

Research Article

Teacher-Related Demotivating Factors Reducing Students' L2 Learning Motivation

Müjgan BEKDAŞ¹  Sami BASKIN^{2,*} 

¹ Malatya Turgut Özal University, Malatya, Turkey mujgan.bekdas@ozal.edu.tr

² Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat, Turkey sami.baskin@gop.edu.tr


* Corresponding Author: sami.baskin@gop.edu.tr

Article Info

Received: 10 May 2024

Accepted: 02 September 2024

Keywords: Demotivation, teacher-related factors, students' learning motivation, L2 learning

 10.18009/jcer.1482025

Publication Language: English

Abstract

This study aims to reveal the factors caused by the teacher that reduce the motivation of the student towards learning Turkish. The findings indicated that demotivating factors were teachers' instructional styles and teaching skills, teaching method, the teacher's personality, the teacher's attitude, the teacher's behaviors, the teacher's classroom management skills, the teacher's competence, the teacher's commitment to the job. This study theoretically extends previous demotivational measurements and the conceptual frameworks of L2 demotivational factors from English language learning to L2 Turkish learning. Also, It is important in terms of notable pedagogical implications are provided for L2 Turkish educators to reveal the demotivational constructions and to stimulate the motivation of L2 Turkish students. In addition, It is essential for taking some remedial measures and taking into account the needs and expectations of the students while determining the teaching methods.



To cite this article: Bekdaş, M. & Baskin, S. (2024). Teacher-related demotivating factors reducing students' l2 learning motivation. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*, 12 (24), 549-567. <https://doi.org/10.18009/jcer.1482025>

Introduction

In general terms, motivation means taking action to do something. L2 motivation can be described as a “combination of effort plus a desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language” (Gardner, 1985, p. 10). Moreover, student motivation naturally relates to the eagerness of learners to take part in the educational process. But it also has to do with the reasons or purposes underlying their participation or absence from academic activities (Bayraktar, 2015). While it is observed that some of the students in educational institutions are willing to produce solutions to the lesson, the subject or the problem encountered, it is observed that some other students are reluctant in the lessons and prefer to escape rather than struggle in producing solutions to the problems they encounter. At the beginning of the factors affecting the formation of this

difference between students is motivation. One of the most essential aspects influencing the efficacy of the learning-teaching process is motivation, as it is effective in energizing the individual and making him willing to behave (Akbaba, 2006). The impact of motivation on learning has been studied in many different languages. For example, L2 motivational situations were highly related with positive feelings but negatively correlated with negative counterparts among Italian secondary school learners (MacIntyre & Vincze, 2017). Accordingly, in the Saudi context, motivation totally influenced L2 learners' willingness to communicate and the perception of learning enjoyment for university English students (Alrabai, 2022). The finding of Kruk (2022) mirrored this pattern by stating that lower levels of anxiety and boredom were associated with higher levels of willingness to communicate and motivation in the Poland English learning context. And again, the findings of Lan, et al. (2023) indicated that L2 enjoyment mediated the association between L2 motivational intensity and L2 willingness to communicate. Additionally, both shyness and L2 boredom moderated the slope between L2 enjoyment and L2 willingness to communicate. However, this pattern has seldom been investigated in the L2 Turkish learning context, especially from the perspective of demotivational constructions. It is, therefore, intriguing and paramount to validate this pattern as the intricate relationship might vary across languages, participants, and contexts.

The effect of motivation on the language learning process has been proven and it has been determined that the key to proficiency and success in language learning is motivation (Spolsky, 1989). However, many negative effects on students' motivation occur during the target language learning process. Many academics emphasized motivation and explored strategies that might have a good impact on students (Dörnyei, 1994). There are, however, other elements that deter pupils from wanting to learn a foreign language and result in a lack of language proficiency. Demotivation, the opposite of motivation, has recently caught the attention of scholars and educators (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2015). Similar to motivators, demotivators lower students' desire to learn. These elements may contribute to pupils' lack of proficiency in learning foreign languages.

To bridge the aforementioned research gaps and improve the field forward, the current study serves as an initial attempt to research the demotivational factors in the L2 Turkish learning context. This study differentiates from previous research in considering the demotivational factors stemmed from the teacher by using interview for more detailed

information beyond quantitative data. Moreover, this study aims to enlarge the existing research scope to L2 Turkish language space from the point of demotivational factors caused by the teacher.

What is Demotivation?

