PERSONALITY TRAITS AS PREDICTORS OF DEMOTIVATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING: A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

[a]Zahid Hussain Pathan, [b] Irum Fatima, [c] Hina Durrani, [d]Muhammad Imran Bhatti

[a]Assistant Professor, Department of linguistics and Philology, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan
Email: pathanzahid82@gmail.com
[b]Assistant Professor, Department of English, Sardar Bahadur Khan Women's University, Quetta, Pakistan
E-Mail: fatimairum01@gmail.com
[c]Assistant Professor, Department of English, Sardar Bahadur Khan Women's University, Quetta, Pakistan
E-Mail: hinadurrani111@yahoo.com
[d]Assistant Professor, Department of linguistics and Philology, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan
Email: simplytell@gmail.com

Abstract

Despite studying the English language in colleges, Pakistani students' English language proficiency level is still lagging behind. Prior research indicates that demotivation is a major cause of language learning failure in many EFL classrooms. To this end, the present research primarily aims at examining the L2 demotivation concept in relation to the big-five personality dimensions (i.e., conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness to experience, extraversion, and neuroticism). The present study adopted a a quantitative m research design to answer the proposed research questions. This study adopted questionnaires on L2 demotivation and big-five personality traits. To analyse the data, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple linear regressions tests were performed in the SPSS (Version, 24). The findings revealed the existence of L2 demotivation among EFL students that was the result of both external and internal factors: characteristics of classes, class environment, class materials, lack of interest in the English language, and experiences of failures. Additionally, the results also highlighted that of the five personality dimensions, the conscientiousness personality trait had a significant and negative impact on all six causes of demotivation (i.e., teacher behaviors, characteristics of classes, class environment, class materials, lack of interest, and experiences of failure) among college students, whereas openness to experience personality trait showed its significant and negative impact on the factors that caused demotivation among college students, except for experience of failure as a cause of demotivation. The overall results garnered in the present study suggest that Pakistani EFL teachers, higher authorities in education, and language-in-education policymakers need to take necessary actions to address the causes that debilitate EFL learners' motivation.

Keywords: Language learning demotivation, Big-five personality traits, Language learning motivation

Introduction

English language has emerged as a global language due to its ever-increasing use in transnational and cross-cultural communications, such as internet, tourism, foreign trade, and media (Feng,

2012; Graddol, 2010). Now is the era when many Asian countries have recognized the unprecedented importance of English language and have included it in their education curriculum (Choi & Lee, 2008) because it can contribute to students' personal, linguistic, social, and cultural development. Pakistan is not an exception to such a trend.

In Pakistan, English language is an official language (Mansoor, 2004) and "it is considered the vehicle for achieving modernization, scientific and technological development, and economic advancement for oneself and the country in Pakistan"(Shamim, 2008, p.236). Additionally, English language is taught as a compulsory subject from secondary education to university education level. Besides, English is used as a medium of instruction for teaching science and mathematics subjects from college education and onwards. English education in Pakistan serves as a passport to avail good job opportunities, social prestige, and social and economic mobility. Due to the promotion of English language in the education sector, the prior studies have largely investigated the Pakistani learners' motivation in learning the English language (Pathan, 2012). However, the darker aspect of motivation i.e., 'demotivation', which is a common phenomenon in English language classrooms (Dörnyei, 2001), is yet to be researched in Pakistani context.

In the past, researchers have also conceptualized L2 demotivation with gender, anxiety, and proficiency level of English language learners (see, Hu, 2011; Kaivanpanah & Ghasemi, 2011; Rastegar, Akbarzadeh, & Heidari, 2012), but still there is a little known about the relationship between personality and L2 demotivation. Big-Five personality traits are also correlated with students' cognitive development, L2 motivation and academic success (Clark & Scroth, 2010; Erfani & Mardan, 2017; Oz, 2016; Pourfeiz, 2015). Personality is defined as "the most individual characteristic of a human being (Dörnyei, 2014, p.11). Additionally, 'personality' is an individual differences factor that affects second language acquisition (SLA) (Ellis, 2008). Personality is measured with Big-Five personality traits: conscientiousness, openness to experience, agreeableness, extroversion-introversion, and, neuroticism (Costa & McCrae, 1985). Of these five personality factors, Dinius (2013) studied 'conscientiousness' in relation to the Malaysian students' demotivation to learn English language. This study found that 'conscientiousness' impacts learners' demotivation and the Conscious learners are capable of keeping themselves motivated even in demotivating environment. As Dinius's (2013) investigation was limited to one personality trait i.e., 'Conscientiousness'; therefore, it is difficult to draw solid conclusions about the overall relationship between Big-Five personality traits and L2 demotivation. Kikuchi (2015) asserts, demotivation is "a process that an individual learner goes through" (p.17). This view implies that demotivation varies from one learner to another. Thus, future studies ought to be carried out combining all the five personality factors in relation to L2 demotivation (Dinius, 2013). To close the existing gap, the present study has a two-fold objective. First, to investigate the factors that cause demotivation among college students. Second, to investigate the Big-Five personality traits of the students that impact their English language learning demotivation.

