

## On the Impact of Achievement Goal-orientations on EFL University Students' Demotivation

Shadi Allahdadi<sup>1</sup>, Safoura Jahedizadeh<sup>2</sup>, Afsaneh Ghanizadeh<sup>3\*</sup>, Akram Hosseini<sup>4</sup>

---

1. M.A. student of TEFL, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran.

Email: shadiallahdadi@gmail.com

2. M.A. student of TEFL, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran.

Email: jahedi.s1310@gmail.com

3. Assistant Professor of TEFL, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran.

4. EFL Instructor, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran.

\* Corresponding Author's Email: ghanizadeafsane@yahoo.com; a.ghanizadeh@imamreza.ac.ir

---

**Abstract** – This study aims at exploring the nexus between goal-orientation and demotivation of EFL university students in Iran. To measure goal-orientation, the study employed the Persian version of the 'Achievement Goal Orientation Inventory' designed by Midgley et al. (1998) and to assess learners' demotivation, the Persian version of 'demotivation scale' designed and validated by Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) and translated to Persian by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (forthc.) was utilized. The former measures three types of goals namely, mastery, performance, and avoidance; the latter gauges six demotivators including, teachers, characteristics of classes, classroom environment, class materials, lack of interest, and experiences of failure. The results of the Pearson Product Moment correlation indicated that there are positive and significant relationships between students' lack of interest and avoidance-goal orientation as well as experiences of failure and avoidance-approach. Negative and significant relationships were also obtained between learners' lack of interest and mastery as well as performance goal orientation. The same results were also obtained for students' experiences of failure and the two goal orientations (mastery and performance). Teachers as demotivators were found to be significantly related to learners' performance and avoidance goal orientation. A significant relationship was also observed between characteristics of classes and avoidance goal orientation as well as classroom materials and avoidance goal orientation.

**Keywords:** Achievement goal-orientation, Demotivation, EFL learners

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Demotivation as the adverse counterpart of motivation should be considered as important as motivation in language learning process given that it acts on the opposite direction of motivation and impedes learners in achieving their goals toward learning English. Dörnyei (2001a) deemed demotivation as specific external forces that reduce the motivational basis of learners' intention or their on-going action (p. 143). According to Gorham and Christophel (1992) as well as Gorham and Millette (1997), factors which can diminish learners' energy for learning are regarded as de-motivators. Different factors such

as: teachers, learners, class room environment, textbook, content and materials, lack of interest, failure experience, teaching methods and facilities can act as de-motivators. They all appear to have a negative influence on the learners' degree of motivation and achievement. The issue of demotivation may be of the interest for not only researchers but also for many teachers who see their learners becoming demotivated in their daily classrooms and are eager to know the factors leading to learners' demotivation.

The goal that a learner adopts for his or her learning can have a crucial influence on the level of demotivation and learners' achievement. Achievement goals can be defined as competence-relevant aims that learners adopt in achievement settings. Elliot (1999) presented a three-factor model of performance goals including, mastery (aimed at attaining task-based or intrapersonal competence), performance-approach (aimed at attaining normative competence), and performance-avoidance (aimed at avoiding normative incompetence). Elliot and McGregor (2001) mentioned that performance-approach goals were linked to effort, persistence, competitiveness, and high grades, while performance-avoidance goals were linked to test anxiety, low grades, and low self-efficacy. According to Elliot and McGregor (2001), there is also a fourth type of goal achievement which is called mastery-avoidance.

Despite the efforts of English teachers to teach effectively, many EFL learners experience demotivation due to inappropriate choice of their goal-orientations. Virtually, the type of goal-orientation learners adopt toward their learning seems to determine their level of demotivation. For instance, learners whose goal is to pass the required exams with a minimum effort and consider the course just as a subject matter to be passed become demotivated due to their perception toward educational goal. The aim of the present study is to probe the role of goal-orientation in EFL learners' demotivation.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **2.1. Review of the Literature on Demotivation**

Dörnyei (2001b) considered demotivation as the adverse forces that diminish learners' willingness to study. Demotivated learners think they cannot have control over their external environments. This feeling of helplessness is created by the lack of contingency between their behaviors and outcomes. Ghanizadeh and Rostami (2015) noted that the starting point of demotivation is out of an external locus and before it turns into an internalized process, there was a demotivating trigger. A study conducted by Chambers (1999) demonstrated that the characteristics of demotivated learners are as follows: making no attempts for learning; showing no interest; reveal poor concentration; producing little or no participation in class activities; not bringing materials; not believing their abilities; showing negative or nil response to praise. Gorham and Christophel (1992) as well as Gorham and Millette (1997) deemed demotivating factors as elements which demote learners' energy and stimulation for learning. In a study carried out by Dörnyei (2001b), nine elements were identified as demotivating factors as follows: the teacher (personality, commitment, competence, teaching method), inadequate school facilities (group is too big or

not the right level, frequent change of teachers), reduced self-confidence (experience of failure or lack of success), negative attitude towards the L2, compulsory nature of L2 study, interference of another foreign language being studied, negative attitudes towards L2 community, attitudes of group members, and course book.