Demotivation can be defined to be any power that lowers learners' motivation to learn or a lack of a desire to put forward an effort (Zhang, 2007). According to Küpers (2001), demotivation is not just a reversal of motivation. Demotivation contains more than inaction or unmotivated behavior. It can also indicate engaging in wrong or counterproductive directions. Aydın (2012) expresses demotivation as a lack of effort, need, and desire. These factors that negatively affect students can be caused by the student himself, the teacher, or many environmental reasons. Whatever the source of demotivation, it negatively affects the learning process (Lu, et al. 2023).

Literature Review

In his study, Dörnyei (2001) revealed the factors that reduce the motivation of students in countries where English is taught as a second language. These are factors originating from the teacher (teacher's personality, competencies, teaching methods, etc.), inadequate learning conditions (crowded classrooms, unsuitable class levels, or frequent changes of teachers), student's decreased self-confidence because of experiences of failure, negative manner towards the learned foreign language. (Lack of interest, obligatory foreign language learning, textbooks used in the course, and boring learning materials.

Inspired by Dörnyei's (2001) studies, many researchers have investigated the factors that decrease the motivation of foreign language learners (Arai, 2004; Falout & Maruyama, 2004; Hasegawa, 2004; Ikeno, 2002; İsaoglu & Emir, 2020; Kikuchi & Sakai, 2009; Quadir, 2021).

Ikeno (2002) investigated demotivation by interviewing 65 university students about their motivation and demotivation experiences. And he discovered some demotivating factors, such as sense of lack of control over what one is learning, doubts about teachers' abilities, doubts about teachers' character, a perception that courses are just focused on exams, self-doubt over one's English proficiency, and classmates' negative for learning the language. Hasegawa (2004) studied on both junior and senior high school students and asked them about their experiences of demotivation. He conducted a qualitative analysis of the data and discovered that teacher-related events were the most commonly reported as a

source of demotivation. According to the findings of the investigation, improper instructor behaviors may have a "significant influence" on student's lack of motivation. Falout and Maruyama (2004) looked into whether demotivating factors before starting college varied between beginner and advanced English students. They noticed that the demotivating factors for the beginner group were self-confidence, perceptions towards the second language itself, classes, teachers, and attitudes of members of the group (in decreasing order), while for the advanced group, self-confidence was the demotivating factor with the other factors being neutral. Arai (2004) questioned 33 university students if they experienced demotivating experiences in foreign language lectures, as well as to describe those events and their immediate reactions to them. The majority of the participants majored in English and were deemed fluent in the language. She gathered 105 comments and classified them into four categories: (a) instructors' attitude or personality, (b) dull or monotonous lessons, (c) classroom atmospheres, and (d) others. The leading group, instructors, accounted for 46.7% of the total, followed by dull lessons (36.2%), class atmospheres (13.3%), and others (3.8%). Kikuchi and Sakai (2007) recently investigated probable demotivating variables and extracted five components: (a) textbooks, (b) insufficient school resources, (c) exam results, (d) non-communicative techniques, and (e) teachers' competence and teaching styles. Kikuchi and Sakai (2007) determined that the factor Insufficient School Resources was less demotivating to their participants than the other four criteria, textbooks, exam results, non-communicative approaches, and teachers' competence and teaching styles.

Certain instructional elements, according to Quadir (2021), influence students' motivation. In addition, he investigated which instructional characteristics had a negative impact on students' enthusiasm to study English in Bangladesh. Teachers' instructional techniques and teaching methods, private lesson, teachers' character and behavior, teachers' competency and class management, and instructors' manner and devotion are listed as the five primary characteristics that negatively impact students' motivation in descending order.

It is well acknowledged that motivation is one of the most significant factors in learning a new language. But, in the literature review, it was observed that the factors that decrease the motivation of the students in teaching Turkish as a foreign language were not investigated much. When the Turkish literature was examined, it was determined that some studies were carried out on motivation (Abubakari, 2016; Barn, 2008; Biçer, 2016; İsaoglu & Emir, 2020; Mohamed, 2019; Yılmaz & Arslan, 2014). Abubakari (2016) evaluated the

motivation levels of students only in terms of high and low motivation and aimed to compare the motivation levels of Turkish students learning English and international students learning Turkish.

