Use of English Language Motivational Strategies: A Comparison between Teachers' and Students' Perspectives in Pakistan

[1]Syed Alamdar Nabi
[2]Abdul Qadir Khan

Abstract

This study has investigated the utilisation of EFL motivational strategies in Pakistani classrooms. The 'teachers' and 'students' perspectives are compared to know the difference in their perceptions. This descriptive and quantitative study deals with the importance and practice of the EFL Motivational strategies. In the present research, twelve macro-strategies are employed to know the utilisation of EFL motivational strategies. These EFL motivational strategies are encapsulated in a construct by Cheng and Dörnyei (2007). Both teachers and students were respondents to this survey research. Two thousand and eighty-nine respondents from different institutes took part in it. They belonged to different levels of educational institutes from Punjab, Pakistan. The collected data were statistically analysed. Results reveal dissimilarities between the perspectives of teachers and students. At both micro and macro level, diversified choices of EFL motivational strategies are found in two perspectives in the Pakistani context. At mean score, 40 micro-strategies are underutilised in both perspectives of teachers and students, while the z score shows 33 micro-strategies in teachers and 51 micro-strategies in students' perspectives as underutilised. In both teachers and students, the mean score reveals 11 macro-strategies underutilised while the z score shows 7 macro-strategies underutilised. The choices of the rank order of macro-strategies are also different in both the perspectives of teachers and students. The present study affirms that EFL motivational strategies are context specific.

Keywords: EFL motivation, Motivational Strategies, Target Language Learning, Teachers' Vs. Students' Motivational Strategies

---

[1] Assistant Professor, Govt. Emerson College Multan, Pakistan

[2] Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Muzaffarabad, Pakistan

1. Introduction

Motivation is a key element in the learning of a second or foreign language. To attain achievement in the target language is one of the important factors in L2 research. According to research, achievement has a relationship with motivation. The core part of learning a language is to create and maintain the interest of the learner in the target language. Sustaining this dynamic learning force of motivation is the key object of target language learning. Learners are always in need of such capability that may create a motivation to learn the target language. Motivation can provide a force that targets achievement in language learning. It is an unquestioned prominent factor for L2 learning but the complex nature of it has intrigued researchers to explore it in diversified directions. Robert Gardener and Wallace Lambert (1959, 1972) were the researchers who analysed motivation from a social psychological perspective. They observed motivation as a pivotal force for the intercommunication of the diversified ethnolinguistic communities. Gardner (1985) distributes L2 motivation in two types: *integrative and instrumental.* Integrative motivation deals with identity and culture while instrumental motivation deals with the need of the learner. The social-psychological approach of Gardner lacks in providing the guidelines for classroom and teachers for creating and maintaining motivation among L2 learners. In 1990's researchers started an education-oriented reflection for L2 motivation (e.g. Dörnyei, 1990, 1994; Crooks & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Trembley & Gardener, 1995; Williams & Burden, 1997). The educational psychological research diversely extended the L2 motivational paradigm. It provides cognitive, situational, and influential theoretical dimensions with reference to the classroom for EFL motivation. This research has the following queries:

(i) What is the perception of the teachers and students about the EFL motivational strategies?

(ii) What is the utilisation level of the EFL motivational strategies in Pakistani classrooms?

(iii) Do teachers and students have the same perception of the EFL motivational strategies?

These questions were investigated through the research procedure.

2. Literature Review

This change of paradigm gave a spur to researchers for the development of techniques and strategies for EFL motivation. These techniques were also produced for educational motivation in general by the researchers in the field of educational psychology (Alderman, 1999). Dörnyei (2001b) listed more than one hundred language classroom motivational strategies. Previously, Dörnyei and Csizer (1998) conducted empirical research to fill the gap between intuitive and empirical claims for motivation. They evaluated 51 motivational strategies having 10 macro-strategies in Hungary. The teachers' perception and practice for EFL strategies were of focus regarding EFL motivation. This research brought out the underutilised strategies in the Hungarian context. This research also transformed the EFL motivational construct tangible for further investigation. Dörnyei and Csizer (ibid) admit that these strategies are brought out from the Western context, 'we cannot say with certainty that the ten commandments are valid in every cultural, ethnolinguistic and institutional setting. There is much room for further research in this respect' (p. 224). This logical statement provides room to researchers to testify the construct of EFL motivational strategies presented by Dörnyei and Csizer in different ethnolinguistic and geographical contexts.