Ushioda (1998) analyzed 20 university learners' opinions in terms of motivation and their experiences on degrees of motivation and the demotivating factors in L2 learning. The researcher employed structured interview for collecting data. The findings revealed specific teaching methods, style, and learning tasks as external demotivating factors.

Chambers (1999) investigated de-motivation in the area of L2 learning and examined de-motivated learners in four schools in Leeds, UK. The researcher handed out a questionnaire among 191 learners and seven teachers. Results revealed the following characteristics for a demotivated learner: 1) lack of interest, motivation and no concentration on learning process, 2) lack of self-confidence and eagerness in doing home works, 3) distracting other students in class. Furthermore, learners considered teachers as main factor of de-motivation because some teachers used traditional teaching approaches and their teaching method was not interesting for learners. Other teachers did not present insufficient description on lesson or did not employ up-to-date techniques and equipment.

Bednarova (2011) conducted a study to find the effect of demotivating factors on students' motivation and their achievement. The study was an attempt to find the source of de-motivation from learners' point of view. Qualitative method was utilized for gathering data. The findings demonstrated that de-motivation was a critical problem that negatively influenced on students' motivation and performance. The finding also revealed that external factors were more de-motivating than internal factors and teachers were considered as the main factor of demotivation. In accounting for the antecedents and ramifications of L2 learning demotivation, Jahedizadeh and Ghanizadeh (2015) examined gender and educational level differences in accounting for demotivation. They reported that male students felt more demotivated than female learners. In terms of educational level, significant differences were found between high school and MA students, as well as MA and BA students; however, no significant relationship was found between high school and BA students in terms of demotivation.

## **2.2. Review of the Literature on Goal-orientation**

Achievement goal theory concerns learners' perception of educational goals. Dweck (2000), Elliot (1997), and Nicholls (1990) contended that achievement goals have an important effect on students' ongoing motivation and achievement. Researchers have considered three types of achievement goal orientations including: mastery goals, where learners try to master a task; performance-approach goals, where learners try to display their capabilities; and performance avoidance goals, where students' main focus is hiding their lack of ability (Elliot, 1999). Based on goal theory, approaching a task out of motivation and interest leads to more effective outcomes (Ames, 1992) while, performance goal-orientation describes learners who focus on outperforming other learners.

According to Elliot and McGregor (2001), performance-approach goals were linked to effort, persistence, competitiveness, and high grades, while performance-avoidance goals were linked to test anxiety, low grades, and low self-efficacy. Elliot and McGregor (2001) added a fourth goal to the achievement goal framework which is *mastery-avoidance*. Mastery-avoidance is defined as "a focus on avoiding self-referential or task-referential incompetence" (Elliot, 2005, p. 61).

Jackson (2002) conducted a study to explore the association between the types of goals that individuals have in their learning and their efficacy beliefs. Findings revealed that learners with mastery goals have higher self-efficacy than those with performance-approach or avoidance orientation. Another study conducted by Dweck and Leggett (1998) demonstrated that learners who adopt mastery goals have higher perception of self-efficacy and self-confidence and this factor influences on their achievement. Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) examined the link between goal-orientation and cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Results indicated that those learners who choose mastery goals use more cognitive and metacognitive strategies than students whose focus is on demonstrating their abilities to others and they fear from others' unfavorable judgment. According to Kharazi, Ezhehei, Ghazi Tabatabaei, and Karrshki (2008), there is a significant correlation between achievement goals, self-efficacy, and metacognition components. In another study, Huang (2011) attempted to find the bond between achievement goals and achievement emotions. The findings revealed that mastery goals correlated highly with interest and enjoyment rather than with anxiety. Hulleman, Schrage, Bodmann, and Harackiewicz's (2010) study corroborated this finding. Reobken (2007) revealed how different goal orientations influence on students' satisfaction and academic success. The results showed that learners who adopt mastery and performance goals were more satisfied with their academic experience, had a higher degree of academic engagement and achieved better grades in comparison with students who adopt a mastery orientation alone or performance avoidance. Hosseini and Jafari (2014) explored 604 Iranian secondary school students' de-motivation. The findings revealed three factors as demotivating: 1) Insufficient school facilities, 2) Inappropriate teaching materials and contents, and 3) lack of intrinsic motivation. The last item was considered as the main source of de-motivation. The results also indicated that inappropriate teaching materials and contexts was the major de-motivating factor for more and less motivated learners.