In his study, Barın (2008) offered suggestions to the instructors to increase motivation, such as arousing students' curiosity, making the student realize the importance of language learning and enjoying it, and planning the lesson in a way that the student would not get bored. Mohamed (2019) aimed to reveal the motivational status of graduate students learning Turkish as a foreign language in his study. And he concluded that the participants were motivated instrumentally and holistically. It was observed that students have more instrumental motivation. Yılmaz and Arslan (2014) aimed to determine students' motivation problems in their studies. They found out that the most important motivation problem of the students was caused by external reasons. İsaoglu and Emir (2020) studied demotivational factors in learning English and indicated that the main factors related to the class environment, course materials, experience of failure, and teacher-related factors are found as demotivators.

The Present Study

Despite the fact that some prior studies have documented the demotivational factors on L2 learning, few could shed light on the demotivational factors stemmed from the teacher in the L2 Turkish learning context with detailed information gathered from qualitative research.

This study theoretically extends previous demotivational measurements and the conceptual frameworks of L2 demotivational factors from English language learning to L2 Turkish learning with the following research question:

- What are the teacher-related factors that reduce the motivation of students learning Turkish as a foreign language?

Method

Research Design

In this study, a case study, one of the qualitative research designs, was used. The aim here was to make a detailed examination of a particular situation and to draw conclusions. The factors (environment, individuals, events, processes, etc.) related to the examined

situation were investigated with a holistic approach and focused on how they affect the relevant situation (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013, p. 83). Within the scope of the research, the holistic single-case model of the case study (Yin, 1984) was preferred. In holistic single case studies, the "unit of analysis" forms the basis of the case. This unit of analysis can sometimes be an individual, an event or an institution (Rowley, 2002). The unit of analysis in this study is "students learning Turkish as a foreign language". Another important concept is the "single situation to work in". The choice of the situation to be studied is determined according to the purpose, question and theoretical framework of the study (Rowley, 2002). In this context, the situation to be studied was determined as "teacher-related demotivating factors that reduce students' motivation".

Participants

A purposive sampling technique was preferred in this study since the subject was tried to be examined in depth and in detail (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). The participants of the study consisted of 12 students in total using maximum diversity sampling. The students participating in the interview were selected from as many different nationalities as possible and the age ranges of these students are similar. 6 of the students are girls and 6 of them are boys. The students who participated in the interview were given code names in terms of the confidentiality of the interview data. Also, the voluntary nature of participation stressed, and each participant signed a voluntary consent form. In order to enable the students to express themselves comfortably, the researcher and the interviewees had no any communication before. The demographic data of the interviewed students are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic data of the students who participated in the interview

Rank	Code Name	Gender	Nationality	Age	Number of language they know
1	S 1	Female	Iranian	21	1(Persian)
2	S 2	Male	Azerbaijan	19	1(Azerbaijani Turkish)
3	S 3	Female	Syrian	22	1(Arabic)
4	S 4	Male	Afghanistan	19	2(Persian, English)
5	S 5	Female	Syrian	20	1(Arabic)
6	S 6	Male	Syrian	20	1(Arabic)
7	S 7	Female	Kazakhstan	27	1(Kazakh Turkish)
8	S 8	Male	Syrian	23	1(Arabic)
9	S 9	Female	Syrian	21	1(Arabic)
10	S 10	Male	Iranian	21	1(Persian)
11	S 11	Female	Uyghur	20	2(Uyghur Turkish, English)
12	S 12	Male	Syrian	19	1(Arabic)

Data Collection Tools

Research data were collected by interview. Interviewing can be described as “a mutual and interactive communication process based on questioning and answering, conducted for a predetermined and serious purpose” (Stewart & Cash, 2011). Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview form with students studying at a Turkish teaching application and research center. The semi-structured interview was preferred because it provided the researcher with the opportunity to ask additional questions (Glesne, 2010). With this approach, all questions were asked in the same order to all participants in the same way. Thus, the subjective judgments of the researcher were minimized and the comparison and analysis of the data obtained were easier (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). The interview form questions used in the research were created using the literature (Kim, 2009; Quadir, 2021). In the development of the interview forms, expert opinion was sought regarding the "content validity" of the interview forms. In line with the suggestions of the experts, the connection of the questions in the forms with the subject, their ordering within a certain logic, and language errors were examined and necessary changes were made. Miles and Huberman (1994) reliability formula ($\text{Reliability} = \text{Consensus} / (\text{Consensus} + \text{Disagreement})$) was used to measure the reliability of the current form created and the agreement rate among experts was determined as 90%. It is expected to be at least 80% (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002).