The present research is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the factors that demotivate college students of Quetta in learning English?
2. Is there any impact of Big-Five personality traits on the factors that cause demotivation among college students of Quetta in learning English?

Literature Review

English Language Learning Demotivation

Motivation is a pivotal individual characteristic that affects L2 learning (Kyriacou & Zhu, 2008) and one of the potential predictors of students' academic success (Dörnyei, 2001). Due to this reason, a plethora of investigations have been carried out in the past in relation to students' L2

motivational orientation in different social contexts to promote L2 language teaching and learning (Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Suryasa, Prayoga, & Werdistira, 2017).

On the contrary, there are some aspects that negatively impact language learners' motivation. Dörnyei (2001) attributes these darker aspects of motivation to 'demotivation' which is the result of some "specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action (p. 143). This view refers to the 'darker side of motivation' that de-energies the motivational basis of L2 learners. Flout & Falout (2005) assert, "If motivation pushes learning for life, demotivation cuts learning short" (p. 280). Additionally, demotivation phenomenon is quite frequent in language classrooms (Dörnyei, 2001), and it is likely to impede L2 learning and needs to be addressed (Kikuchi, 2015). The urgency to address this issue is also crucial because "demotivation can negatively influence the learner's attitudes and behaviors, degrade classroom group dynamics and teacher's motivation, and result in long-term and widespread negative learning outcomes" (Falout, Elwood, & Hood, 2009, p.403).

Prior researche (Hamada, 2008; Tsuchiya, 2006) concluded that teacher behaviors and ineffective teaching materials (External factors) and lack of self-confidence and negative attitude toward the target language (internal factors) demotivate English language learners. Drawing upon these findings, Kikuchi (2011) conceptualized the definition of demotivation as "specific external and internal forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis o f a behavior, intention or an on-going action" (p.11). Kikuchi's (2011) definition of 'L2 demotivation' has got empirical supported by the researches in different social contexts i.e., In Malaysia (Dinius, 2013), China (Li & Zhou, 2017), Iran (Ghonsooly et al., 2017), Saudi Arabia (Daif-Allah & Alsamani 2014), Vietnam (Tuan, 2011), Korea (Kim, 2011; Song & Kim, 2017), and Turkey (Akay, 2017).

Teacher-related factors are not always strongly implicated as demotivating factors in English language learning. For example, Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) studied Japanese upper secondary school students' demotivation in learning the English language. This study also aimed to investigate the difference in demotivation between less motivated and highly motivated students. To collect the data, a questionnaire comprising 35 items was administered to 656 students who were randomly chosen from four upper secondary schools in Japan. The findings of this study revealed that course contents and teaching materials were a potential threat to students' motivation, followed by low test scores as the second leading cause of their demotivation. In this study, the teacher emerged as the least source of students' demotivation in learning English, and this finding supports the findings of the study by Hamada (2008) carried out in Japan. In the Pakistani context, Pathan et al. (2021) also found that a lack of learning facilities, ineffective teaching methods, and boring teaching and learning materials caused demotivation in learning the English language among Pakistani students.

Personality and English language learning

Personality is defined as "the most individual characteristic of a human being (Dörnyei, 2014, p.11) which "account for consistent patterns of feeling, thinking and behaving" (Pervin & John, 2001, p. 4). Personality is generally composed of series of traits (Ellis, 2008). These traits are well defined in 'The Big Five Model (BFM)' which is a popular model to assess personality traits. This model posits that there are Big-Five traits to human personality: (a) extroversion-introversion, (b) agreeableness, (c) conscientiousness, (d) Neuroticism-Emotional stability, and (e) intellect-imagination (Openness to experience). The five personality factors have also been validated in previous classic studies using different data sources and methodologies. For example, Goldberg (1981) asked participants to rate their personality based on the inventory 1,710 trait adjectives.

The findings of the factor analysis were consistent with five factors of human personality: (a) intellect-imagination, (b) conscientiousness, (c) agreeableness, (d) emotional stability-neuroticism, and (e) extraversion-introversion.

