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Abstract
The aim of this quantitative study is to investigate the relationship between motivation and game-based learning among Swedish students attending junior high school and high school. To investigate this, the motivational theory Self-Determination Theory was used to create a questionnaire containing questions about experiences of games in and out of school. Furthermore, this essay discusses the possibilities of bringing the concept of game-based learning into an educational environment of L2 English learning. In addition, support has been found that strengthens the claim of an existing willingness to include games as part of the education in the Swedish school system.
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1. Introduction

Computers and other digital tools seem to successively become a bigger part of everyday life, and most people use them on a daily basis. Digital tools can serve many different purposes. However, the focus of this essay lies on digital learning tools in education.

Computers and other digital tools have a natural part in Swedish schools, and Skolverket (the Swedish national agency for education) reports that Sweden is one of the countries with the greatest access, as well as usage of computers in school (Skolverket 2015). The Swedish government (Regeringskansliet 2017) has decided that the curriculum of the Swedish school needs to be improved, and it has therefore undergone a revamp to include elements to improve students’ digital competence (Regeringskansliet 2017). The new version of the curriculum will fully replace the previous curriculum by July 1\textsuperscript{st} 2018 (Skolverket 2017b). One of the several changes being done in the revamp is that students from now on are required to work with digital tools during their schooling (Regeringskansliet 2017). Additionally, these tools should be included by the teachers in a way that promotes knowledge (Skolverket 2017a).

One way of implementing digital tools that promote knowledge is by using games, and there is an increasing willingness to implement games in education (Åkerfeldt 2014). The implementation of games can be done with the concept of game-based learning. Game-based learning is basically the concept of using games to achieve educational outcomes (Felicia et al. 2014).

This brings me to the aim of this study, which is to investigate to what extent game-based learning is motivational for Swedish students. In addition, this study will also focus on game-based digital learning tools in the teaching and learning of English in Sweden. In order to perform the study, a questionnaire was created and conducted, which was answered by students attending junior high school and high school. The questionnaire contained questions that was constructed based on the motivational theory Self-Determination Theory (SDT), and the answers were analysed by using SDT (Ryan & Deci 200), as well as being compared to previous research. The questionnaire contained questions concerning the students’ habits and what they thought was important regarding gaming and the use of technological devices (computers, iPads and smartphones) at home and in school. In this study, two main research questions will be investigated:

- To what extent are students in the Swedish school system willing to use games as a tool for learning and would they be motivated by the implementation of games as part of their schooling?
What factors are most important among students from a motivational aspect when they play games, use games as a tool for learning, or learn English?

Considering the willingness to include games in education (Åkerfeldt 2014), the new curriculum (Regeringskansliet 2017) and the availability of computers (Skolverket 2015), I hope that this study can bring important and relevant knowledge to the field.

2. Theoretical background
As mentioned in the introduction above, the aim of this essay is to investigate Swedish students’ attitudes toward game-based learning, by researching if and how games as a tool for learning motivates them. The first two sections will deal with motivational theories, to give further understanding about motivation. In 2.3 game-based learning, earlier research, as well as possibilities surrounding the implementation of games in an educational environment will be covered.

2.1 Motivation
Feeling motivated is a feeling most people probably can relate to, but what does it truly mean to be motivated? Ryan and Deci (2000:54) define motivation as follows:

To be motivated means to be moved to do something. A person who feels no impetus or inspiration to act is thus characterized as unmotivated, whereas someone who is energized or activated toward an end is considered motivated.

Understanding why certain behaviour occurs is a question that arose among psychologists long ago. In the beginning, the idea was that there were two different explanations for why different behaviour occurred, either if there was something to gain from the behaviour, an extrinsic reward (e.g. money awarded for working) or avoid punishment, or because of basic biological needs. The basic biological needs include the drive to procreate and survive, e.g. attraction or hunger. In either case, the motivation for any behaviour begins in the target of a certain outcome (Sansone & Harackiewicz 2000). In addition, there is also variation in the amount of motivation that can be experienced depending on the individual and the different conditions (Ryan & Deci 2000).

However, as studies went further, researchers found behaviour which could not be connected to either biological needs nor extrinsic rewards or punishments. This behaviour did not only occur among humans but among animals as well. Instead, it seemed as if the behaviour could be connected to the activity itself and to have more to do with enjoyment and satisfaction.
This created the birth of new ideas concerning motivation. The idea was that motivation of this kind was connected to a pleasant experience rather than surviving the day. This had to do with intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic motivation could be e.g. to gain competence, curiosity or play instincts. In conclusion, the difference between extrinsic and intrinsic rewards is that the intrinsic rewards are “inherent to the activity” (Sansone & Harackiewicz 2000), while extrinsic rewards are gained as a result of doing the activity (Sansone & Harackiewicz 2000).

2.2 Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) divides motivation into different types of motivation depending on what reason or goal that would be the outcome of a behaviour. The first division is made between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, with intrinsic motivation dealing with motivation based on enjoyment or interest, and “…extrinsic motivation, which refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome” (Ryan & Deci 2000:55).

According to Deci and Vansteenkiste (2004) SDT has three vital inherent psychological needs which need to be fulfilled. If they are not fulfilled, they claim that people will not be able to function and as a result “passivity, ill-being, fragmentation, and alienated functioning” (2004:25) may occur. The psychological needs, which must be fulfilled, are relatedness, autonomy and competence (Deci & Ryan 2000, Deci & Vansteenkiste 2004). Relatedness deals with our need to interact with others as well as to connect with and care for them. In addition, relatedness has to do with fitting in and the sense of belonging. Competence is basically the feeling of being able to deal with the environment knowing that there is a possibility of succeeding. Lastly, to feel autonomy basically means that you have the feeling of being willing to do something and that you have at least some decisions that you can decide on your own (Deci & Vansteenkiste 2004).