The interview form consisted of the questions teachers' instructional styles and teaching skills, the teachers' teaching method, teachers' personality, teachers' attitude, teachers' behavior, teachers' classroom management skills, teachers' competence, teachers' commitment to work.

At the end of each interview, the participant was asked to add situations that were not listed in the protocol but that reduced the student's own motivation.

Data Collection

The interviews were conducted in Turkish. The purpose of the first two questions was to break the ice. Everyone who took part in the interview was ready to share their experiences. The objective and topic of the interview were explained to the participants a day or two before the interview, and they were given time to reflect on their previous experiences and impressions of the issue. Moreover all participants were first informed that

their identifiable information would be hidden and the principles of science ethics would be adhered to, and they were reminded that the data to be collected would not be used for other than scientific purposes and that they could stop the interview at any stage of the research if desired.

The interview was held with 12 foreign students studying at a Turkish teaching application and research center. The interview was conducted in a quiet environment away from the factors that would negatively affect the participant. The interview took an average of 40 minutes for each participant. Interview questions were asked to each participant in the same way and in the same order. During the interview, the data were recorded with the consent of the student participant. The researcher recorded the information from the interview without making any changes, and a colleague verified the correctness.

Analysis of Data

The qualitative data analysis method developed by Miles and Huberman was used to analyse the gathered data (1994). Three processes of data analysis were proposed by Miles and Huberman: reduction, presentation, drawing conclusions, and verification. By developing matrices, variables, and codes based on the opinions of the students, the qualitative data acquired from the interviews was condensed and shown. First, the data obtained from the interviews were transcribed. Then the data were coded separately by both researchers and the coding was compared for verification. Finally, the coding was reorganized and tabulated in line with expert opinions.

Validity and Reliability

Internal validity: In order to increase the internal validity, the interviews were conducted in a quiet environment and were recorded with a voice recorder with the permission of the participant in this process. Afterwards, the interviews were transcribed and a copy was given to the participant within the scope of ethical rules and consent was obtained. In addition, the interview form was presented to the expert opinion and some corrections were made in line with the suggestions. In addition, the statements of the participants in the interview were given as direct quotations in the findings section to support the internal validity. In the findings section, the statements of the participants were supported by giving direct quotations.

External validity: External validity was tried to be provided by the demographic data of the study group, the methods and reasons used in the research, the participant statements provided that direct quotations are given without any changes and all sections are explained in detail.

Internal confidence: In the findings section, the data are given as direct quotations without comment, and the codes and factors that have been revealed were presented to the expert opinion and necessary corrections were made.

External confidence: In order to understand whether the results of the research and the findings are consistent, these two departments were presented to two academicians who are experts in their fields and the results obtained were confirmed.

Findings

Teacher-related factors that negatively affect the motivation of students to learn Turkish as a foreign language were examined under eight different categories. Based on the interviews, these factors were given in the table below, from the most stated to the least stated by the students.

Table 2. Teacher-related factors negatively affecting the motivation of students learning Turkish as a foreign language

Factors	Name of the participants mentioning the point	%
Factor 1 Teachers' instructional styles and teaching skills	All	100
Factor 2 The teachers' teaching method	All	100
Factor 3 Teachers' personality	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S9, S11, S12	83
Factor 4 Teachers' attitude	S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S7, S10, S11, S12	75
Factor 5 Teachers' behavior	S1, S2, S3, S6, S7, S9, S10, S11, S12	75
Factor 6 Teachers' classroom management skills	S2, S4, S5, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12	75
Factor 7 Teachers' competence	S1, S2, S5, S6, S8, S10, S11, S12	66
Factor 8 Teachers' commitment to work	S1, S2, S3, S4, S7, S8, S11, S12	66

As a result of the analysis, a separate table was created for each factor and the codes and participants for each factor were shown separately. The codes in each table were supported by giving direct quotations from the statements obtained from the interviews of the participants.

Factor 1: Teachers' instructional styles and teaching skills

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, it was determined that the teacher's instructional styles and teaching skills emerged as the most significant factor (100%) that reduced the students' motivation to learn. The codes and participants for this factor were given in Table 3.