According to Elliot and Dweck (1988), learners who adopt mastery-goals are intrinsically motivated, so they have a better achievement; while learners with performance-avoidance goals appear to have maladaptive learning patterns and they tend to play safe and relinquish when confront to difficulties (Dweck, 2000). In other words, performance-oriented learners have an extrinsic motivation and select superficial learning approach (Elliot & Dweck, 1988).

Taken together, the present study is an attempt to empirically examine the hypothesized influence of goal orientation on demotivation among Iranian EFL university students.

### 3. METHOD

#### 3.1 Participants

The participants of the present study comprised 125 EFL learners (28 male, 97 female) selected according to convenience sampling among EFL students learning English at two universities in Mashhad, a city in north east of Iran. After a brief explanation of the purpose of the research, all participants received the Persian versions of the ‘*Achievement Goal Orientation Inventory*’ and ‘*De-motivation Scale*’. The researchers assured all participants that their views would be kept confidential by asking them not to write their names on the questionnaires. They were just required to indicate some demographic information such as, age, gender, grade point average (GPA), and educational level. The questionnaires were then coded numerically.

The profile of the participants is as follows: Their age varied from 19 to 36 years old ( $M= 23.39$ ,  $SD= 3.33$ ), with the GPA between 13 and 19 ( $M= 17.05$ ,  $SD= 1.39$ ) studying English at B.A. level (79 teaching, 22 translation, and 24 literature).

#### 3.2. Instruments

##### 3.2.1. Achievement Goal Orientation Inventory

Students' goal orientation was measured by the translated version of ‘*Achievement Goal Orientation Inventory*’ designed by Midgley et al. (1998). The inventory comprises three subscales, 6 items for each goal orientation that make a total of 18 items and allows responses ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). Table 1 demonstrates three possible goal orientations considered in this study:

**Table 1**

*Subscales of the AGOI along with the Corresponding Descriptions*

Subscale	Definition	Alpha	Items
Mastery-approach	Attaining task-based or intrapersonal competence	.85	1-6
Performance-approach	Attaining normative competence	.89	7-12
Performance-avoidance	Avoiding normative incompetence	.74	13-18

##### 3.2.2. De-motivation Questionnaire

To examine EFL learners' de-motivation, the Persian version of 'de-motivation scale' designed and validated by Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) and translated to Persian by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (forthc.) was utilized. The de-motivation questionnaire consists of 35 statements evaluating six constructs of de-motivation: teachers (6 items), characteristics of classes (7 items), class environment (7 items), experiences of failure (5 items), class

materials (6 items) and lack of interest (4 items). The scale measures these six constructs via a 5-point Likert-type response format (1: not true, 2: to some extent not true, 3: not either true or untrue, 4: to some extent true, and 5: true). Validity evidence for construct interpretation investigated through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was indicative of model fit (A GFI of .91 and a RMSEA of .06). Sample items for each subscale are as follows: *Teachers*: 1) Teachers' pronunciation of English is poor, and 2) The teacher ridicules students' mistakes. *Characteristics of classes*: 1) Most of the lessons focus on translation, and 2) I seldom have chances to communicate in English. *Experiences of failure*: 1) I get lost in how to self-study for English lessons, and 2) I lost my interest in English. *Class environment*: 1) Visual materials (such as videos and DVDs) are not used, and 2) Audio materials (such as CDs and tapes) are not used. *Class materials*: 1) English sentences dealt with in the lessons are difficult to interpret, and 2) Topics of the English passages used in lessons are not interesting. *Lack of interest*: 1) I have lost my goal to be a speaker of English, and 2) I have lost my interest in English.

The Persian version of the questionnaire translated and validated by Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (forthcoming) enjoyed acceptable validity and reliability estimates. The validity indices were computed via CFA and are as follows: the chi-square/df ratio= 2.1, the RMSEA= .062, NFI=.90, GFI= .89 and CFI= .91. The Cronbach's alpha estimate for the six de-motivators was .95 regarding 35 items. The reliability of the subscales ranged from .72 to .87 (teachers= .87, characteristics of classes= .72, class environment= .72, class materials= .82, experiences of failure= .84, and lack of interest= .87). All items had accepted factor loadings and ranged from .42 (item 21 measuring classroom environment) to .86 (item 33 measuring lack of interest).