The students with high conscientiousness are motivated, dutiful, and achievement-oriented (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003). The previous researchers have also confirmed that conscientiousness is related to students' academic performance at different educational levels (Geramian, Mashayekhi, & Ninggal, 2012; Hakimi, Hejazi, & Lavasani, 2011; Komarraju, Karau, & Schmeck, 2009). Moreover, people who are low on neuroticism are resilient against stressful conditions and exhibit resolute behavior. Those who are high on neuroticism are mostly anxious and tense (Howard & Howard, 2001). It also negatively affects students' academic performance because students with high neuroticism have low self-estimated intelligence, and a poor self-concept. Agreeableness refers to the degree to which an individual is softhearted, lenient, and agreeable in seeking harmonious relationship with others. Therefore, an individual who is low in agreeableness is reckoned as unfriendly, cold, questioning, and proud. On the contrary, an individual with high agreeableness tend to be friendly, likeable, and modest (Dörnyei, 2014). Additionally, extroversion-introversion denotes that an individual high on extroversion is active and sociable,and an individual low on extroversion is passive, sober, and aloof (Dörnyei, 2014). According to Hurd (2002, as cited in Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012, p.39):

"Extrovert students tend to participate more in classroom interactions, worry less about accuracy and have a tendency to take risks with their language, all of which are assets when it comes to communicative oral competence. In the other respect, extroversion may well have a role to play in the development of oral skills, but introversion may be of even more significance for the independent language learner, given its positive correlation with mega-cognitive skills and their link with autonomy".

Openness to Experience refers to how much an individual is imaginative, creative and enjoys ideas and activities. An individual high on this dimension tends to be curious and flexible (Howard & Howard, 2001) whereas an individual who is low on this dimension tends to be unartistic and conservative (Dörnyei, 2014). Prior research studies have generated different findings on this construct in relation to academic performance of students. For instance, Lounsbury et al. (2003) found that openness to experience was related with GPA of high school students and junior high students whereas no such relationship was found in the study by Chamorro-Premuzic and Fumham (2003).

Personality has been labelled as a major factor contributing to students' success in learning second/foreign language (Ellis, 1994). Of the Big-Five personality factors, extroversion introversion personality trait has been widely researched in ESL/EFL content. The reason of the popularity of this personality dimension among ESL/EFL researchers is because it seems to be related with language learning (Dörnyei, 214) and it can also be reliably measured using Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Moreover, SLA theorists also argue that extroverts are better than introverts because they are social, gregarious and engage themselves conversations both inside and outside classrooms (Wakamoto, 2009). However, there has been inconsistency in the results of the impact of extroversion and introversion personality traits on ESL/EFL learning.

For example, in a study examining the differences between extroverts and introverts in the use of language learning strategies, Wakamoto (2000) found that extroversion was connected to language learning strategies. A survey on language learning strategies was administered to 254 Japanese college EFL students and the results were matched with students' personality traits. The findings showed that extrovert students used more social-affective strategies and functional strategies than

introvert students in learning a language. In a similar study, it was also found that extroverts put more emphasis on meaning than form of the language. This study also concluded that extroverts were more active than their counterparts in seeking information for clarifications, thus had enough chances of input lucrative for learning language. On the contrary, in a study investigating the differences in the proficiency level of ESL/EFL students according to their personality dimensions, Zabihi (2011) administered the NEO-FFI scale and an English language test among 168 Iranian learners at a private English language center. The findings revealed that extroversion was negatively correlated with learners' English language proficiency.

Method

The present research employed quantitative research that exclusively deals with numerical data which is analysed through descriptive and other rigorous statistical techniques (Kothari, 2004). Quantitative research uses numerical data to describe and explain the phenomena of interest or to examine the impact of variable(s) on another variable(s) (Creswell, 2014). Similarly, the present research unravels the impact of personality on the English language learning demotivation experienced by the college students of Quetta.

Research Instruments

Demotivation Questionnaire

A questionnaire comprises items on variables in the interest of the research, and it is administered among respondents who are expected to respond to them either by writing their answers or by selecting the options on the Likert-scale (Creswell, 2014; Cohen et al., 2013). In this study, the 'Demotivation Questionnaire' was adapted from the study by Kikuchi (2011). The decision to use this questionnaire was made after seeking permission from Kikuchi through a series of emails.

The demotivation questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part asked for student demographics, such as, student I.D number, age, gender, and year of study. The second part of the questionnaire was composed of 40 items on the six broad demotivating categories. The students were asked to show their level of agreement against each item on 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = not true, 4 = true). Example items of this scale included "I was often forced to memorize sentences in English" and "Teacher laughed at students' mistakes". The overall reliability calculated for the demotivation questionnaire was α = 0.81.