Table 3. Teachers' instructional styles and teaching skills

Codes	Participants
Does not encourage writing in own words	All
Not making creative writing practices but making memorized writings	All
Little or no group work	S1,4,5,6,10
Using only textbooks	S1,6,7,9
Encourage memorization of conversational dialogues only from books	S6
Not practicing interesting or effective grammar	S1,2,4,5,6
Not providing guidance to improve our Turkish language skills	S11, 5

When Table 3 is examined, 7 codes related to the teacher's teaching style and skill category were created. Accordingly, the students stated that the teachers neglected writing skills, only taught lessons based on the textbook, and did not use more entertaining methods such as group work. They emphasized that this situation caused them to have low motivation. Moreover, the data in Table 3 was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "How do you feel about the orientation skill and style your teacher uses in the classroom? Does it affect your motivation to learn?". For example, S4, one of the participants, explained the reason for his low motivation by saying "The teacher only makes activities from the textbook. It would be better if he uses other materials such as videos and daily life. Thus, my interest in the lesson will increase". S5, one of the participants, explained the situation that negatively affected her motivation with the following sentences: "Some grammar topics in Turkish are really difficult. I have difficulties sometimes. Maybe if the teacher explained these topics in more fun ways, it would be more memorable. And we can learn more easily."

Factor 2: The teachers' teaching method

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, the teaching method used by the teacher was the factor that reduced student motivation. The codes and participants for this factor were given in Table 4.

Table 4. The teachers' teaching method

Codes	Participants
Teacher-centered boring lessons	All
Little/no classroom activities related to oral communication	S4,5,7,9
Too much emphasis on grammar	S1,4,6,10
Not using the demonstration method	S1,5
Not giving the student the opportunity to ask questions	S3,4,5

When Table 4 is examined, 5 codes related to the teacher's teaching method category were created. According to this, the students stated the fact that the teachers taught boring lessons that were mostly teacher-centered while focusing on grammar subjects, they were less active on speaking and did not give them the opportunity to ask questions. As a result of these, they stated that they had low motivation towards learning. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "What do you think about the teaching method your teacher uses in the classroom? Does it affect your motivation to learn?"

For example, S4, one of the participants, stated that his motivation towards the lesson sometimes decreased and explained this situation with the following sentence: "When I asked the same question several times because I did not understand a subject, the teacher's attitude changed and he did not want to answer it." S1, one of the participants, explained her low motivation by saying "I don't like boring lessons. I get bored when the teacher only talks about the subject and we listen passively. Maybe the teacher can do different things."

Factor 3: Teachers' personality

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, the personality of the teacher has emerged as the factor that reduces student motivation. The codes and participants for this factor were given in Table 5.

Table 5. Teachers' personality

Codes	Participants
Passing through difficult issues quickly and being impatient with us	S1,4,5,11
To be angry	S1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,12

When Table 5 is examined, 2 codes were created for the teacher's personality category. Accordingly, the students stated that the teachers were sometimes angry with themselves, were not more tolerant, and were impatient with the students by passing the difficult subjects quickly, irrespective of nationality and gender. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the

students to the question "What do you think of your teacher's personality? Does it affect your motivation to learn?"

For example, S11, one of the participants, expressed her views as "The teacher is a little impatient and angry with me. Because I understand a little late and I have difficulties. She has to explain a little more, but she doesn't sometimes. It's like she gets angry."

Factor 4: Teachers' attitude

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, the attitude of the teacher emerged as the factor that reduced student motivation. The codes and participants for this factor were given in Table 6.

Table 6. Teachers' attitude

Codes	Participants
Paying more attention to good students in the class	S1,2,3,4,5,7,10
Neglecting poor-performing students	S1,2,3,4,5,10,11,12
More caring to students of a certain gender	S4

When Table 6 is examined, 3 codes related to the teacher's attitude category were formed. Accordingly, students stated that teachers neglected students with poor performance and showed more interest in students with high performance. They said that this situation created an unwillingness to learn in them. Also, one male student said that some teachers discriminated against gender. He stated that this situation also upsets him. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "How do you feel about your teacher's attitude towards you in the classroom? Does it affect your motivation to learn?"

For example, S5, one of the participants, expressed her concern with the following sentence: "The teacher spends more time with successful and quick-to-understand students. She does not want to deal with me. Because I understand late. This makes me sad.". Another male participant S2 stated the negative effect of teacher attitude on student motivation with the words "My teacher sometimes treats girls much better. I feel sorry for this".

Factor 5: Teachers' behaviours

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, the teacher's behaviors emerged as the factor that reduced student motivation. The codes and participants for this factor were given in Table 7.