Both the intrinsic and extrinsic factors are at work as a motivational force among learners: in intrinsic motivation self-image, lecture noting and enjoying movies are at work while in extrinsic motivation success in exam and job are the keynotes (Lashari, Mashori, Abbasi & Talpur, 2018). Demotivation is also important and is related to interest, future career, examination, textbooks peers and teachers (Li & Qian, 2018). Course content and teaching material were found a demotivating factor and instrumental motivation was found the most influential source of motivation among students in research at Quetta in Pakistan (Ali & Pathan, 2017). Many researchers have investigated the nature of the complex construct of EFL motivational strategies. In Spain, a study was conducted by Bernaus and

Gardner (2008) by using twenty-six motivational strategies for EFL. There were six hundred and ninety-four (694) participants: who were both the teachers (thirty-one) and students (six hundred and sixty-three). The results reveal that teachers and students agreed on many strategies and their frequency, but students have a different perception according to their attitude.

Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) investigated motivational strategies practiced by teachers in Korea. The effect of these strategies was measured on students' motivation for language learning. One thousand three hundred and eighty-one (1381) students from forty (40) classrooms were participants of this investigation. As research tools, both observation and a questionnaire were used. Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) was developed for observation. The research shows that there was a significant relationship between the practice of teachers' motivational strategies and students' motivation and learning behaviour.

The current study is also a replication of the work of Cheng and Dörnyei (2007). This study aims to know the usefulness of EFL motivational strategies in the Pakistani context. The perception and practice of both teachers and students are investigated in this study.

3. Materials and Methods
EFL motivational strategy was adopted from Cheng and Dörnyei (2007) with their permission. Further, it was modified, and two more strategies were included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire, with modifications, was administered both in English and Urdu languages for the convenience of the participants. After pilot testing, the questionnaire was administered among participants. From different educational backgrounds and levels, 2089 participants were part of the present research study. There were One thousand and sixty-five teachers and one thousand and twenty-four students as participants. The included institutes were also diversified for their level of education which were University (99 teachers, 44 students), College (228 teachers, 340 students), Vocational College (16 teachers, 6 students), Primary

School (106 teachers, 6 students), Middle School (129 teachers, 52 students), High School (447 teachers, 136 students), Play School (6 teachers), Private lessons (25 teachers, 16 students) and of any other than the stated levels (9 teachers, 4 students). The respondents belonged to the community of English language learners and teachers, therefore, they had the same characteristics and have homogeneity between them for the elicitation of the questionnaire. The items of the questionnaire were analysed quantitatively. The data were homogenous because it represents the same perceptions regarding the EFL motivation and the respondents were the members of the same community bearing the same traits. The teachers' and students' perceptions of EFL motivational strategies were calculated statistically.

Both the mean score and z score measures were applied to analyse the data. The mean score shows the efficiency of the respective EFL motivational strategy. The z score shows the standard statistical representation of the data. The standard statistical data is a way to know the results in a comprehensive form which is a better analysis than the analyses of statistical central tendency of the mere mean score. The intra-difference in the mean and z score revealed the utilisation of macro and micro strategies. Here, the macro-strategy represents the subscale and the micro-strategy represents the item within a subscale of the construct of the EFL Motivational Strategy Questionnaire. A negative difference score shows that the EFL motivational strategy is underutilised while the preference of EFL motivational strategies is shown through their respective rank order between teachers' and students' perceptions.

4. Results

The calculated results were shown in the tabular form attached in Appendix A: Table 5. It represents teachers' vs. students' EFL motivational strategies in Pakistan. The statistical calculations provide a thick description which is not appropriate to discuss in this short paper, however, the results are given here in connection with the data provided in Appendix A. To understand data, it is necessary to keep in mind that twelve macro-strategies have further fifty-three micro-strategies in them. These macro-strategies and micro-strategies are analysed on mean and z score measures. Both these measures further distinctively represented for underutilisation of the EFL Motivational Strategies. This utilisation is also further arranged in the

ranking of the strategies. All this data has revealed the comparative form of two categories i.e. teachers and students. Therefore, to comprehend the dynamics of data, these threads are necessary to keep in mind. All the twelve macro-strategies are analysed in the following with the said detail.

(i) "Proper Teacher Behaviour" is the first macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has five micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, item No. 23 is the highest, and item No. 47 is the lowest in both categories of teachers and students. At mean difference measure two micro-strategies are found underutilised (negative difference), on the other hand, overall macro-strategy and three micro-strategies are normally utilised in both categories of teachers and students.

At z score difference measure, there was a difference in perception among the teachers' and students' categories. The teachers' category has the overall macro-strategy and three micro-strategies underutilised but the students' category has overall macro-strategy and four micro-strategies underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 12th rank in the teachers' category and 10th rank in the students' category.

(ii) "Recognize Students' Effort" is the second macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has four micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, the highest micro-strategy is No.46 and the lowest micro-strategy is No. 8 in both the categories of teachers and students.

At mean score difference measure, the overall macro-strategy with two micro-strategies are underutilised in the category of teachers, and in students' overall macro-strategy and one micro-strategy is underutilised.