Intrinsic motivation is very individual as people are intrinsically motivated by different things. Something that is very motivating for someone might not be motivating at all for someone else, meaning that intrinsic motivation occurs in the relation between an activity and an individual (Ryan & Deci 2000). Moreover, the factor that secures motivation into becoming intrinsic is if the activity itself is fulfilling or enjoyable without any need of rewards, thus making it entirely autonomous (Deci & Vansteenkiste 2004).

When an activity itself is insignificant and the reason for performing it is based on the reward, we are talking about extrinsic motivation. This means that extrinsic, unlike intrinsic motivation, focuses on the end product of something rather than the fulfilment or satisfaction of performing an activity. With this said, there are different levels of extrinsic motivation
according to SDT stretching all the way from being non-autonomous to being autonomous (Ryan & Deci 2000).

The extrinsic motivational factors are divided into four groups in SDT, (i) external regulation, (ii) introjection, (iii) identification and (iv) integration. Firstly, external regulation deals with motivation driven by external rewards or demands, and is the least autonomous subtype of external motivation. Secondly, introjection is when motivation is driven to give a form of ego-boost or to gain recognition from oneself and/or others. Thirdly, identification has to do with personal importance. It could be the importance of performing an activity in order to reach a certain goal, e.g. learning street signs because they are important to know when driving, with becoming a good driver as the objective. Lastly, integration, which is the most autonomous of the four, deals with just autonomous actions that fit with personal beliefs and needs (Ryan & Deci 2000).

In SDT there is a possibility of motivation being non-existent, called amotivation. This is the case when there is no desirable outcome, a disbelief in being competent enough and no value in the activity itself. In addition, in SDT there is a division between whether the motivation is either external or internal. The internal and external factors decide the different type of motivation. Extrinsic motivation can be either external or internal, depending on what type of extrinsic motivation we are dealing with. Intrinsic motivation on the other hand can only be internal (Ryan & Deci 2000).

In Figure 1 (Ryan & Deci 2000) the different states of motivation in SDT, that was explained above, can be seen with a brief explanation, the associated processes. Figure 1 was used as a template to create three of the questions in the questionnaire. The three questions were created with alternatives that represented the different regulatory styles of SDT: external regulation, introjection, identification, integration and intrinsic motivation, with the exception of amotivation. The reason amotivation was left out was down to the fact that the questions investigate what types of motivation are most important to students in different scenarios, and therefore an alternative for amotivation was not needed as part of the questions.
2.3 Digital tools and game-based learning

As mentioned in the introduction, the access to computers in the Swedish school system is great and basically every student attending a municipal high school has their own school computer (Åkerfeldt 2014). This is called the one-to-one project, which is when every student and teacher has a portable computer at their disposal in school (Fleischer 2013, Åkerfeldt 2014). In the municipal primary school however, there is approximately one computer for every three students (Åkerfeldt 2014). Bringing computers into the classrooms may be positive, although this is not always the case. Fleischer and Kvarnsell (2015) claim they have experienced cases when administration and speed have been in focus rather than the pedagogical possibilities computers can bring into the classroom. They argue that administration should not be in focus but rather the pedagogical possibilities computers bring. To build on that, while using computers in school, it is very important to carefully consider what outcome you want from using computers and how they will help to achieve that outcome (Skolverket 2015), because the fact that everyone has a computer at hand will not ensure that positive benefits will occur (Fleischer & Kvarnsell 2015). However, as mentioned in the introduction, there is a willingness to bring games into education (Åkerfeldt 2014) and moving on from here, the remainder of this section will focus on games as a tool for learning.

Game-based learning emerged from the concept of Serious Games, which is a branch in the gaming industry with educational purposes. Unlike most games with entertaining purposes,
games that are part of Serious Games do not have entertainment as their primary goal. Instead, they primarily target educational outcomes. Game-based learning is the concept of using a game with “clearly defined learning outcomes through the medium of play” (Felicia et al. 2014:8). In addition, game-based learning is a method using the attractiveness of games to provide the user with an educative experience. However, the aim of game-based learning is not necessarily to entertain the user, it is still a possibility that the game is entertaining while striving to achieve the learning objectives (Felicia et al. 2014). However, Prensky (2007) claims that entertainment, as well as engagement, is exactly what digital game-based learning is about.

Prensky (2007) goes on by saying that the tools used today are outdated, and therefore not as successful with the new generation, or the “Games Generation” as he refers to them. Moreover, contrary to the outdated tools, digital game-based learning is a tool that appeals to the Gaming Generation. Older generations tend to equate learning and hard work, but Prensky (2007) argues that, even though the work is still hard, using digital game-based learning makes it fun thus making the user forget about the process actually being hard work.

Digital game-based learning games have a wide range of application areas. For instance, there are digital game-based learning games that deal with review, games that deal with reinforcement and games that can work as a primary source for learning about e.g. complicated software. In addition, it can work as a great tool while learning something that the learner does not find intrinsically motivating (Prensky 2007).