Table 7. Teacher's behaviors

Codes	Participants
Critical behavior towards students' mistakes	S1,3,6,7,9
Does not encourage students to overcome their weak areas	S1,2,3,7,9,10,11,12

When Table 7 is examined, 2 codes related to the category of teacher behaviors were created. Accordingly, the students stated that the teachers sometimes acted critically against the mistakes made by the students and did not support the students in terms of improving their weaknesses. In such a situation, they stated that their motivation decreased and they emphasized that their participation in the lesson decreased because they were afraid of making mistakes. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "How do you feel about your teacher's behavior towards you in the classroom? Does it affect your motivation to learn?"

For example, S9 expressed her feelings with the following sentences: "Sometimes I don't fully understand Turkish and I make mistakes. Our teacher is actually very patient, but sometimes she can't be tolerant and reacts when I make too many mistakes. I wish it wasn't like that."

Factor 6: Teachers' classroom management skills

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, the teacher's classroom management skills emerged as the factor that reduced student motivation. The codes and participants for this factor are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Teacher's classroom management skills

Codes	Participants
Not including all students in classroom activities	S2,4,5,9,11,
Failure of all students to focus on the lesson	S7,10
Inability to manage the noise in the lesson	S8,11,12
Not interacting with all low-performing students	S10,11

When Table 8 is examined, 4 codes were created for the teacher's classroom management skills category. Accordingly, the students stated that the teachers sometimes could not include all the students in the activities and could not focus the attention of the whole class on the lesson. In addition, they stated that sometimes the teacher could not manage the noise in the classroom and stated that these situations caused low motivation in them. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "How do you feel about your teacher's classroom management skills? Does it affect your motivation to learn?"

For example, S12, one of the participants, explained the situation that affects his motivation by saying "Sometimes there can be a lot of noise in the classroom. I can't concentrate. Our teacher is a very good person, but discipline is also important."

Factor 7: Teachers' competence

According to the data obtained from the interviews with the students, the competency of the teacher emerged as the factor that lowered the student's motivation. The codes and participants for this factor were given in Table 9.

Table 9. Teacher's competence

Codes	Participants
Giving unclear and unorganized instructions in the classroom	S2,6
Go through difficult topics quickly	S1,5,8,10,11,12

When Table 9 is examined, 2 codes related to the teacher's competence category were created. According to this, the students stated that the teachers sometimes passed the difficult topics quickly and the instructions were in a mess without being clear and understandable. They also stated that these situations cause low motivation in them. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "How do you feel about your teacher's competence? Does it affect your motivation to learn?".

For example, S2, one of the participants, explained the factor affecting his learning as follows: "The teacher sometimes has difficulty in explaining abstract concepts, and when we do not understand, she passes the subject quickly." Another participant S3 stated that sometimes in-class directions could not be made clearly, with the words "Sometimes I don't understand what the teacher is saying, I don't quite decide what to do about the activity. Because I don't think the teacher explains it fully".

Factor 8: Teachers' commitment to work

According to the data obtained from the students' interviews, the teacher's commitment to work emerged as the factor that lowered student motivation. The codes and participants for this factor are given in Table 10.

Table 10. Teacher's commitment to work

Codes	Participants
Usually finishes early	S1,2,3,4,7,8
Does not seriously motivate students to learn Turkish	S11,12

When Table 10 is examined, 2 codes were created for the category of teacher's commitment to his work. Accordingly, students stated that some teachers usually finish the course early and motivate them less towards learning Turkish. In this section, the data in the table was tried to be supported by quoting directly from the answers given by the students to the question "How do you feel about your teacher's commitment to his/her job? Does it affect your motivation to learn?"

Half of the participants stated that the teacher always finished the lesson early and explained that this situation created a reluctance towards the lesson in them. One of the participants, S11, supported this situation with the words "Our teacher usually leaves the class before the lesson ends".

Conclusion and Discussion

This study was carried out to reveal the teaching factors that negatively affect students' motivation in teaching Turkish to foreigners. In this context, a qualitative analysis of students' perceptions of teacher practices in Turkish teaching was made and the factors affecting the dynamic nature of student-teacher interactions were revealed.

Twelve L2 Turkish students were interviewed about the factors that reduce their motivation. In consequence of the interviews, it was determined that the factors that decrease the motivation of the students in the classroom are, in decreasing order, teachers' instructional styles and teaching skills, the teacher's teaching method, the teacher's personality, the teacher's attitude, the teacher's behaviors, the teacher's classroom management skills, the teacher's competence, the teacher's commitment to the job. Under these factors, sub-codes were created explaining the teacher-induced reasons underlying students' indifference towards the lesson.