At z score difference measure, only a single micro-strategy is underutilised in the teachers' category, while four micro-strategies are underutilised in the students' category.

43

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 3rd rank in the teachers' category and 1st rank in the students' category.

(iii) "Promote Learners' Self-Confidence" is the third macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has five micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At mean score measure both categories of teachers and students have different micro-strategies as highest and the lowest; micro-strategy No. 36 in teachers and micro-strategy No. 28 in the students is the highest, while micro-strategy No. 33 in teachers and micro-strategy No. 11 in students are the lowest.

At mean score difference measure, overall macro-strategy with three micro-strategies in teachers and in student overall macro-strategy and two micro-strategies are underutilised.

At z score difference measure, one micro-strategy in the teachers' category, and in students' category four micro-strategies are underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 2nd rank in the teachers' category and 3rd rank in the students' category.

(iv) "Create a Pleasant Classroom" is the fourth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. There are four micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, micro-strategy No. 30 in both teachers and students is the highest while the lowest micro-strategy in teachers is micro-strategy No. 1 and in students micro-strategies No. 21 and No. 41 are the lowest.

At mean difference measure, overall macro-strategy with its complete four micro-strategies is underutilised in both the categories of teachers and students.

At z score difference measure, overall macro-strategy and three micro-strategies are underutilised in both the categories of teachers and students.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 9th rank in the teachers' category and 8th rank in the students' category.

(v) "Present Task Properly" is the fifth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has two micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, the highest micro-strategy in the teachers' category is No. 25, while the highest in students is micro-strategy No. 6. Contrary to this, the lowest micro-strategy in the teachers' category is No. 6 and the lowest in the students' category is No. 25.

At mean difference measure, overall macro-strategy and two micro-strategies are underutilised in the teachers' category while in the students' category overall strategy of the motivation of EFL and one micro-strategy are underutilised.

At z score difference measure, only in the students' category the overall macro-strategy of EFL of motivation with one micro-strategy are underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 4th rank in the teachers' category and 9th rank in the students' category.

(vi) "Increase Learners' Goal-Orientedness" is the sixth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has four micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, the highest micro-strategy in the teachers' category is No. 10 and in the students' category is No. 26, while the lowest micro-strategy in both the teachers' and students' categories is item 31.

At mean difference measure, the overall macro-strategy of EFL of motivation with its complete four micro-strategies is underutilised.

At z score difference measure, the overall macro-strategy of the motivation of EFL with two micro-strategies are underutilised in the teachers' category, while in the students' category overall macro-strategy and four micro-strategies are underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 8th rank in the teachers' category and 11th rank in the students' category.

(vii) "Make the Learning Task Stimulating" is the seventh macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has six micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, the highest micro-strategy in the teacher category is No. 18 and in students it is No. 43, While the lowest micro-strategy in the teachers' category is No. 27 and in the students' category it is No. 45.

At mean difference measure, the overall macro-strategy of motivation in EFL with six micro-strategies are underutilised in both categories of teachers and students.

At z score difference measure, the overall macro-strategy of the motivation of EFL with six micro-strategies are underutilised in the teachers' category, and in the students' category overall macro-strategy with five micro-strategies are underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 10th rank in the teachers' category and 12th rank in the students' category.

(viii) "Familiarize Learners with L2 Related Values" is the eighth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has seven micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At mean score measure, in both teachers' and students' categories, the highest and lowest micro-strategies are the same. The highest micro-strategy in both categories is No. 9 and the lowest is No. 19.

At the mean score difference measure, the overall macro-strategy of motivation and five micro-strategies are underutilised in teachers' and

students' categories. At z score difference measure, overall macro-strategy and five micro-strategies are underutilised both in categories of teachers and students.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 11th rank in the teachers' category and 7th rank in the students' category.

(ix) "Promote Group Cohesiveness and Group Norms" is the ninth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has five micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At mean score measure, the highest and lowest micro-strategies are the same in both the categories of teachers and students i.e., No. 5 as highest and No. 35 as lowest.

At mean difference measure, overall macro-strategy with four micro-strategies are underutilised both in teachers' and students' categories.

At z score difference measure, overall macro-strategy, and three micro-strategies are underutilised in the teachers' category while in the students' category only two micro-strategies are underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 6th rank in the teachers' category and 4th rank in the students' category.

(x) "Promote Learner Autonomy" is the tenth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. It has six micro-strategies in it. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, the highest micro-strategy is No. 24 and the lowest micro-strategy is No. 22 in both the categories of teachers and students.

At mean difference measure, overall macro-strategy and five micro-strategies are underutilised both in teachers' and students' categories.