Digital game-based learning is a concept which has had success when applied in second language acquisition. When used in an environment where the second language (L2) was German, Neville et al. (2009) found through two different studies that digital game-based learning was beneficial when acquiring German vocabulary, when writing, as well as acquiring cultural knowledge. Both studies had two different groups completing the same assignments. The studies consisted of 15 university students who were divided into two groups, one with eight (group 1) students and the other with seven (group 2). During the first study, both groups did the same homework and assignments, although they studied differently. Group 1 did their studying by reading a story in German, and group 2 did their studying by playing a “game that covered the same scenario presented in the story and made use of the same vocabulary” (Neville et al. 2009:415). The second study had a similar structure, although it had an additional in-class debriefing and lesson about German train stations. The lesson about the German train stations included pictures of what a train station can look like, instead of requiring the students to imagine that themselves.
During the first study, the group who read the text thought their task was more in line with learning their L2 than the digital game-based learning task. However, the group who did the digital game-based learning task tended to perform better on the assignments, which could indicate that the text-reading group might have been wrong in their assumption. The assignments for both studies included homework of “matching, fill-in-the-blank, word field, and essay composition components” (Neville et al. 2009:415). The assignments also included self-assessment, where the students were supposed to “assess the apparent complexity and difficulty of the assigned task, mental effort spent on the task, sense of immersion in the German culture, enjoyment of the task, and the degree to which the task engaged and retained attention” (ibid.). In addition, the assignments of the studies had a follow-up of the homework the day after it was due that tested the students’ ability in vocabulary transfer and retention. Furthermore, the retention task was the same exercise they had had as homework. Even though the digital game-based learning group performed well, they felt that the gameplay had insufficient instructions. Both studies showed that the students who were playing a game performed better, both when it came to writing and vocabulary when they did their homework and assignments (Neville et al. 2009).

Moreover, all students who took part in the studies would be willing to take a foreign language course where games are the tool for learning. While being assessed, the students who were part of the digital game-based learning group found the tasks easier and “exerted less mental effort” (Neville et al. 2009:420) than those in the text-reading group. During the gameplay, the students seemed to acquire enough knowledge of vocabulary in order for them to apply it in their own writing, even though they were not necessarily aware the process of gameplay being significantly important to their language acquisition (Neville et al. 2009).

Sundqvist and Wikström (2015) argue that hypothetically a conclusion can be drawn that digital gameplay has a positive impact on L2 acquisition. In order to find out if gameplay and L2 acquisition have a correlation they performed a study on Swedish junior high school students attending 9th grade. Their study had 80 students (15-16 years of age) participating and the L2 language investigated was English. They found that students who played games the most outside of school, more than 5 hours per week, performed best on their vocabulary tests, while non-gamers and moderate gamers “were indistinguishable from one another” (2015:71). The frequent gamers also got the highest grades on their essay writing, even though the non-gamers wrote longer essays. The reason they received higher grades may have been that their teachers might value knowledge of vocabulary as a very important feature of essay writing. However, the fact remains that the frequent gamers had “the strongest results for all vocabulary measures”
Sundqvist and Wikström (2015) claim that their findings of a connection between English L2 acquisition and gameplay affirm previous research on the subject, affirming the hypothetical assumption that digital gameplay has a positive impact on L2 acquisition.

Using games can prove to be a helpful tool to get students to use their L2 language. This is because games can help in providing an atmosphere where users are able to commit mistakes but avoid losing face, hence making the willingness to use the target language greater. This is, even if they are not entirely sure if e.g. the grammar or pronunciation is correct. In addition, games can create a positive atmosphere with rewards and encouragement, which is relaxed and enjoyable for the user (Reinders & Wattana 2015). While playing games involving social meetings there is an optimal opportunity to learn and acquire language. One game that has been studied from a language perspective is World of Warcraft, where the players learnt the structure of the game through communication and interaction with other players as well as objectives in the game. Another game that has been found successful while learning language is EverQuest, which helped in improving both understanding and vocabulary skills of the users (Ryu 2013). However, there are those who dislike games who instead can feel demotivated by them, and it is therefore important to include additional support when a game is used. Also, inclusion of games should only occur if they give “additional benefits” (Reinders & Wattana 2015:40). Additionally, there will probably always be some student who dislikes the task, whatever the task might be, and giving the opportunity to choose another way of working is one way of dealing with that issue (Prensky 2007).

When Prensky (2007) discusses digital game-based learning, he brings forward the view of several naysayers, as he calls them. These are people who do not really believe that the concept of digital game-based learning is worthwhile. One group of them are the people who are very traditional in their thinking, and their idea is that it should remain as it used to be with teachers as the provider of information and the students as the recipients. However, Prensky (2007:374) argues “that today’s learners have changed” and that traditionalists either do not see that or simply deny it. Another group is the group of people who thinks that computers are bad for children rather than something good. They claim that we do not have enough research about what may happen when children get too much screen time, and therefore are against it. Of course, it is sound to be cautious regarding what tools are being used in education, but Prensky (2007) believes that we should not be afraid of using digital game-based learning and suggests the naysayers should have the mentality of being open to new things if they work. He continues
by stating that if there are games that do not “produce learning” (Prensky 2007:379), it is the product of bad design and not because it is a game, as he points out that well designed games have proven to be effective (Prensky 2007).

3. Method and material

In this section, the collection of data during this study will be presented, including the choices and considerations made during the process. In order to perform this study a quantitative research method was chosen, and the collection of data was done using a questionnaire. The study was carried out among 115 students attending the Swedish high school, and Junior high school, which means that the age range of the students who were able to take part in the study is between 13 – 19. All in all, the study was conducted at 5 different schools, and it was done by teachers who got the questionnaire by mail. The questionnaire itself is an electronic questionnaire (see Appendix 2) and all answers were instantly collected when the students were done. As the teachers distributed the questionnaire to their students they were free to distribute it whenever they preferred. However, they had one requirement, which was to only include students who learned English.