#### 4. RESULTS

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of EFL university students' achievement goal orientation.

**Table 2**  
*Descriptive Statistics of Student Goal orientation*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Mastery</b>	125	8.00	30.00	22.0480	4.57175
<b>Performance</b>	125	11.00	30.00	22.4080	4.41788
<b>Avoidance</b>	125	12.00	30.00	21.6880	3.39215
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	125				

According to this table, among the three dimensions of student goal orientations, mastery and performance goal orientations received the highest means: Mastery-approach ( $M= 22.04$ ,  $SD= 4.57$ ), and performance-approach ( $M= 22.40$ ,  $SD= 4.41$ ).

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics of EFL university students' demotivation. In this study, TEA stands for teachers, COC for characteristics of classes, CEN for classroom

environment, EOF for experiences of failure, CMA for classroom materials, and LOI for lack of interest.

**Table 3**  
*Descriptive Statistics of Student Demotivation*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>TEA</b>	125	6.00	26.00	16.0960	5.60878
<b>COC</b>	125	11.00	32.00	22.6160	4.38433
<b>EOF</b>	125	5.00	22.00	14.0080	4.34128
<b>CEN</b>	125	8.00	32.00	22.4720	5.21409
<b>CMA</b>	125	6.00	26.00	17.0080	4.56405
<b>LOI</b>	125	2.00	9.00	4.8240	2.25068
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	125				

As the table indicates, among the six constructs of student demotivation, ‘characteristics of classes’ obtained the highest mean ( $M= 22.61$ ,  $SD= 4.38$ ), followed by ‘classroom environment’ ( $M= 22.47$ ,  $SD= 5.21$ ).

To investigate the relationship between students’ goal orientations and their demotivation, multiple correlations were run. The results of Pearson Product Moment correlations are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4**  
*The Correlation Coefficients among Achievement Goal-orientation and Demotivation*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>1. mastery</b>	1								
<b>2. performance</b>	.570**	1							
<b>3. avoidance</b>	.107	.229*	1						
<b>4. TEA</b>	-.116	-.203*	.273**	1					
<b>5. COC</b>	-.134	-.145	.257**	.664**	1				
<b>6. EOF</b>	-.219*	-.248**	.275**	.695**	.652**	1			
<b>7. CEN</b>	.097	.074	.151	.377**	.482**	.311**	1		
<b>8. CMA</b>	-.145	-.101	.367**	.648**	.562**	.651**	.268**	1	
<b>9. LOI</b>	-.279**	-.257**	.260**	.567**	.597**	.698**	.386**	.591**	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As indicated in Table 4, the highest correlation was found between classroom materials and avoidance goal orientation ( $r= 0.36$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), followed by the correlation

between lack of interest and mastery goal orientation ( $r = -0.279, p < 0.05$ ), experiences of failure and avoidance goal orientation ( $r = 0.275, p < 0.05$ ), and teachers and avoidance goal orientation ( $r = 0.27, p < 0.05$ ). The correlation between lack of interest and avoidance goal orientation was also significant ( $r = 0.26, p < 0.05$ ).