At z score difference measure, four micro-strategies are underutilised in both the teachers' and students' categories.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 5th rank both in teachers' and students' categories.

(xi) "Resolving Disharmony between Languages" is the eleventh macro-strategy of EFL motivation. The results appear as follows:

At mean score measure, both categories of teachers and students have the same highest and lowest micro-strategies: the highest micro-strategy is No. 53 and the lowest micro-strategy is No. 49.

At mean difference measure, the overall macro-strategy of motivation in EFL with one micro-strategy is underutilised in the teachers' category while in the students' category overall macro-strategy with two micro-strategies are underutilised.

At z score difference measure, three micro-strategies in the teachers' category, and two micro-strategies in the students' category are underutilised.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has got 1st rank in the teachers' category and 2nd rank in the students' category.

(xii) "Resolving cultural and historical disagreement" is the twelfth macro-strategy of EFL motivation. The results appear as follows:

At the mean score measure, the highest and lowest micro-strategies are quite opposite to each other. In the teachers' category, the highest micro-strategy is No. 50 and in students' it is No. 52, on the contrary to this the lowest in teachers is micro-strategy No. 52 and in the students the lowest is micro-strategy No. 50.

At mean score difference measure, overall EFL motivational strategy with its two micro-strategies are underutilised both in teachers' and students' categories.

At z score difference measure, overall macro-strategy with two micro-strategies are underutilised in both teachers' and students' categories.

Overall, among all EFL motivational strategies, this macro-strategy has 7th rank in the teachers' category and 6th rank in the students' category.

The data in connection with its analysis provided results that are thick and seem to be difficult to understand as each macro-strategy has its utilisation and score. The analysis reveals results. There is a complex phenomenon and indicators are available within the data. Results are further interesting in a way that they are diversified. The teachers' and students' categories with the connection to the EFL motivational strategy have been further explained in the next section where the discussion has uncovered the hidden proves and dimensions regarding the data.

5. Discussion
The teachers vs. students based EFL motivational strategies show that micro-strategy No. 23 "Establish a good relationship with students" has the highest while micro-strategy No. 19 "Invite some English speaking foreigners" has the lowest mean score among all the micro-strategies.

Based on their respective z score difference, micro-strategy No. 39, "Motivate students by uses of English in class" has the highest z score difference in teachers and micro-strategy No. 36, "Each students' learning techniques for effective and easy learning" is the highest in students while micro-strategy No. 19 "Invite some English speaking foreigners" has the lowest z score difference in both teachers and students, out of all fifty-three micro-strategies.

The measure of z score indicated that the micro-strategy " Motivate students by users of English in class" is favourite in teachers' perspective but students' perspective has favourite micro-strategy, "Each student's learning techniques for effective and easy learning". The favourite micro-strategy in both perspectives was different but the rejected micro-strategy in both

perspectives of teachers and students is the same i.e., "Invite some English speaking Foreigner in the classroom". The perspectives are revealed to have different choices which are a clear difference of opinions because of different contexts.

Comparatively, the mean score shows harmony in both perspectives of teachers' and students' because the most favourite micro-strategy and rejected strategies are the same. The favourite micro-strategy is, "Establish a good relationship with students" and the rejected micro-strategy is, "Invite some English speaking foreigner". Here it is highlighted that the rejected micro-strategy is the same through both the measures of z score and mean score.

In findings, there is an indication that there is a lack of students' and teachers' relationships in the classrooms. Most classes are teacher-centred and students are passive learners. Respondents do not feel that foreigners' involvement is useful in the classroom because there are no cultural openings available for these innovations in the eastern set up of the classroom where outsiders are not allowed.

The findings represent a diversified situation that teachers feel the need for motivation for their students which can be enhanced through the use of the English language in the classroom, In the Pakistani context, students have to learn English as a compulsory subject which is one of the reasons of emotiveness for the English language learning. On the contrary, the students chose the learning techniques as a more important factor which is an outcome that they deal with the English language as a subject which they deal not with motivation but with techniques for passing the exam because English is not the language they are learning with passion or choice, therefore, techniques are used to cope an unwanted language as a subject of their studies.

Fifty-three micro-strategies were part of twelve macro-strategies which were the subscales based on the foreign language motivational strategies framework of Dörnyei. There are forty underutilised and deficient micro-strategies both in teachers' and students' perspectives. Comparatively, the z score analysis shows that there are thirty-three under-utilised micro-strategies in teachers' perspective but fifty-one micro-strategies are under-

utilised in the students' perspective. It reveals a major difference of opinion regarding teachers and students about the deficiency of strategies.