The questions that are part of the questionnaire were created to obtain adequate information to be able to fulfil the aim of this study. A quantitative research method was considered favourable for this study where the goal is to find out if there is a connection between motivation in language learning and game-based learning (Bryman et al. 1997, & Riffe et al. 2014). The quantitative research method also benefits this study as it has the aim to get information from a large quantity of informants, which would not be as easy to achieve with a qualitative study carried out through e.g. interviews (Bryman 2011). The reason why it would not be achievable through interviews is that that would be time-consuming and my goal is to reach a larger group of students and get some “pin-pointed” information, rather than much information from a small number of students (Bryman 2011).

As already mentioned, the tool used to collect the data from the informants in this study is an online questionnaire, which was created by using the free tool Google forms. When creating the questionnaire, the following advice from Bryman (2011:228) was considered:

- Use closed questions
- Use an outline which is easily understood
- Keep it short
Closed questions are preferred as they are usually easier to understand and the results are easier to compile. An outline that is clear and easy to understand is preferable as it will reduce the risk of informants struggling to answer the questions of the questionnaire. Keeping the questionnaire short generates less likelihood of informants to weary and not finish or perhaps just filling in the questions without reading (Bryman 2011).

While deciding whether or not to use a questionnaire the time aspect was an important factor as the administration is quick and easily conducted (Bryman 2011). Bryman (2011) says that even though questionnaires are easily managed the collection of them can be problematic as you do not necessarily get them answered and returned immediately afterwards. However, these problems were considered and dealt with by using an online platform for the questionnaire. This made sure that the survey was done without any unnecessary paperwork and the data was collected immediately when the questions were handed in. Apart from that, all the data was compiled by the platform which helped greatly, both with the time aspect and the convenience of not having to compile the data myself.

When working with questionnaires the respondents do not have to answer questions to someone performing an interview. This eliminates the effect the interviewer might have on the answers given as factors such as e.g. sex, ethnicity and/or social background might affect the respondent to answer differently. However, it is still unclear how these factors may affect the answers of a respondent (Bryman 2011).

Bryman (2011) argues that questionnaires have some elements that can prove to be disadvantageous. One of these is that the researcher who sent out the questionnaire cannot answer questions that may occur, and another is that when sending out a questionnaire you can never be sure who really answered it and if they did it on their own.

While creating the questionnaire, three questions (questions 13-15, see Appendix 2) were created by using the so-called regulatory styles from Figure 1 (Ryan & Deci 2000). Except for amotivation the questions contained every regulatory style, external regulation, introjection, identification, integration and intrinsic motivation, as possible options to pick while answering. However, the options were “translated” by explaining the associated processes for each regulatory style in more comprehensible words and to fit the questions asked (see the third column in Table 1). The way it was done can be seen in table 1 below, the regulatory style and associated process come directly from Figure 1 (Ryan & Deci 2000:61). Table 1 contains the answering options for question 13, 14 and 15 of the questionnaire (see Appendix 2).

**Table 1. Simplification of SDT’s regulatory styles**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory style</th>
<th>Associated process</th>
<th>Explanation / answering option in the questionnaire for question 13 and 14</th>
<th>Explanation / answering option in the questionnaire for question 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External regulation</td>
<td>Salience of extrinsic rewards or punishments. Compliance / Reactance.</td>
<td>Rewards.</td>
<td>The grade/other reward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjection</td>
<td>Ego involvement. Focus on approval from self or others.</td>
<td>Winning and / or getting recognition form others.</td>
<td>That I become good at English and/or other people think I am good at English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Conscious valuing of activity. Self-endorsement of goals.</td>
<td>Learning something useful.</td>
<td>Speaking English will be useful in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Hierarchical synthesis of goals. Congruence</td>
<td>You have chosen the game and the game fits your needs and / or values.</td>
<td>I think English is important to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Interest / enjoyment. Inherent satisfaction.</td>
<td>That the game is interesting and/or fun.</td>
<td>I think English is interesting and/or fun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1 Validity and reliability

It is of importance that the study is possible to recreate in order for it to gain reliability. The reason for this is that if the study can be recreated the result can be tested, and should the result from a second execution of the study be similar to the result of this study it would validate the reliability (Bryman 2011). Moreover, validity is also of importance and therefore the questions
of this study were carefully considered to make sure that they really tested what they were set out to explore. The questions were created with earlier research of game-based learning and motivation in mind. When creating questions, it is important to make sure that the validity is high enough, and therefore, a pilot study was carried out, where three teachers tried out the questionnaire, before it was sent out to all informants (Bryman 2011).

To avoid factors of randomness the empirical data was collected from five different schools with 115 informants. The reason why five different schools were part of the study was to make sure the randomness would be lowered, as well as, to get a wider range among the informants. Factors that make sure the randomness is lowered could be that the students came from different schools and that they have different teachers, with different approaches. Furthermore, the reason why a range of informants is desirable is that the study might become more stable, meaning that the result would not differentiate should the study be conducted again. The number of informants was also considered to make sure that if the study is conducted again the result would stay the same, or at least close to what this study has found. A larger number of informants is also relevant to make sure that the group is not homogenous, as this study aims to get a more general view of students, and not of a homogenous group of e.g. students from the same social class or students who have the same interests (Bryman 2011).