Big-Five Inventory

Big-Five Inventory (BFI) (John et al., 1991) was used to measure the personality dimensions of college students. The BFI is freely available for non-commercial research purposes. The BFI and its scoring instructions can be downloaded from the Berkeley Personality Lab (2007) website after providing demographic and research information. The BFI is a 44-item self-administered inventory written in simple and plain English. The BFI measures five personality factors rated on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). An example item of this scale included "I see myself as someone who is relaxed, handles stress well" (John et al., 2008, p. 157). In the BFI, all the items are based on traits' adjectives prototypical markers of the big five personality factors. To reduce acquiescence bias, the statements in BFI are both positively and negatively worded. Therefore, prior to calculating the mean score of subscales in the inventory, all the negatively-keyed items were reverse-coded (John & Srivastava, 1999). The Cronbach's alpha according to five personality factors is reported as, 0.79 for agreeableness, 0.82 for conscientiousness, 0.86 for extraversion, 0.87 neuroticism, and 0.83 for openness.

Participants

"A sample is a group of individuals, items, or events that represents the characteristics of the large group from which the sample is drawn" (Gay & Mills, 2009, p.124). In the current study, senior

high school students, senior college students and senior undergraduates were included because they could give sufficient information on the causes of their demotivation that they might have experienced during their course of learning the English language at their current institutes.

Discussing the sample size-related issues, Creswell (2012) stated, "one way to determine the sample size is to select enough participants for the statistical procedures you plan to use" (p.147). As this study intended to use sophisticated inferential tools, such as multiple regression, therefore the required minimum sample size to test the hypotheses of the study was calculated in G*Power (3.0.10 software). To estimate the required sample size of the study to run multiple regressions according to the number of variables of the proposed study, a power analysis for multiple regression was also performed using G*Power (3.0.10 software) with the following input parameters: significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, power $= 0.9$, number of response variables $= 5$. The G*Power computation indicated that the current study needed a minimum of 138 samples assuming an effect size of 0.15.

After computing the minimum sample size required, the present study recruited a large sample size of 234, comprising 120 male and 114 female students from colleges located in Quetta city, Balochistan, Pakistan. The Studies that involve the larger sample than a minimum required sample tend to make less 'sampling error' (Creswell, 2012). The present study included only those students who were studying in government colleges s. The reason to choose public educational institutes was that because they admit students from diverse socio-economic and demographic backgrounds. Students of public institutes, therefore, served as a representative of the population.

Procedure

Prior to the data collection, all the concerned heads of the colleges were contacted to seek approval to administer a questionnaire. Additionally, the students were given consent forms that succinctly described the nature of the study. The consent form also stated that students participated in the study voluntarily and they could withdraw from the study at any time without giving any justifications. All of the participants were also assured that their response would remain confidential and would only be accessed by the one who was doing this research. Thus, after getting the informed consent of the participants, a paper and pen survey was administered during regular class hours. The researcher was present during the administration of the survey in the case of responding to participants' queries.

Data Analysis

Data analysis refers to the description of procedures and statistical tools used to analyse quantitative or qualitative data (Creswell, 2014). Prior to the data entry and data analysis, all survey responses were reviewed and organized. The survey was coded and scoring codes were also noted in a book (Creswell, 2012). Following this, the survey data were entered into the SPSS database (Version 24). Prior to analysing the data, the data cleaning procedure was performed and incomplete responses were discarded from the final data analysis. To answer the proposed research questions of the study, descriptive statistics, Simple linear regressions and multiple linear regressions tests were performed.

Results

According to Table 1 below, characteristics of classes (M = 3.07, SD = .75), experiences of failure (M = 3.06, SD = .69), class materials (M = 3.00, SD = .62), class environment (M = 2.98, SD = .76), and lack of interest (M = 2.85, SD = .75) were the leading causes of demotivation in learning English for college students. However, teachers behaviours (M = 2.83, SD = .66) was the least source of demotivation for them.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Demotivating Factors

Demotivating Factors	Mean	SD
Teacher behaviours	2.83	.66
Characteristics of classes	3.07	.75
Class environment	2.98	.76
Class materials	3.00	.62
Lack of interest	2.58	.75
Experiences of failure	3.06	.69

The findings garnered in Table 1 delineate the existence of L2 demotivation among students of public colleges situated in the Quetta city of Balochistan province in Pakistan. These findings also provide empirical evidence to Dörnyei's (2001) argument that L2 demotivation is an inherent phenomenon in ESL/EFL classrooms.

To investigate whether there was any impact of Big-Five personality traits on the factors that cause demotivation among college students of Quetta in learning English, Multiple regressions were performed in the SPSS. Prior to performing the test, multicollinearity was checked through two methods. First, tolerance level and VIF values of independent variables were checked against each dependent variable separately. Both tolerance level and VIF values were tenable. In addition to checking multicollinearity through tolerance level and VIF values, correlation between independent and dependent variables were examined. Table 2 reveals that the correlation between independent variables did not exceed (r.7) and they also showed relationship with dependent variables (Pallant, 2013).