## **5. DISCUSSION**

The aim of the present study was to investigate the role of goal-orientations in learners' demotivation. The results highlighted the contention that the type of goal a learner adopts for his or her learning can have a pivotal influence on demotivation and achievement. The target of the present research was mainly those learners who learn English in universities. Actually, there are different channels in Iran for learners to learn a foreign language as follows: institutes, schools, and universities. Among these learners, those who study at universities seem to have decisively set an academic goal for themselves. Dweck (2000), Elliot (1990), Nicholls (1990) mentioned that achievement goals have an important effect on students' ongoing motivation and achievement. Some learners are mastery oriented who focus on developing their competence or mastering a task. Another group are performance oriented who are concerned with demonstrating their competence relative to others. While those groups of learners who are avoidance-oriented aimed at hiding their lack of ability. Essentially, this avoidance-orientation can cause a hindrance in learning process which leads to learners' demotivation. Demotivation as a negative counterpart of motivation is considered as an obstacle in education that acts on the opposite direction of motivation and impedes learners from being motivated to learn English. Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) categorized demotivating factors in to the following six group: 1. Teachers: teachers' attitudes, teaching competence, language proficiency, personality, and teaching style 2. Characteristics of classes: course contents and pace, focus on difficult grammar or vocabulary, monotonous and boring lessons, a focus on university entrance exams and the memorization of the materials 3. Experiences of failure: disappointment due to test scores, lack of acceptance by teachers and others, and feeling unable to memorize vocabulary and idioms 4. Class environment: attitudes of classmates, compulsory nature of English study, friends' attitudes, inactive classes, inappropriate level of the lessons, and inadequate use of school facilities such as not using audio-visual materials 5. Class materials: not suitable or uninteresting materials (e.g., too many reference books and/or handouts) 6. Lack of interest: sense that English used at schools is not practical and not necessary. Dornyei (2001b) put demotivators in nine categories as follows: The teacher (personality, commitment, competence, teaching method); Inadequate school facilities (group is too big or not the right level, frequent change of teachers); Reduced self-confidence (experience of failure or lack of success); Negative attitude towards the L2; Compulsory nature of L2 study; Interference of another foreign language being studied; Negative attitude towards L2 community; Attitudes of group members; Course book. Generally, those learners who adopt avoidance goals for their learning are at the risk of undergoing demotivation more habitually than their counterparts with mastery goal. This de-motivation, in turn, influences on their achievement which leads to experience of failure. This is in harmony with the finding of this study which

demonstrated that experience of failure, as an internal factor, is the strongest de-motivator for those learners who adopted avoidance goals.

As the results indicated, there was a negative significant relationship between performance goals and teacher as one of the demotivating factors and a positive relationship was also detected between avoidance goal and teacher. This entails those learners who have more tendency toward avoidance goals consider their teacher as a strong demotivating factor and when teacher is not capable enough to present the materials in an effective and appealing way, it leads to the adaptation of avoidance goals on the part of learners who are not motivated enough. A positive significant relationship was found between avoidance goals and characteristics of the classrooms. A negative significant relationship was obtained between mastery goals and experience of failure. In other word, those learners who have experienced failure do not adopt mastery goals and those learners who adopt mastery goals have less experience of failure. A positive relationship was found between avoidance goals and experience of failure which means that those learners who adopt avoidance goal have higher level of failure.

Those learners who apt for avoidance goal become demotivated if the material of the classroom were not innovative, challenging, and interesting for them. This substantiates another finding of this study revealing a significant positive relationship between avoidance goal and classroom materials as a demotivating factor. Results also indicated a positive relationship between avoidance and lack of interest which means for those learners who adopt avoidance goal for their learning, lack of interest can be a strong de-motivator for them. This is consistent with the finding which showed a negative relationship between mastery goals and lack of interest and also a negative relationship between performance goal and lack of interest.

Taken together, the results of this study can be justified in the light of previous research corroborating the association of avoidance goal and demotivation. According to Pajares and Schunk (2001) as well as Sideridis (2003), avoidance goals have been shown to be positively related to anxiety and negative attitudes which are the features of demotivated learners. Jackson (2002), Pajares (2003), Zafarmand, Ghanizadeh, and Akbari (2014) found that learners with avoidance goal have lower self-efficacy. Dweck and Leggett (1998) demonstrated that those learners who adopts avoidance goal have lower self-confidence that is one of the features of demotivated learners. Dweck (2000) noted that learners who prefer avoidance goals are demotivated and their learning is associated with maladaptive patterns and their purpose is just to relinquish when they encounter with difficulties; while Middleton and Midgley (1997), Pajares, Britner, and Valiante (2000) found that mastery goals are associated with effective and adaptive patterns of learning and achievement. Those learners who choose mastery-goals are intrinsically motivated and use elaboration strategies, so they get a better achievement (Elliot & Dweck, 1988). Wolters and Pintrich (1996) found that students adopting a performance-approach goal showed adaptive learning patterns including deep cognitive and regulatory strategies. Nicholls (1990) contended that learners who believe that ability is defined by attempts tend to adopt mastery goals, while those who believe that ability is determined by normative comparison tend to adopt performance goals.

On the other hand, it is contended that avoidance-oriented learners have an extrinsic motivation and adopt superficial learning approach and strategies for their learning (Elliot & Dweck, 1988).

To sum up, the present study demonstrated the effect of goal-orientations on demotivation. The findings of the present study can have significant implications for students, teachers, and educationalists. By informing learners to identify appropriate goal-orientation, we can thwart demotivation in learners. Teachers should guide learners toward mastery goal which leads to a noticeable augmentation in the level of learners' self-confidence and self-efficacy. In this way, students become intrinsically motivated and have more effective and adaptive patterns of learning which can in turn enhance their learning and academic achievement.