3.2 Problems and limitations
An argument for creating this quantitative study was that by using a questionnaire the information would be “pin-pointed” rather than getting other information from e.g. an interview. However, because of just that, a deeper insight from anyone who took part will be missed out on. The deeper insight refers to the information an interview could bring in addition to the questions, i.e. information that could be interesting to find out for the study that was not part of the original set of questions.

Another limitation to this study is the factor of time. This meant that the time aspect limited the amount of empirical data I was able to collect, as I had to start to compile the result of the questionnaire. A larger sample size would of course have been preferable to give the result of this study greater credibility (Bryman 2011).

3.3 Ethical considerations
Bryman (2011) writes about ethical principles and their importance for anyone participating in a research study. Voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymous participation and integrity are questions that are of concern when it comes to ethics of a study. Swedish science has a set frame of principles that concern ethics while performing a scientific study. First, there
is the demand of information (*informationskravet*) which says that any informants of a study should have been made aware of the aim of the study. Secondly, it says that informants should be informed that participation is voluntary, and that it is possible to quite the participation at any point. Thirdly, they should also get information about what different elements the study includes. In addition to this, there is also the demand of consent (*samtyckeskravet*), which means that any participant should be able to decide for themselves to participate, and if they are not of age, parental acceptance might be needed. Furthermore, the demand of confidentiality (*konfidentialitetskravet*) must be considered. The demand of confidentiality means that any information about informants can under no circumstances be leaked to anyone who is not authorised. In addition, the information is confidential and must be treated delicately. Lastly, the collected data can only be used in the purpose of the study and for nothing else because of the demand of use (*nyttjandekravet*) (Bryman 2011; Vetenskapsrådet 2002). All of the ethical principles above were considered and fulfilled during this study.

4. Results and analysis

This section addresses the results of the questionnaire and an analysis of the results in relation to previous research. The analysis will mainly focus on the results in relation to game-based learning (Felicia et al. 2014) and Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci 2000). The questions will be presented in this section, but not in the exact order in which they were asked in the questionnaire. The structure of the results will be based on the research questions, and the results are split into four separate sections that will discuss different themes. The tool used to compile results did not provide the opportunity to compare different respondent groups’ answers to each other, e.g. what the females answered compared to the males on a specific question.

4.1 General information

This part addresses the general information collected about the informants to provide a clear view of who participated in the study. The general information includes the information about the informants’ gender and what grade they attended.

115 students attending junior high school and high school in Sweden participated in this study. Out of the 115 students 63 (54.8%) were female, 51 (44.3%) were male, whereas one (0.9%) student chose to refer to themself as other, which is illustrated in figure 2.
Figure 2. Illustration of the distribution of answers regarding gender.

The students were questioned what grade they were in and had six different options to choose from, year 7 - 9 at junior high school and year 1 - 3 at high school. As none of the students who took part attended year 7 in junior high school, this means that the age span of students should be between 14 – 19. Despite the fact that no students attended year 7 in junior high school, most of the students participating in the study actually attended junior high school, with 54 (47%) students attending year 8 and 24 (20.9%) attending year 9. As for the students attending high school, 17 (14.8%) students attended year 1, 12 (10.4%) students attended year 2, and 8 (7%) students attended year 3, as can be seen in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3. Illustration of the distribution of answers regarding what school year the students attended.
The students participating in the study came from five different schools. 115 informants and a range of five different schools is considered enough for the study to be valid and reliable (Bryman 2011).

4.2 Student screen time off school

The questionnaire contained a question (question 5, see Appendix 2) where the students were asked to estimate how many hours they spent using either a computer, iPad, or smartphone during their spare time on a daily basis. When estimating how many hours they spent they got to choose between six different options which were: less than one, 1 - 2, 2 - 3, 3 - 4, 4 - 5 and more than 5 hours, and the results can be seen in Figure 4 below.

How many hours do you use a computer/iPad/smartphone in your spare time on a daily basis?

Out of the six options available, only three (2.6%) students claimed to use the devices less than one hour, while 19 (16.5%) students claimed to use them more than 5 hours on a daily basis. In addition, almost 55% put themselves among the three highest options. Among the 55%, most of these students, almost a third, estimated that they spend 2 – 3 hours using the devices on a daily basis. The majority of the students estimated that they use computers, iPads, or smartphones, at least 3 hours a day which suggests that Prensky’s (2007) claim that they belong to a new generation may be true, although the Games Generation which he calls it is perhaps not the best name for them. The reason it may not be the best name, is that this study showed that only a third (33.6%) of the students play computer or video games, as can be seen in Figure 5 below. This means that there is an extensive daily use of either computers, iPads or

Figure 4. The distribution of answers regarding the students’ daily use of computers, iPads, and smartphones in school.
smartphones among the students, but with another purpose than playing computer and/or video games.

![Pie Chart](image)

**Figure 5. Illustration of the distribution of answers regarding whether the students play any computer and/or video games.**

The most commonly mentioned game title among the students who played games were *Fortnite* (14 mentions), followed by *FIFA* (8 mentions), and *Counter-Strike* (6 mentions).