Table 2

Correlation between Independent and Dependent Variables

No	Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	OTEX	-										
2	CONS	.43*	-									
3	EXTR	.47*	. .41*	-								
4	AGRB	.46*	.53*	.53*	-							
5	NEURO	.43*	.45*	.49*	.55*	-						
6	TB	-.47*	-.42*	-.42*	-.45*	-.42*	-					
7	CC	-.46*	-.39*	-.36*	-.43*	-.33*	.44*	-				
8	CE	-.51*	-.47*	-.37*	-.41*	-.39*	.45*	.59*	-			
9	CM	-.35	-.45	-.31	-.33	-.31	.49	.38	.43	-		
10	LI	-.49*	-.45*	-.39*	-.48*	-.42*	.52*	.65*	.62*	-.49*	-	
11	EF	-.38*	-.36*	-.33*	-.41*	-.35*	.54*	.39*	.35*	.53*	.44*	-

Note: OTEX = openness to experience; AGRB = agreeableness; CONS = conscientiousness; EXTR = extraversion; NEURO = neuroticism; TB = teacher behaviors; CC = characteristics of classes; CE = class environment; CM = classroom materials, LI = lack of interest; EF = experiences of failure. *.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Table 3 below shows that big-five personality model was significant and accounted for 32.3% of the variance in teacher behaviours related demotivation for college EFL students ($R^2 = .338$, $R^2adj = .323$, $F(5, 228) = 23.26$, $p < .001$). Of the five personality dimensions, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.24$, $t = -3.66$, $p < .001$), openness ($\beta = -.15$, $t = -2.21$, $p < .05$) significantly negatively predicted the criterion variable in the model. Contrarily, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism did not contribute significantly in the model ($P > .05$).

Additionally, the big-five personality model also significantly accounted for 27.8% of the variance in college EFL students' demotivation caused by characteristics of classes ($R^2 = .293$, $R^2adj = .278$, $F(5, 228) = 18.91$, $p < .001$). Concerning the individual contribution of the five personality traits in the model, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.28$, $t = -4.11$, $p < .001$), openness to experience ($\beta = -.14$, $t = 1.98$, $p < .05$) and agreeableness ($\beta = -.19$, $t = -2.55$, $p < .05$) were significant negative predictors in the model. On the contrast, extraversion, and neuroticism were insignificant negative predictors for the dependent variable ($P > .05$).

The big-five personality model also explained 33.9% of the variance in class environment as a source of demotivation for college EFL students ($R^2 = .353$, $R^2adj = .339$, $F(5, 228) = 24.85$, $p < .001$). Given the predictive power of the big-five personality dimensions in the model, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.31$, $t = -4.84$, $p < .001$), and openness to experience ($\beta = -.25$, $t = -3.80$, $p < .001$) significantly negatively predicted learners' demotivation associated to classroom environment. Contrarily, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism insignificantly negatively predicted the criterion variable ($p > .05$).

concerning the impact of big-five personality dimensions on class materials as a source of college EFL learners demotivation, the model was significant and accounted for 22.1% of the variance in the dependent variable ($R^2 = .238$, $R^2adj = .221$, $F(5, 228) = 14.24$, $p < .001$). Of the five personality factors, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.14$, $t = -1.98$, $p < .05$), openness to experience ($\beta = -.32$, $t = -4.40$, $p < .001$) significantly negatively predicted the criterion variable. Contrarily, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism personality traits did not significantly predict the dependent variable.

It can also be observed in Table 3 above, the big-five model significantly predicted and explained 34.4 % of the variance in college EFL learners' demotivation caused by lack of interest ($R^2 = .358$, $R^2adj = .344$, $F(5, 228) = 25.43$, $p < .001$). Concerning the contribution of big-five personality traits in the model, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.27$, $t = -4.17$, $p < .001$) and openness to experience ($\beta = -.18$, $t = -2.77$, $p < .05$) significantly negatively predicted the criterion variable. Contrarily, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism did not significantly predict the criterion variable in the model ($p > .05$).

Additionally, the predictive big-five model was also significant and explained 22% of the variance in experiences of failure as a source of demotivation for college EFL students ($R^2 = .236$, $R^2adj = .220$, $F(5, 228) = 14.11$, $p < .001$). Of the big-five personality dimensions, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.17$, $t = -2.47$, $p < .05$) and agreeableness ($\beta = -.19$, $t = -2.40$, $p < .05$) significantly negatively predicted the criterion variable. Contrarily, openness to experience, extraversion, and neuroticism insignificantly negatively predicted the criterion variable in the model ($P > .05$).

