iyoku no shinrigaku* (Psychology of learning motivation). Tokyo: Seishin Shobo.

Stevens, J. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Surveymonkey.com (2006). Surveymonkey.com, powerful tool for creating web surveys. Retrieved December 15, 2006 from http://www.surveymonkey.com/

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Tsuchiya, M. (2004a). *Nihonjin daigakuseino eigogakushuuheno demotivation* (Japanese university students' demotivation to study English). *The Chugoku Academic Society of English Language Education Kenkyukiyo, 34*, 57-66.

Tsuchiya, M. (2004b). Factors in demotivation concerning learning English: A preliminary study of Japanese university students. *The Kyushu Academic Society of English Language Education (KASELE)*, *32*, 39-46.

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

Tsuchiya, M. (2006b). Profiling of lower achievement English learners at college in terms of demotivating factors. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan (ARELE), 17*, 171-180.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories and research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zhang, Q. (2007) Teacher misbehaviors as learning demotivators in college classrooms: A cross-cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan, and the United States, *Communication Education*, *56*, 209-227

Appendix A

Question Items (Translated into English)

No	Item
1	I seldom had chances to communicate in English.
2	Most of the lessons focused on translation.
3	Most of the lessons focused on grammar.
4	Most of the lessons were entrance examination oriented.
5	I was expected to use (or speak and write) grammatically correct English.
6	I was forced to memorize the sentences in the textbooks too often.
7	I had difficulty in memorizing words and phrases.
8	I got low scores on tests (such as mid-term and final examinations).
9	I got lost in how to self-study for English lessons.
10	The pace of lessons was not appropriate.
11	Teachers' pronunciation of English was poor.
12	Teachers ridiculed students' mistakes.
13	Teachers made one-way explanations too often.
14	Teachers' explanations were not easy to understand.
15	Teachers shouted or got angry.
16	Topics of the English passages used in lessons were not interesting.
17	English passages in the textbooks were too long.
18	English sentences dealt with in the lessons were difficult to interpret.
19	A great number of textbooks and supplementary readers were assigned.
20	Topics of the English passages used in lessons were old.
21	Computer equipment was not used.
22	Visual materials (such as videos and DVDs) were not used.
23	The Internet was not used.
24	LL equipment was not used.
25	Audio materials (such as CDs and tapes) were not used.

No	Item
26	The number of students in classes was large.
27	I could not do as well on tests as my friends.
28	I did not like my classmates.
29	My friends did not like English.
30	I was often compared with my friends.
31	English was a compulsory subject.
32	I lost my understanding of the purpose of studying English.
33	I lost my interest in English.
34	I lost my goal to be a speaker of English.
35	English questions did not have clear answers.

Appendix B

The Questionnaire (Original)

次の理由は高校における英語学習のやる気をなくすものとしてどれくらい当てはまりますか。自分の経験に基づいて、該当箇所をクリックください。

No	Item
1	英語でコミュニケーションをする機会がなかったから。
2	英語を訳すことが多かったから。
3	文法に関する学習が多かったから。
4	大学入試のための授業が多かったから。
5	文法的に正しい英語を使うこと（話すことや書くこと）を求められたから。
6	教科書本文の暗記をさせられることが多かったから。
7	英単語・熟語を覚えられなかったから。
8	定期テスト（例：中間・期末・実力テスト）の結果が悪かったから。
9	英語の予習・復習方法がわからなくなったから。
10	授業のペースが適切ではなかったから。
11	先生の英語の発音が悪かったから。
12	先生が生徒の間違いを馬鹿にした態度をとったから。
13	先生の一方的な説明が多かったから。
14	先生の説明がわかりにくかったから。
15	先生が感情的にどなったり怒ったりしたから。
16	授業で扱う英文のトピック（話題）が興味深くなかったから。
17	教科書の文章が長かったから。

No	Item
18	授業で扱う英文の内容が難しかったから。
19	教科書や副読本がたくさん与えられたから。
20	授業で扱う英文のトピック（話題）が古いものだったから。
21	コンピュータ設備を使わなかったから。
22	映像教材（ビデオ・DVD）を使わなかったから。
23	インターネットを使わなかったから。
24	LL教室の設備を使わなかったから。
25	音声教材（CDやテープ）を使わなかったから。
26	1クラスの生徒数が多かったから。
27	友達と比べてテストの得点がとれなかったから。
28	クラスメートが嫌いだったから。
29	まわりの友達が、英語が嫌いだったから。
30	友達とよく比較されたから。
31	英語が必修科目であったから。
32	英語を学ぶ目的がわからなくなったから。
33	英語に興味がなくなったから。
34	英語のできる人にならなくていいと思ったから。
35	英語の問題の回答が明確でなかったから。