### 4.3 Student screen time in school

This section deals with screen time in school, both when it comes to duration and in what specific subjects they use either computers, iPads or smartphones. The first question (Question 4, see Appendix 2) of the questionnaire about screen time in school gave the students six options to choose from as they were supposed to estimate how many hours they use computers, iPads, and smartphones on a daily basis during school. The options possible were: less than one, 1 - 2, 2 - 3, 3 - 4, 4 - 5 and more than 5 hours. While only three (2.6%) students estimated their use of computers, iPads, or smartphones to 1 hour or less on a daily basis during school, ten (8.7%) students estimated that they spent five or more hours a day using computers, iPads or smartphones. The fact that 97.4% of the answers were split among the five alternatives with one hour or more, and almost two thirds claiming to use computers, iPads or smartphones at least two hours during their day at school was not surprising. According to Skolverket (2015) Sweden is one of the countries with both the greatest access to computers and usage of them in school. The amount of time students spent using computers, iPads or smartphones is shown in Figure 6 below.
Figure 6. Illustration of the distribution of answers regarding hours spent using a computer, iPad or smartphone in school on a daily basis.

When asked in what subjects the students used either computers, iPads, or smartphones (question 6, see Appendix 2) most of them used them in English, which came second highest of all subjects. Only Swedish had a higher percentage. During the lessons in English 85% of the students claimed to use computers, iPads, or smartphones, while 91% of the students did so while studying Swedish, as can be seen in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7. Illustration of the distribution of answers regarding in which subject the students use computers, iPads or smartphones.
The requirement in the new curriculum that students shall work with digital tools during their schooling, (Regeringskansliet 2017) seems to be well underway according to the findings of this study.

4.4 Games in school

When asked about their willingness to include games as a tool for learning, and to rate it from 1 – 5 with 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest (question 9, see Appendix 2), almost a quarter (24.3%) of the students chose option 5. In addition, 19.1% of the students rated their willingness 4 out of 5, 33% 3 out of 5, 12.2% 2 out of 5, and 11.3% 1 out of 5, which can be seen in figure 8 below.

Figure 8. The distribution of answers regarding the students’ willingness to use games as a tool for learning.

The question belonging to Figure 8 reads as follows: On a scale from 1-5, rate how much you would like to use games as a tool for learning, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest.

The answers in Figure 8 support Prensky’s (2007) claim that digital game-based learning is an appealing tool among the Gamers Generation. In addition, the numbers also support the existence of a willingness to include games in education, at least among students. In addition, 71.9% of the students answered yes when asked if they had used games as a tool for learning in school, as is shown in figure 9 below.

I now turn to the students’ use of games as tools for learning in school, which is shown in figure 9.
The fact that as many as 71.9% of the students have used games as a tool for learning in school indicates that their teachers are among those who are willing to include games in education. This can be compared to Åkerfeldt’s (2014) claim that there is an increasing willingness to implement games in education.

Students who answered that they had used games as a tool for learning were also asked to write what games they had played. The most commonly mentioned type of game was mathematics games (29) without any title, while the most commonly mentioned titles were Kahoot (22) and Seterra (17). Kahoot may have been used during English, as well as some of the less mentioned games, but there were no titles of games that are specifically for English mentioned by the students except for one, called the Minnits.

**4.5 Self-Determination theory and Games**

The aim of this study, to find out if and why game-based learning is motivational for Swedish students, was investigated through the following questions in the questionnaire (question 10, 13, 14 and 15, see Appendix 2).

- Question 10: On a scale from 1 - 5 rate how much using games as a tool for learning would motivate you, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest.
- Question 13: What is most important for you when you play a game during your spare time? Rank the following statements in the order you think is most important, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important. The answering options available for this question were: Winning and/or getting recognition form others,
Learning something useful, You have chosen the game and the game fits your needs and/or values, and That the game is interesting and/or fun.

- Question 14: What is the most important for you when you play a game as a tool for learning in school? Rank the following statements in the order you think is most important, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important. The options available for this question were: Rewards, Winning and/or getting recognition form others, Learning something useful, You have chosen the game and the game fits your needs and/or values, and That the game is interesting and/or fun.

- Question 15: What is the most important for you when learning English? Rank the following statements in the order you think is most important, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important. The options available for this question were, from left to right: The grade/other reward, That I become good at English and/or other people think I am good at English, Speaking English will be useful in the future, I think English is important to learn, I think English is interesting and/or fun.

To find out what type of motivation the students have while playing games, as well as when learning English, question 13, 14 and 15 were created with five different answering options, each one representing one of the different Regulatory styles of Ryan and Deci’s (2000) Taxonomy of human motivation, except for amotivation (see Table 1, section 3). As each of these three questions asked the students to rank the answering options from 5 - 1, the answers show a general view of how the students rank the different types of motivation for each of the questions.

First of all, in question 10 the students were asked to appreciate how much using games as a tool for learning would motivate them, and the results for each possible answer were: 1 (7%), 2 (16.7%), 3 (28.9%), 4 (39.7%), and 5 (16.7%), as can be seen below in figure 10.
The idea that digital game-based learning can be used as a tool when students do not find what they are learning intrinsically motivating (Prensky 2007) seems to be true for the majority of the students. In Figure 10, almost half of the students rated their motivation to use games as a tool for learning either with “4” or “5”, and only 7% rated it “1”. With this in mind, the conclusion can be drawn that using games as a tool for learning would be positively embraced by the students as their motivation to work with games is high.

Another question concerned what was important to the students when playing games during their spare time, which figure 11 shows.
Figure 11. Illustration of what students ranked as most important while playing a game during their spare time.