Table 3. Impact of Big-five Personality Traits on College EFL Learners' Demotivating Factors

	TB		CC		CE		CM		LI		EF	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
AGRB	-.14	-1.89	-.19	-2.55*	-.06	-.79	-.04	-.53	-.18	-2.48	-.19	-2.40*
CONS	-.24	-3.66**	-.28	-4.11**	-.31	-4.84**	-.14	-1.98*	-.27	-4.17**	-.17	-2.47*
EXTR	-.12	-1.73	-.069	-.965	-.04	-.59	-.06	-.80	-.05	-.69	-.06	-.77
OTEX	-.15	-2.21*	-.14	-1.98*	-.25	-3.80**	-.32	-4.40**	-.18	-2.77*	-.13	-1.78
NEURO	-.11	-1.63	-.01	-.08	-.09	-1.33	-.05	-.73	-.09	-1.36	-.08	-1.06
F (5, 228)	23.26		18.91		24.85		14.24		25.43		14.11	
R^2	.338		.293		.353		.238		.358		.236	
R^2_{adj}	.323		.278		.339		.221		.344		.220	

Note: AGRB = agreeableness; CONS = conscientiousness; EXTR = extraversion; OTEX = openness to experience; NEURO = neuroticism; TB = teacher behaviours; CC = characteristics of classes; CE = class environment; CM = classroom materials, LI = lack of interest; EF = experiences of failure. *p<0.05, **p<0.001

The results garnered in Table3 delineate that conscientiousness impacted all the six demotivating factors experienced by college EFL students. Furthermore, openness to experience personality trait also negatively affected college EFL students' demotivating factors except for experiences of failure. These results imply conscientious and open learners overcame their L2 demotivation. Contrarily, neuroticism did not exert any significant impact on any of the demotivating factors.

Discussion

The findings of the present study not only confirm that Pakistani EFL learners are susceptible to the demotivation but also support Dörnyei's (2001) claim that "demotivation' is not at all infrequent in language classes and the number of demotivated L2 learners is relatively high" (p.141). The results delineated that the factors, such as characteristics of classes, class environment, experience of failure and class materials were a threat to college students' motivation in learning the English language. These demotivating factors were the result of external sources and provide empirical justification to the definition of L2 demotivation propounded by Dörnyei (2001) "specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action" (p. 143). This evidence is also commensurate with the findings of the previous research (Dinius, 2013; Kaivanpanah & Ghasemi, 2011; Kikuchi, 2011).

L2 demotivation related to the characteristics of classes encompassed exam-oriented teaching, overemphasis on English grammar, decontextualized vocabulary learning, and lack of communicative learning activities (Kikuchi, 2011). These results imply that existing teaching and learning scenarios in English classrooms in Pakistan fail to provide impetus to ELLs and similar results are also reflected in previous research (Dinius, 2013) conducted in different social contexts. In Lao PDR, Xaypanya et al. (2017) found teachers' less emphasis on communicative activities as the determinant of EFL learners' demotivation. In Iranian context, Sharififar and Akbarzadeh's (2011) study also concluded that the characteristics of classes discouraged students in learning the English language and a similar factor was also attributed to L2 demotivation by the pre-university students in the Malaysian context (Dinius, 2013).

Learners also attributed their language learning demotivation to overcrowded language classrooms. This cause of L2 demotivation does not necessarily implicate language teachers. In fact, in such a situation, it gets difficult for language teachers to provide students with corrective feedback on their assignments. Therefore, instead of focusing on individual learners' fluency and accuracy in the target language, in large classrooms, teachers dictate language learners the hard and fast grammatical rules of the target language, decontextualized vocabulary, and assign writing assignments. In fact, the overcrowded classroom has also been found to demotivate language teachers (Yaghoubinejad, Zarrinabadi, & Nejadansari, 2017). Therefore, this study calls for the attention of the higher authorities in education to tailor language classroom size so that language teachers may be able to focus on students' individual learning needs.

Additionally, to address the burgeoning issue of L2 demotivation in Pakistan, English language programs also need to be evaluated that can provide "a variety of evidence-based decisions and actions, from designing programs and implementing practices for judging the effectiveness and improving outcomes." (Norris, 2016, p.169). Such an evaluation tasks can also be beneficial to determine language learners' views on the sufficiency of the teaching materials, and the teaching methods.

Given the impact of personality on demotivation, conscientiousness exerted a significant and negative impact on all the six causes of demotivation experienced `by college. These results imply that high conscientiousness leads to a low L2 demotivation. This finding is partially consistent with past research done in the Malaysian context (Dinius, 2013) in which conscientiousness influenced first-year pre-university students' L2 demotivation caused by class materials, lack of interest, and experiences of failure.

The overall results regarding the interaction of conscientiousness and L2 demotivating factors suggest that the conscientious language learners, who are self-disciplined, industrious, meticulous, and confident of their abilities, do not feel low due to experiencing the instances that reduce their L2 motivation. L2 demotivation seems to be less threatening to the conscientious language learners because they maintain the academic discipline to attain academic success (Kaufman, Agars, & Lopez-Wagner, 2008). Besides, conscientious individuals are persistent and exhibit a profound need for achievement. Conscientious individuals also possess thinking and reasoning skills that make them be adaptive, motivated and goal-oriented and these characteristics possibly help them overcome their L2 demotivation.