### REFERENCES

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84 (3), 261-271.
- Bednarova, N. (2011). *De-motivating influences for learning English among students on lower stages of 8-year grammar school*. Diploma thesis, University of Masaryk.
- Chambers, G. N. (1999). *Motivating language learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Longman: Harlow.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Lillington, NC Taylor & Francis.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-73.
- Elliot, A. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, 34, 149-169.
- Elliot, A. J. (2005). *A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct*. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.) *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (pp. 52-72) New York, New York: The Guilford Press.
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 5-12.
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: a mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 461-475.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2X2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 501-519.

- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2015). An exploration of EFL learners' perceptions of classroom activities and their achievement goal orientations. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 4 (3), 33-45
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Rostami, S. (2015). A Dörnyei-inspired study on second language motivation: a cross-comparison analysis in public and private contexts. *Psychological Studies*, 60(3), 292–301, DOI 10.1007/s12646-015-0328-4.
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Royaei, (2015). Emotional facet of language teaching: emotion regulation and emotional labor strategies as predictors of teacher burnout. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/22040552.2015.1113847>
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1992). Students' perceptions of teacher behaviours as motivating and de-motivating factors in college class. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 239-252
- Gorham, J., & Millette, D. (1997). A comparative of analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and de-motivation in college classes. *Communication Education*, 46, 245-261.
- Harackiewicz, J., & Hulleman, S. (2010). The importance of interest: The role of achievement goals and task values in promoting the development of interest. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(1).
- Hosseini, S. A., & Jafari, S. M. (2014). Possible de-motivating factors for secondary school students. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 5(3), 188-201.
- Huang, C. (2011). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: A meta-analysis. *Education Psychology Review*, 23, 359-388.
- Hulleman, C. S., Schragger, S. M., Bodmann, S. M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2010). A meta-analytic review of achievement goal measures: Different labels for the same constructs or different constructs with similar labels? *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 422–449.
- Jackson, J. W. (2002). Enhancing self-efficacy and learning performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 70, 243-55.
- Jahedizadeh, S., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2015). Demotivation and foreign language achievement: educational level and gender differences among Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Foreign Language Learning in the Islamic World*, 3 (6), 5-9.
- Kaplan, A., Gheen, M., & Midgley, C. (2002). Classroom goal structure and student disruptive behavior. *British Journal of Education Psychology*, 72, 191-211.
- Kharazi, S. A. N., Ezhehei, J., Ghazi Tabatabaei, M., & Kareshki, H. (2008). An investigation of the relationships between achievement goals, self-efficacy and metacognitive strategies: Testing a causal model. *Journal of Psychology and Education*, 38, 69-87.

- Middleton, M. J., & Midgley, C. (1997). Avoiding the demonstration of lack of ability: An underexplored aspect of goal theory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 710–718.
- Midgley, C., Kaplan, A., Middleton, M., Maehr, M.L., Urdan, T., Anderman, L.H., Anderman, E., & Roeser, R. (1998). The development and validation of scales assessing students' achievement goal orientations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 23 (2), 113-31.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1990). What is ability and why are we mindful of it? A developmental perspective. In R. Sternberg & J. Lolligian (Eds.), *Competence considered* (pp. 11–40). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19, 139–158.
- Pajares, F., Britner, S., & Valiante, G. (2000). Relation between achievement goals and self-beliefs of middle school students in writing and science. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 406-422.
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. In R. Riding & S. Rayner (Eds.), *Perception* (pp. 239-266). London: Ablex Publishing.
- Pintrich, P. R., & DeGroot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 82, 33-40.
- Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of de-motivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37, 57-69.
- Sideridis, D. (2003). On the origins of helpless behavior of students with learning disabilities: avoidance motivation. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED313854). Retrieved from ERIC database. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2004.06.011
- Ushioda, E. (1998). *Effective motivational thinking: A cognitive theoretical approach to the study of language learning motivation*. In E. A. Soler & V. C. Espurz (Eds.), *Current Issues in English language Methodology* (pp. 77-89). Spain: Universita Jaume I.
- Wolters, C., Yu, S., & Pintrich, P. (1996). The relation between goal orientation and students' motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8, 211-238.
- Zafarmand, A., Ghanizadeh, A., & Akbari, O. (2014). A structural equation modeling of EFL learners' goal orientation, metacognitive awareness, and self-efficacy. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5 (6), 112-124.