As can be seen in Figure 11, the answers are widely spread among the answering options. However, “That the game is interesting and/or fun” was by far the most popular option to pick as the most important, as well as, the least frequent option picked as least important. This indicates that the intrinsic motivation is the most important type of motivation when it comes to playing games during the spare time for the students who took part in this study. If the students feel intrinsic motivation they will, according to Deci and Vansteenkiste (2004) not need any other rewards or separate outcomes from playing the game, meaning that the game itself is fulfilling enough.

Figure 12 below, shows the distribution of what the students thought was the most important while playing a game as a tool for learning in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewards.</th>
<th>Winning and / or getting recognition form others.</th>
<th>Learning something useful.</th>
<th>You have chosen the game and the game fits your needs and / or values.</th>
<th>That the game is interesting and/or fun.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Illustration of what students ranked as most important while playing a game as a tool for learning in school.

Just like Figure 11, Figure 12 deals with playing games. However, in Figure 11, the question was about games played during students’ spare time and figure 12 is about playing games as a tool for learning in school. In Figure 12 we can see that “Learning something useful”, representing identification in SDT (Ryan & Deci 2000), is by far the most commonly picked answer as the most important factor while playing a game as a tool for learning. In addition, only two students recognised “Learning something useful” as the least important of the five options. “Rewards”, representing the external regulation of SDT (Ryan & Deci 2000), was picked as the least important factor by the students when playing a game as a tool for learning.

In Figure 13 the result regarding what was important to the students when learning English is shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The grade/other reward</th>
<th>That I become good at English and/or other people think I am good at English.</th>
<th>Speaking English will be useful in the future.</th>
<th>I think English is important to learn.</th>
<th>I think English is interesting and/or fun.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 13. Illustration of what the students ranked as the most important for them while learning English.

In Figure 13 the students ranked what they found most important while learning English. When it comes to which option was the most important, “That I become good at English and/or other
people think I am good at English”, representing introjection in SDT came in first, closely followed by “Speaking English will be useful in the future”, representing identification in SDT (Ryan & Deci 2000). “I think English is interesting and/or fun”, representing intrinsic motivation in SDT (Ryan & Deci 2000), was considered the least important option among the students.

When comparing the results of Figure 11, 12 and 13 we can see that they all had different alternatives picked as the most popular ones, as well as a wide spread of variation among the answers from the students. Both Figure 11 and 12 dealt with playing games, although in different settings. The students answered the questions differently as the setting changed from spare time to school. When considering Ryan & Deci’s (2000) different regulatory styles, it seems that when the setting switches, so does the type of motivation among the students. In addition, it would seem that when games are used as a tool for learning the students think that the outcomes of the game are more important than when playing during their spare time. The same mind-set seems to apply when learning English, as the aspects of becoming good at English, or recognised as a good at English, and that English will become useful to know in the future was the most important for the student, making the outcomes of the activity the most important for them, which would imply that they find extrinsic factors the most important when learning English. Furthermore, the importance that it is fun / interesting was the least important while learning English, in contrast to when playing a game during their spare time, which had the option of being fun / interesting as the most important. This gives further confirmation to the claim that motivation is perceived differently, both between individuals and between different activities (Ryan & Deci 2000). Therefore, using the tool of game-based learning as one of the methods in an EFL-classroom, as well as using varied types of games, is one method that may motivate students, as has been found by this study.

The final question of the questionnaire was an open question where the students were asked in what way they thought they learn English best (question 16, see Appendix 2). Some students listed more than one thing they learnt best from. Among the 94 individual answers, 16 of them answered either that they learn English best from games, or that they learn best from games as one of the things they learn best from. Other commonly listed answers were listening, speaking, reading, watching movies and school related answers e.g. vocabulary practice and doing exercises, as can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2. The best way to learn English, according to the students.
The best way to learn English, according to the students in this study (the eight most common answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking / discussing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/Series or clips e.g. YouTube clips</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary homework</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework / Studying / repetition</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other answers than the top eight most common answers listed above were not mentioned enough times to be considered significant for the study. Out of the 94 individual answers collected for question 16 (see Appendix 2), 48 of them either included two or more different ways in which they thought they learn English best, e.g. speaking and listening, or answered “variation” which would imply that they learn best from varied education with different approaches. Considering what the students answered in Table 2, as for how they learn English the best, it should mean that for many of them game-based learning, with an appropriate game, would probably be greatly beneficial. This is because the aspects of writing, listening, reading and speaking, could all be included as elements of a game. Furthermore, as speaking/discussing was the most common answer, it would imply that the social interaction between individuals is an important factor when learning language. The social interaction is a central part of some games and while playing them the opportunity to learn and acquire language is great (Ryu 2013).

5. Pedagogical implications

This section will focus on a didactical approach based on the findings of this study as well as previous research, and it will focus on how and why game-based learning would be a beneficial method for the EFL-classroom.

First of all, the question of why game-based learning should be part of the EFL-classroom will be addressed. There are many ways and many different methods to teach language, and game-based learning is one of them. It is up to the teacher to choose what tool to use to reach the goals, and with that in mind would it not be optimal to work with tools that the students appreciate using? This study found that students are not only willing but also motivated by
using games as a tool for learning. This increase in motivation occurred regardless of what they were supposed to do, as using games as a tool for learning would be a factor of motivation on its own to some students (see Figure 10). This suggests that using game-based learning would be a great tool to use while educating students. Furthermore, the possibility to include game-based learning as part of the education would not be a problem as Skolverket (2015) claims that the access to computers in the Swedish school system is sufficient.