Moving towards a larger scale analysis, these fifty-three micro-strategies are calculated and submerged in twelve macro-strategies of motivation for EFL. On the macro-strategies level, eleven out of twelve are underutilised based on mean score analysis both in teachers' and students' perspectives. The favourite macro-strategy is "Proper Teacher Behaviour," in both perspectives while the rejected macro-strategy in teachers is "Familiarize Learners with L2 related values" but in students' perspective it is "Make the Learning Task Stimulating".

The standard z score reveals that the most favourite macro-strategy in teachers' perspective is, "Resolving Disharmony between Languages" and in the students' perspective is, "Recognize Students' Effort". Seven macro-strategies are under-utilised in both teachers' and students' perspectives. These underutilised macro-strategies are given below:

Table 1: Underutilisation of Macro-strategies

Macro-strategies	Underutilised in Teachers'	Underutilised in Students'
"Proper Teacher Behaviour"	√	√
"Create a Pleasant Classroom"	√	√
"Present Task Properly" (in Student only)	×	√
"Increase Learners' Goal-Orientedness"	√	√
"Make the Learning Task Stimulating"	√	√
"Familiarize Learners with L2 related values"	√	√
"Promote Group Cohesiveness and Group Norms" (in Teachers only)	√	×
"Resolving Cultural and Historical Disagreement"	√	√
Total	7	7

This discussion shows that most of the micro and macro-strategies for motivation in foreign language learning are underutilised in the Pakistani context. The usage of these strategies is significantly deficient and needs consideration for improvement.

The underutilisation of micro and macro-strategies is important for making some decisions about EFL motivational strategies in the Pakistani context. The Pakistani classroom is deficient in the utilisation of both micro and macro-strategies because the classrooms of the English language are not interactive and classrooms are dealt with like a subject of social science or science but not as a language where proficiency and skill are needed. This orientation of classrooms causes the least room for the exercise of these strategies either on a micro or macro level. The overall macro-strategies are seven out of twelve are underutilised with a minimal difference of opinion which shows the hidden tendency that most of the macro-strategies which are deficient belong to the teachers, classroom and content related. Interestingly, in the Pakistani context language classrooms are large and without innovations in content and teaching activities. The only activity which occurs in most of the Pakistani classrooms is lecture delivery which is without activities.

These macro-strategies are equal in number for underutilisation, but their ranking based on their z score is different. (Appendix B: Table 6)

Table 2: Ranking of motivational strategies according to different perspectives in the Pakistani context

Motivational Strategy	Ranking Teachers' Perspective	Ranking Students' Perspective
1. Set a Personal Example with Your Own Behaviour.	12	10
2. Recognise Students' Effort and Celebrate their Success.	3	1
3. Promote Learners' Self-Confidence.	2	3
4. Create a Pleasant and Relaxed Atmosphere in the Classroom.	9	8
5. Present Tasks Properly.	4	9

Motivational Strategy	Ranking Teachers' Perspective	Ranking Students' Perspective
6. Increase the Learners' Goal-Orientedness.	8	11
7. Make the Learning Tasks Stimulating.	10	12
8. Familiarise Learners with L2-Related Values.	11	7
9. Promote Group Cohesiveness and Set Group Norms.	6	4
10. Promote Learner Autonomy.	5	5
11. Resolving Disharmony between Languages	1	2
12. Resolving Historical Disharmony	7	6

Table 2 shows the rank order of EFL motivational strategies based on teachers' and students' perspectives in Pakistan. Here the major difference is found at the fifth macro-strategy ''Present Tasks Properly'' which is at 4th rank in teachers and at 9th rank in students. The second difference is found in the eighth macro-strategy ''Familiarise Learners with L2-Related Values'' which is at 11th rank in teachers and 7th rank in students. The other macro strategies are also dislocated in their rank order however have a minor rank difference.

The rank order of the macro-strategies is diversified both in teachers and students because students' needs for foreign language learning are never considered for improving the syllabus and teaching methodologies. The teachers are also habitual of dealing with languages like a subject of social science or humanities but not like a language that brings differences in ranking order of the EFL macro-strategies ranking

Table 3: EFL Motivational macro-strategies in accordance with perspectives

Perspective	Total macro-strategies Underutilised	Total macro-strategies Underutilised	Highest ranked macro-strategy on z	Lowest ranked macro-

	on mean score difference	on z score difference	score difference	strategy on z score difference
Teachers	11	7	MS No. 11	MS No. 1
Students	11	7	MS No. 2	MS No. 7

The analysis in Table 3 provides us with a result that the number of underutilised macro-strategies is the same in both teachers and students but this underutilisation shows that these strategies are not as much in practice in the classroom as they are needed in Pakistani classrooms. Further, there is a difference between the highest and lowest-ranked macro-strategies in teachers and students. Teachers consider resolving disharmony between languages as the highest factor while students consider that their efforts to learn a language may be recognized. Teachers consider the lowest to make a personal example in a language class while students consider that the least is that learning tasks should be stimulating in language classrooms which causes L2 de motivation.