In addition to the impact of conscientiousness on L2 demotivation, openness also negatively predicted students' reasons for L2 demotivation except for the experience of failuret. These findings advocate the view that being open served college EFL students to confront L2 demotivation in an effective way. These findings also provide empirical justification that openness is essential to cope with possible L2 demotivation because open individuals possess creative

thinking (Wolfradt & Pretz, 2001) and are curious to explore new ideas. Open language learners also exhibit profound L2 WTC (Khany & Nejad, 2017; Piechurska-Kuciel, 2018). Besides, open L2 learners are also able to use and understand the target language in a social context. In other words, L2 learners' openness to experience personality trait is positively correlated with their pragmatic competence (Verhoeven & Vermeer, 2002). The characteristics of being creative, curious, pragmatically competent, and willing in L2 learning seem to make L2 learners capable of coping with English language learning demotivation.

Future Directions

It is also recommended to carry out ex post facto research (non-experimental quantitative causal-comparative research) to investigate how demotivation interacts with language learners' level of personality. This might produce some meaningful results about how demotivation is perceived by EFL learners with high, medium, and low personality traits. Additionally, to understand the complex interrelationship between L2 demotivation and personality, future studies may also use full-fledged structural equation modeling. This can provide insight into the direct and indirect relationships among the variables.

Implications and Conclusion

Drawing on the results garnered from quantitative findings, the present study identifies some pedagogical implications for Pakistani English language teachers' considerations to help their students' alleviate their English language learning demotivation. The results concerning EFL learners' causes of demotivation inform Pakistani EFL teachers of the existence of L2 demotivation in EFL classrooms and it can have pernicious effects on students' language learning performance. As the results of the present study abound with evidence that uncommunicative teaching practices seem to inhibit students' interest in the English language learning, therefore English language teachers are recommended to shift toward more student-centered teaching methods.

Regarding communicative teaching methods, there is a wrong notion that it ignores language learners' accuracy in the target language. It should be clarified here that communicative method does not exclude grammar at all, whereas it is taught implicitly within a context that is better than cramming grammatical rules out of context. In a similar vein, Brown (2007) notes that grammar can be understood in a better way "within various functional categories" (p. 242). Therefore, in the backdrop of the communicative teaching methods, students would participate in meaningful and real-world communicative activities and would also be in a better position to attain both fluency and accuracy in the target language. Additionally, in such a milieu, language learners would not feel demotivated for being criticized by their concerned teachers for their grammatical errors which are considered tolerable and natural. In addition Pakistani English language teachers can implement task-based language teaching an alternative to teaching grammar to diminish students' demotivation stemming from uncommunicative language teaching. TBLT can also be effective in enhancing language learners' communicative confidence by introducing focused learning tasks covering the linguistic features of the target language (Ellis, 2018).

REFERENCES

Akay, C. (2017). Turkish high school students' English demotivation and their seeking for remotivation: A mixed method research. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(8), 107-122.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *37*(4), 319-338.

Choi, Y. H., & Lee, H. W. (2008). Current trends and issues in English language education in Asia. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *5*(2), 1-34.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.

Clark, M. H., & Schroth, C. A. (2010). Examining relationships between academic motivation and personality among college students. *Learning and Individual Differences, 20*(1), 19-24.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research*: *Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daif-Allah, A. S., & Alsamani, A. S. (2014). Motivators for demotivators affecting English language acquisition of Saudi preparatory year program students. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(1), 128-138.

Dinius, S. M. (2013). *Malaysian student demotivation in learning English: The impact of conscientiousness* (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University, Scottsdale, America). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3571837).

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(3), 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z (1998). Demotivation in foreign language learning. Paper presented in the *TESOL '98 Congress, Seattle, WA, March.*

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*(4), 519-538.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2014). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.

Dörneyi, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003).*Group dynamics in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In: C. J. Doughty and M.H. Long, (Eds), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 589–630). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Dornyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2010). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching motivation:* (3rd ed.). Harlow, UK: Longman.

Dörnyei. Z. (2007) *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis R (2018). *Reflections on task-based language teaching*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Erfani, S. S., & Mardan, H. (2017). The relationship between big-five personality traits, English language proficiency scores on IELTS, and academic success of Iranian foreign students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(11), 1046-1058.

Falout, J., & Falout, M. (2005). The other side of motivation: Learner demotivation. In *JALT2004 conference proceedings* (pp. 280-289). Tokyo.

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

Feng, A. (2012). Spread of English across greater China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*(4), 363-377.