The most noted codes by students are that teachers do not attach much importance to the development of writing skills, do not do different and fun activities, prefer to use textbooks all the time, focus too much on grammar teaching, and neglect communicative skills. When the demographic data of the participants who produced these codes are analysed, these codes do not vary according to the gender, nationality or the number of languages they know. Because these behaviours can affect the motivation of all students. In addition, it is among the codes stated by the students that the teachers prefer the teacher-centered lecture method that makes the student passive. It is also among the codes that the teacher gives more importance to the successful students but neglects the students with low

performance. Only one male student among the codes stated that the teacher was more compassionate and tolerant towards female students. There was no such code from the class in general. However, it can be thought that the distinction between male and female students in the classroom environment negatively affects student motivation. Many students also stated that the teacher, who cannot successfully manage the classroom, affects student motivation negatively. In addition, the codes of leaving the course early and not motivating students to learn in the real sense were also stated by the students a lot.

When the results of the studies done in other countries were compared with this study, they were parallel with the result of this study. In his research, Quadir (2021) discovered five unique elements that have a negative impact on student motivation. Teachers' instructional techniques and teaching methods, private tutoring, teachers' personality and behavior, teachers' competency and classroom management, and instructors' attitude and commitment were recognized in descending order.

According to Juybar and Rahimi (2021), the teacher had a crucial influence in learner motivation. Al-Khasawneh (2017) studied the demotivating factors of learning English among Saudi learners and discovered six factors that affect English learning among those students (classroom characteristics, teacher's behavior, curriculum content, and educational materials, impacts of poor test results, classroom atmosphere, and a lack of confidence and curiosity). These findings are similar to the results of our study.

According to Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (2015), the teacher is the most influential external element in influencing students' failure. In other words, teachers' positive reinforcement and backing of students can decrease students' negative impressions of failing and push them to consider such experiences as a path to success rather than an impediment. As a consequence, this data strongly validates the findings of this study.

Dang et al., (2021) studied on factors influencing the motivation of students towards learning English and found parental, environmental, teacher's, and intrinsic (personal) factors. Chong et al., (2019) studied on demotivation in L2 classrooms and indicated that both teacher-related factors, such as inadequate teaching methods and attitudes, as well as learner-related factors, mostly resulting from internal problems like low self-esteem or low self-worth, had an impact on learner demotivation.

Effective and permanent teaching practices are a challenging and complex process and largely depend on the capacity of teachers (Fullan, 2007). This study is important in

terms of taking some remedial measures based on the results obtained and taking into account the needs and expectations of the students as a result of the research while determining the teaching methods of the teachers. Although this research was conducted with a limited study group, it ensures an chance to see class applications from the learners' point of view.

Limitations and Suggestions

Although the current study is the first attempt to offer evidence in terms of the demotivational factors stemmed from the teacher in L2 Turkish learning, we acknowledge some limitations and provide suggestions for future study. First of all, this study could not be supported by quantitative data, which would increase the objectivity of the research. Thus, a longitudinal research design or the mixed method is highly recommended to bridge the shortcoming of this study. Secondly, the present study's participants were from Turkey, L2 Turkish learners, and only 12 students, weakening the generalization of the findings. It is unknown whether the demotivational factors in this study could be supported by more participants of different languages and cultures as the results might vary across participants and contexts.

Ethical Committee Permission Information

Name of the board that carries out ethical assessment: Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University Social and Humanities Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board

The date and number of the ethical assessment decision: 07.05.2024 and 08/46

Author Contribution Statement

Müjgan BEKDAŞ: *Conceptualization, literature review, methodology, collection of data, data analysis, translation, and writing*

Sami BASKIN: *Conceptualization, literature review, methodology, data analysis, reviewing and editing.*

References

- Abubakarı, A. (2016). *Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerle İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin motivasyon durumlarının karşılaştırılması*, [Comparison of the motivation status of foreign students learning Turkish and Turkish students learning English]. Master Thesis, Ankara University, Educational Sciences Institute, Ankara. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
- Akbaba, S. (2006). Eğitimde motivasyon. [Motivation in education], *Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 343-361.