Table 4: EFL micro motivational strategies in accordance with perspectives

Perspective	Total Micro-strategies Underutilised on mean score difference	Total Micro-strategies Underutilised on z score difference	Micro-strategy Highest on the mean score No.	Micro-strategy Highest on z score difference No.	Micro-strategy No. Lowest on the mean score	Micro-strategy No. Lowest on z score difference
Teachers	40	33	item No. 23	item No.39	item No. 19	item No. 19
Students	40	51	item No. 23	item No.36	item No. 19	item No. 19

In Table 4 the results presented are different at z score difference. However, it presents a major difference because teachers consider that there are 33 micro-strategies for motivation as underutilised, but students take a different perspective and consider that 51 micro-strategies are underutilised.

It is a significant number as out of 53 micro-strategies 51 are considered underutilised by the students. This shows a difference of consideration among both perspectives. The other analyses are the same.

Both at the micro and macro levels, the underutilisation of strategies is significant and of a large number. There is a slight disagreement among the teachers and students regarding the underutilisation of EFL motivational strategies but there is a strong agreement that these strategies are overall underutilised. The findings are strongly dependent on the role of teachers, syllabus, classroom, methodology and activities which are not in harmony and practice for the English language.

6. Conclusion

Conclusively, the perspectives of teachers and students are different from each other regarding EFL motivational strategies in the Pakistani context. Students' perspective showed more underutilisation of micro-strategies than that of the teachers' perspective. Both the highest and lowest-ranked macro-strategies are dissimilar according to the perspectives of the teachers and students. Teachers' and students' perspectives, based on z score, are also different for the highest micro-strategy. The mean score shows 40 micro-strategies as underutilised in both the perspectives of teachers and students, on the other hand, the z score reveals 33 micro-strategies in teachers and 51 micro-strategies in students' perspectives as underutilised. In both teachers and students, the mean score shows 11 macro-strategies while the z score shows 7 macro-strategies underutilised. Both teachers and students ranked macro-strategies with diverse perceptions. There was a difference in the results between the two perspectives. The underutilisation, in both macro and micro EFL strategies, is a significant finding which is quite different from the studies of Taiwan (Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007) and Hungary (Dörnyei & Csizer, 1998) where the underutilisation is on a small scale. English language learning has a different and diversified perspective and context in Pakistan. The studies of Taiwan and Hungary were in a native English-speaking context but Pakistan has a context of the non-native community

where English is only used among elites, offices, trade and for academic purposes. Therefore, the context is an important factor for the choice of EFL motivational strategies, and it is indicative in the Pakistani context among teachers and students' perception of EFL motivational strategies with a different result.

References

Alderman, M. K. (1999). *Motivation for achievement: Possibilities for teaching and learning*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ali, M. S., & Pathan, Z. H. (2017). Exploring factors causing demotivation and motivation in learning English language among college students of Quetta, Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 7, No. 2; 2017. Doi:10.5539/ijel.v7n2p81.

Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. (2008). Teacher motivational strategies, student perceptions, motivation, and English achievement. *Modern Language Journal*, 92: 387-401.

Cheng, H. F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1: 153-74.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, Vol. 40: 45-78.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). New themes and approaches in L2 motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 21: 43-59.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2 (3): 203-229.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13: 266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Newbury House.

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL* Quarterly, 42(1): 55-77.

Lashari, A. A., Mashori, G. M., Abbasi, A. M., & Talpur, Q. (2018). Motivation to learn English language: A study of Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur, Sindh. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 8, No. 1; 2018. Doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n1p15.

Li, C., & Qian, J. (2018). Investigating changes in demotivation among Chinese EFL learners from an activity theory perspective. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 8, No. 1; 2018. Doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n1p44.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78: 12-28.

Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol.79: 505-520.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A: Table 5: Teachers' vs. students' EFL motivational strategies

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
MS 1= "Proper Teacher Behaviour"	**3.66**	**3.58**	**0.08**	**0.00**	**-1.11 (12)**	**-0.92 (10)**
"Teacher respect and care student"	3.81	3.81	0.23	0.23	-1.01	-0.7
"Show enthusiasm for teaching English"	3.69	3.61	0.11	0.03	-0.82	-0.61
23. "Establish a good relationship with students"	3.95	3.91	0.37	0.33	-0.7	-0.55
40. "Share with students that teachers' learning of English has enriched his life"	3.36	3.33	-0.22	-0.25	0.17	0.15
47. "Try to be genuine in front of students"	3.5	3.24	-0.08	-0.34	0.5	-0.14
MS 2= "Recognize students' effort"	**3.49**	**3.49**	**-0.08**	**-0.08**	**0.54 (3)**	**0.9 (1)**
8. "Monitor Students Accomplishment and celebrate"	3.22	3.06	-0.36	-0.52	-0.71	-1.05