Gay, L. R., & Mills, G. E. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications, Global Edition:* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Gay, L. R., & Mills, G. E. (2015). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications, Global Edition:* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Graddol, D. (2010). *English Next India: The future of English in India*. New Delhi: The British Council.

Geramian, S. M., Mashayekhi, S., & Ninggal, M. T. B. H. (2012). The relationship between personality traits of international students and academic achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 4374-4379.

Hakimi, S., Hejazi, E., & Lavasani, M. G. (2011). The relationships between personality traits and students' academic achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *29*, 836-845.

Hu, R. J. S. (2011). The Relationship between Demotivation and EFL Learners' English Language Proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(4), 88-96.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York, NY: Guildford Press.

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory – versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). *Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues*. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 114-158). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kaivanpanah, S., & Ghasemi, Z. (2011). An investigation into sources of demotivation in second language learning. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL), 14*(2), 89-110.

Kaufman, J. C., Agars, M. D., & Lopez-Wagner, M. C. (2008). The role of personality and motivation in predicting early college academic success in non-traditional students at a Hispanic-serving institution. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *18*(4), 492-496.

Khany, R., & Nejad, A. M. (2017). L2 willingness to communicate, openness to experience, extraversion, and L2 unwillingness to communicate: The Iranian EFL context. *RELC Journal*, *48*(2), 241-255.

Kikuchi, k (2009). Listening to our learners' voices: What demotivates Japanese high school students? *Language Teaching Research, 13*(4), *453–471.*

Kikuchi, K. (2011). *Learner perceptions of demotivators in japanese high school english classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University). Available at ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3477768).

Kikuchi, K. (2015). *Demotivation in second language acquisition: Insights from Japan*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kim, T. Y. (2011). Korean elementary school students' English learning demotivation: A comparative survey study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *12*(1), 1-11.

Komarraju, M., Karau, S. J., & Schmeck, R. R. (2009). Role of the big five personality traits in predicting college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *19*(1), 47-52.

Li, C., & Zhou, T. (2017). A Questionnaire-based study on Chinese university students' demotivation to learn English. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(3), 128-135.

Lounsbury, J., Sundstrom, E., Loveland, J., & Gibson, L. (2003). Broad versus narrow personality traits in predicting academic performance of adolescents. *Learning and Individual Differences, 14*, 65-75.

Norris, J. M. (2016). Language program evaluation. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*, 169–189.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pathan, H. (2012). *A longitudinal investigation of Pakistani university students' motivation for learning English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow). Retrieved on March 03, 2024 from http://theses.gla.ac.uk/4534/.

Pathan, Z. H., Ismail, S. A. M. M., & Fatima, I. (2021). English language learning demotivation among Pakistani university students: do resilience and personality matter? *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, *13*(4), 1024-1042.

Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (2001). *Personality: Theory and research* (8th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Piechurska-Kuciel, E. (2018). Openness to experience as a predictor of L2 WTC. *System*, *72*, 190-200.

Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Exploring the relationship between global personality traits and attitudes toward foreign language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *186*, 467-473.

Rastegar, M., Akbarzadeh, M., & Heidari, N. (2012). The darker side of motivation: demotivation and its relation with two variables of anxiety among Iranian EFL learners. *ISRN Education, 2012,* 1-8.

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

Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(3), 235–249.

Sharififar, M., & Akzarbadeh, M. (2011). An analysis of demotivators in English classes for Iranian university students. *Iranian EFL Journal, 7*(2), 28-40.

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

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

Tuan, L. T. (2011). EFL learners' motivation revisited. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(10), 1257-1272.

Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2002). Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *23*(3), 361-374.

Wakamoto, N. (2000). Language learning strategy and personality variables: Focusing on extroversion and introversion. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 38*(1), 71-81.

Wakamoto N. (2009). *Extroversion/introversion in foreign language learning: interactions with learner strategy use*. Bern, Germany: Peter Lang.

Wolfradt, U., Pretz, J.E. (2001), Individual differences in creativity: Personality, story writing, and hobbies. *European Journal of Personality, 15*(4), 297-310.

Xaypanya, V., Ismail, S. A. M. M., & Low, H. M. (2017). Demotivation Experienced by English as Foreign Language (EFL) Learners in the Lao PDR. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *26*(6), 361-368.

Yaghoubinejad, H., Zarrinabadi, N., & Nejadansari, D. (2017). Culture-specificity of teacher demotivation: Iranian junior high school teachers caught in the newly-introduced CLT trap!. *Teachers and Teaching*, *23*(2), 127-140.

Zabihi, R. (2011). Personality in English language proficiency and achievement. *Wilolud Journal*, *4*(1), 1-6.

Zafar, S., & Meenakshi, K. (2012). A study on the relationship between extroversion-introversion and risk-taking in the context of second language acquisition. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *1*(1), 33-40.