- Al-Khasawneh, F. M. (2017). Demotivating factors affecting EFL learning of Saudi undergraduate students. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics (IJLEAL)*, 6, 25-34.
- Arabai, F. (2022). Modeling the relationship between classroom emotions, motivation, and learner willingness to communicate in EFL: Applying a holistic approach of positive psychology in SLA research. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2053138>
- Arai, K. (2004). What ‘demotivates’ language learners?: Qualitative study on demotivational factors and learners’ reactions. *Bulletin of Toyo Gakuen University*, 12(3), 39-47.
- Aydın, S. (2012). Factors causing demotivation in EFL teaching process: A case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(51), 1–13.
- Barın, E. (2008). The importance of motivation in teaching Turkish to foreigners. *Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7, 135-143.
- Bayraktar, H. (2015). Sınıf yönetiminde öğrenci motivasyonu ve motivasyonu etkileyen etmenler. [Student motivation and factors affecting motivation in classroom management], *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 10(3), 1079-1100.
- Biçer, N. (2016). Views of students about their motivation in teaching Turkish as a foreign language and classroom observations. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4(1), 84-99.
- Chong, M., Renandya, W. & Ng, Q. (2019). Demotivation in L2 classrooms: Teacher and learner factors. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 12(2), 64-75.
- Dang, T., Lei, V. & Ha, T. (2021). Factors affecting motivation of English-majored students towards learning English at a university in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 95-115.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/330107>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.)*. Routledge.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Ghanizadeh, A. & Jahedizadeh, S. (2015). Demotivators, burnout and language achievement in an Iranian EFL context. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 7(3), 61-85.
- Glesne, C. (2010). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* Pearson Publication.
- Hasegawa, A. (2004). Student demotivation in the foreign language classroom. *Takushoku Language Studies*, 107, 119-136.
- Ikeno, O. (2002). Motivating and demotivating factors in foreign language learning: A preliminary investigation. *Ehime University Journal of English Education Research*
- İsaoğlu, Y. & Emir, S. (2020). Demotivational factors towards learning English for the students of social sciences high school. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 18(3), 1438-1447.
- Falout, J. & Maruyama, (2004). A comparative study of proficiency and learner demotivation *The Language Teacher*, 28(8) <https://jalt-publications.org/ilt/articles/447-comparative-study-proficiency-and-learner-demotivation>
- Juybar, M. & Rahimi, M. (2021). A qualitative study of demotivating factors among students who quit their English classroom. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 8(2), 40-49. <http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/1178>

- Kikuchi, K., & Sakai, H. (2009). Japanese learners' demotivation to study English: A survey study. *JALT Journal*, 31(2), 183-204.
- Kim, K. (2009). A comparative analysis of demotivation in secondary English classes. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 15(4), 75-94.
- Kruk, M. (2022). Dynamicity of perceived willingness to communicate, motivation, boredom and anxiety in second life: The case of two advanced learners of English. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35, 190-216.
- Küpers, W. (2001). *A Phenomenology of embodied passion and the demotivational realities of organisations*. Citation source: <https://docplayer.net/90909399-A-phenomenology-of-embodied-passion-and-the-demotivational-realities-of-organisations.html> Date of access: 18.12.2022.
- Lan, G., Zhao, X. & Gong, M. (2023). Motivational intensity and willingness to communicate in L2 learning: A moderated mediation model of enjoyment, boredom, and shyness. *System* 117, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103116>
- Lu, G., Xie, K. & Liu, Q. (2023). An experience-sampling study of between- and within-individual predictors of emotional engagement in blended learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 107, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102348>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Vincze, L. (2017). Positive and negative emotions underlie motivation for L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 61-88.
- Mohammed, A. (2019). *Post graduate foreign students' motivation towards learning Turkish as a foreign language*. Master Thesis. Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Quadir, M. (2021). Teaching factors that affect students' learning motivation: Bangladeshi EFL students' perceptions. *TEFLIN Journal*, 32(2), 295-315.
- Rowley, J. (2002). Using case studies in research. *Management Research News*, 25(1), 16-27.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, C. J., & Cash, W. B. (2011). *Interviewing: principles and practices*. McGraw-Hill.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]. Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Yılmaz, F. & Arslan, S. B. (2014). Turkish learners' motivation resources and problems of foreign students at COMU TOMER. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(6), 1181-1196.
- Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research: design and methods*. (3. Basım). Sage Publications
- Zhang, Q. (2007). Teacher misbehaviors as learning de-motivators in college classrooms: A cross-cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Education*, 56, 209-227. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ763998>

Copyright © JCER

JCER's Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement are based, in large part, on the guidelines and standards developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). This article is available under Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)