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
15. "Make sure grades reflect both achievement and effort"	3.52	3.63	-0.06	0.05	0.59	-0.93
42. "Encourage learners to see their failure as insufficient effort on their part"	3.62	3.64	0.04	0.06	1.09	-0.64
46. "Show students that their effort is recognized"	3.63	3.66	0.05	0.08	1.18	-0.9
MS 3= "Promote Learners Self Confidence"	**3.48**	**3.42**	**-0.09**	**-0.15**	**0.59 (2)**	**0.58 (3)**
11. "Design tasks that are within learner's ability"	3.38	3.16	-0.2	-0.42	0.08	-0.4
28. "Encourage learners through belief that they can do the task"	3.55	3.62	-0.03	0.04	0.84	-0.79
33. "Make clear to students about effective and	3.3	3.27	-0.28	-0.31	-0.34	-0.12

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
meaningful communication"						
34. "Notice students' progress and give positive feedback"	3.6	3.58	0.02	0	1.23	-0.9
36. "Teach students learning techniques for effective and easy learning"	3.62	3.48	0.04	-0.1	1.15	0.85
MS 4= "Create a Pleasant Classroom"	**3.26**	**3.17**	**-0.31**	**-0.40**	**-0.63 (9)**	**-0.74 (8)**
1. "Bring in and Encourage Humour"	3.11	3.27	-0.47	-0.31	-2.08	-0.56
21. "Use short and interesting opening activities"	3.26	2.99	-0.32	-0.59	-0.42	-0.99
30. "Create a supportive and pleasant classroom climate"	3.57	3.44	-0.01	-0.14	1.04	0.53
41. "Avoid social comparisons among students"	3.13	2.99	-0.45	-0.59	-1.07	-1.45

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
MS 5= "Present Task Properly"	**3.50**	**3.52**	**-0.07**	**-0.05**	**0.48 (4)**	**-0.81 (9)**
6. "Give clear instruction to carry out a task"	3.47	3.59	-0.11	0.01	0.31	-0.72
25. "Give good reasons in favour of activities"	3.53	3.46	-0.05	-0.12	0.64	0.56
MS 6= "Increase Learners' Goal-Orientedness"	**3.24**	**3.01**	**-0.33**	**-0.56**	**-0.47 (8)**	**-1 (11)**
10. "Encourage students to set realistic short term goals"	3.43	3.07	-0.15	-0.51	0.24	-0.78
20. "Help students to develop realistic beliefs about learning"	3.11	3.1	-0.47	-0.48	-1.01	-0.69
26. "Try to find out students' need to build curriculum"	3.35	3.11	-0.23	-0.47	0.08	-0.55
31. "Display the class goals on the wall regularly"	3.08	2.77	-0.5	-0.81	-1.13	-1.95

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
MS 7= "Make the Learning Task Stimulating"	**3.21**	**3.00**	**-0.36**	**-0.57**	**-0.64 (10)**	**-1.08 (12)**
12. "Introduce in lessons various interesting content and topics"	3.27	2.97	-0.31	-0.61	-0.54	-1.46
13. "Make tasks challenging and problem solving"	3.21	3.07	-0.37	-0.51	-0.7	-0.55
18. "Break the routine by varying presentation format"	3.39	3.19	-0.19	-0.39	-0.09	-0.23
27. "Allow students to produce things that can be displayed"	3.02	2.81	-0.56	-0.77	-1.3	-1.94
43. "Make tasks attractive and novel raise curiosity"	3.29	3.28	-0.29	-0.3	-0.37	0.06
45. "Enrich communication by presenting auditory and visual aids"	3.12	2.74	-0.46	-0.84	-0.8	-2.09

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
MS 8= "Familiarize Learners with L2 related values"	**3.09**	**3.11**	**-0.48**	**-0.46**	**-1.07 (11)**	**-0.68 (7)**
4. "Familiarize Cultural background"	3.02	3.48	-0.56	-0.1	-1.47	0.73
7. "Invite senior student to talk with class"	2.96	2.91	-0.62	-0.67	-1.81	-1.48
9. "Regularly remind students of English and Success"	3.72	3.75	0.14	0.17	-0.87	-0.47
19. "Invite some English speaking foreigners"	2.06	2.13	-1.52	-1.45	-3.79	-3.75
32. "Bring various authentic cultural products as materials"	2.8	2.54	-0.78	-1.04	-2.33	-2.36
38. "Highlight the usefulness of English"	3.48	3.37	-0.1	-0.21	0.66	0.53
39. "Motivate students by uses	3.62	3.61	0.04	0.03	1.23	-0.85

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	**Student**	**Teacher**	**Student**	**Teacher**	**Student**
of English in class"						
MS 9= "Promote Group Cohesiveness and Group Norms"	**3.39**	**3.34**	**-0.18**	**-0.23**	**-0.08 (6)**	**0.24 (4)**
3. "Create Opportunity to mix up"	3.45	3.46	-0.13	-0.12	0.47	0.82
5. "Explain Class Rules"	3.65	3.79	0.07	0.21	-1.1	-0.61
16. "Ask learners to recommend useful classroom rules"	3.27	3.21	-0.31	-0.37	-0.96	-0.78
35. "Include activities that require students' to work in groups"	3.13	2.91	-0.45	-0.67	-1.16	-1.16
44. "Encourage students to share personal experiences as a part of learning"	3.48	3.35	-0.1	-0.23	0.27	0.15
MS 10= "Promote Learner Autonomy"	**3.38**	**3.27**	**-0.19**	**-0.30**	**0.12 (5)**	**0 (5)**
14. "Teach students self-	3.42	3.36	-0.16	-0.22	0.36	0.59

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
motivating strategies"						
22. "Involve students to design language course"	3.1	2.99	-0.48	-0.59	-0.96	-1.22
24. "Encourage students' active participation in activities"	3.67	3.62	0.09	0.04	-1.2	-0.79
29. "Give students choice for their assessment"	3.22	3.2	-0.36	-0.38	-0.85	-0.49
37. "Adopt the role of a facilitator and not of encyclopaedia"	3.54	3.33	-0.04	-0.25	0.92	0.18
48. "Give students opportunities to assess themselves"	3.37	3.17	-0.21	-0.41	-0.03	-0.47
MS 11= "Resolving Disharmony	**3.54**	**3.41**	**-0.03**	**-0.16**	**0.95 (1)**	**0.72 (2)**

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
between Languages"						
49. "Encourage students to resolve differences between English and mother tongue"	3.29	3.1	-0.29	-0.48	-0.23	-0.67
51. "Encourage students to consider English as global language"	3.67	3.46	0.09	-0.12	-1.29	0.85
53. "Give students understanding that there is no clash with religion if they use English"	3.68	3.67	0.1	0.09	-1.45	-1.13
MS 12= "Resolving Cultural and Historical Disagreement"	**3.30**	**3.17**	**-0.27**	**-0.40**	**-0.2 (7)**	**-0.28 (6)**
50. "Eliminate disrespect and hate for English language"	3.34	3.17	-0.24	-0.41	-0.03	-0.38
52. "Discuss and settle	3.28	3.19	-0.3	-0.39	-0.35	-0.17

EFL Motivational Strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank Order)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
disagreement of cultures of English and Muslims of Pakistan"						

Appendix B: Table 6: Teachers' vs. students' motivational macro-strategies

EFL macro-strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank ORDER)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
MS 1= "Proper Teacher Behaviour"	3.66	3.58	0.08	0.00	-1.11 (12)	-0.92 (10)
MS 2= "Recognize students' effort"	3.49	3.49	-0.08	-0.08	0.54 (3)	0.9 (1)
MS 3= "Promote Learners Self Confidence"	3.48	3.42	-0.09	-0.15	0.59 (2)	0.58 (3)
MS 4= "Create a Pleasant Classroom"	3.26	3.17	-0.31	-0.40	-0.63 (9)	-0.74 (8)
MS 5= "Present Task Properly"	3.50	3.52	-0.07	-0.05	0.48 (4)	-0.81 (9)
MS 6= "Increase Learners' Goal-Orientedness"	3.24	3.01	-0.33	-0.56	-0.47 (8)	-1 (11)
MS 7= "Make the Learning Task Stimulating"	3.21	3.00	-0.36	-0.57	-0.64 (10)	-1.08 (12)
MS 8= "Familiarize Learners with L2 related values"	3.09	3.11	-0.48	-0.46	-1.07 (11)	-0.68 (7)
MS 9= "Promote Group Cohesiveness and Group Norms"	3.39	3.34	-0.18	-0.23	-0.08 (6)	0.24 (4)

EFL macro-strategies	Mean		Mean Difference		z score Difference (Rank ORDER)	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
MS 10= "Promote Learner Autonomy"	3.38	3.27	-0.19	-0.30	0.12 (5)	0 (5)
MS 11= Resolving Disharmony between Languages"	3.54	3.41	-0.03	-0.16	0.95 (1)	0.72 (2)
MS 12= "Resolving Cultural and Historical Disagreement"	3.30	3.17	-0.27	-0.40	-0.2 (7)	-0.28 (6)