Not only is it important that game-based learning is a tool that students are willing to use, it is also vital that learning is the outcome of using it. It is important that students learn while being in school and this study has shown that this is something they value as well. This makes the study by Sundqvist and Wikström (2015) very interesting as they found a connection between English L2 acquisition and gaming among Swedish 9th graders, which confirmed the findings of previous research on the subject. In addition, the fact that Neville et al. (2009) found that digital game-based learning was beneficial as it helped acquiring language skills in German, as well as the acquisition of cultural knowledge, is further scientific evidence that game-based learning is a tool that works in the process of acquiring a language.

Concerning how game-based learning should be implemented in language education the suggestion to use varied types of games is brought forth. This was also part of the results of this study as students are motivated by different things, which confirmed the ideas of Ryan & Deci (2000) that motivation depends on the individual and the activity. Therefore, using different games, or having a few games to choose from, would be preferable as the likelihood of motivating more students would be greater with more options or variation. In addition, the findings regarding how students learn English best according to themselves had a great number of elements that can be found in gaming, such as, reading, writing, speaking and listening. This, along with the fact that there were some students who thought that gaming itself was the best way for them to learn further strengthens the claim that game-based learning would be a profitable tool to use in English education. Furthermore, their study about language learning while playing World of Warcraft, where players learnt the game through communication, interaction, and completing objectives, is one example of a game involving social meetings that has proven to work as a tool for language acquisition in practice.

6. Conclusion
In conclusion, even if a sample of 115 students from five different schools may not necessarily be representative for all students attending junior high school and high school in Sweden, the
The findings of this study may still be relevant, because the findings provide a general picture of the students’ motivation and willingness toward the inclusion of game-based learning.

The aim of this study was to find out if and why game-based learning is motivational for Swedish students. Additionally, this study focused on game-based digital learning tools in the teaching and learning of English in Sweden and students were asked to state what factors are important from a motivational aspect when using games as a tool for learning. All in all, this study has been successful in finding out more about Swedish students’ motivation related to game-based learning. The findings of this study correlate with earlier research from Neville et al. (2009), seeing that many students would be willing to include games as a tool for learning. Åkerfeldt (2014) claimed that there is a willingness to implement games in education with the expectation to increase student motivation and commitment. This was also confirmed by the results of this study, as it has shown that both willingness and motivation to use game-based learning is high among the students. Combined with the fact that over 70% of the students claimed to have used games in their schooling is a sign that some teachers share the same willingness to include game-based learning as their students. Furthermore, the willingness of including games in education in combination with the new curricula containing an increased focus on digital tools (Regeringskansliet 2017), and the huge access to computers in the Swedish school system (Skolverket 2015) hints that game-based learning is probably here to stay as part of the future of schooling.

Ryan and Deci’s (2000) claim that intrinsic motivation is individual and that extrinsic motivation is created between an individual and an activity, is confirmed by the results of this study. This was shown by the result of Figure 11 (p.21), Figure 12 (p.22), and Figure 13 (p.23) where the students had to rank what was most important for them in different scenarios as all had a wide representation of answers among them. In other words, the results of the three figures show that the students are motivated by different things. This was clear since the different answering options of the three figures all were very different from one another. As for playing games, it was somewhat expected that the student would be motivated by other things while playing them at home (Figure 11, p.21) in comparison to playing games in school (Figure 12 p.22). A conclusion when comparing the two figures when it comes to motivational aspects of playing games is that the game itself is enough for most students while playing at home to motivate them, but while playing in school other motivational aspects, the outcomes from playing the game, are more important to the students than the game itself.

An interesting and unexpected finding of this study was found in the results of Figure 13 (p.23). The unexpectedness came from the low priority students gave the answer “The grade /
other reward” on question 15 (see Appendix 2). That answering option was expected to gain high priority on the outset.

When it comes to the method used to conduct this study the quantitative research method of using a questionnaire has been favourable, especially since the collection of the data was conducted online with the help of Google forms, which was quick and easy to use. Additionally, the method was beneficial as time and management of the data was very efficient. However, even if using a questionnaire has positive aspects there are negative ones as well. Other methods e.g. interviews, might have brought more information that could have been valuable for the study, although for this study little information from many rather than much information from a few was considered favourable. The reason this was seen as favourable is because of the hope to gain a more representative view of Swedish students in general, and the data collection from many increases the possibility of accurateness.

I suggest further studies to collect more information about motivation and game-based learning. In addition, I suggest studies investigating specific games, and their possible impact on the acquisition of L2 English. The more information we can collect about motivation and game-based learning the better we can understand how to implement it and when, as well as to gain greater understanding of its effects. This is especially important as digital competence and working with digital tools during school is soon to be a part of the Swedish syllabus (Regeringskansliet 2017), meaning that game-based learning in the Swedish school system may likely rise. Therefore, the importance to investigate what games would be suitable to use in school and for which specific purposes becomes relevant, especially as this study found that many students had used game-based learning in school. But the variety in games was very low as only a few games were mentioned by the students when asked what games they had used in school. On a final note, I would like to stress the importance of remembering that game-based learning is a tool that targets educational purposes (Felicia et al. 2014), and that games should not be used for the sake of simply entertaining students. We also need to make sure that it becomes a tool that targets the educational purposes we strive to reach.
References


Skolverket, 2017b. Tydligare om digital kompetens i läroplaner, kursplaner och ämnesplaner. 


Appendix 1 Letter

Jag uppskattar verkligen om ni kan tänka er att avvara några minuter åt en kortenkätundersökning som sen kommer bli underlag till min undersökning. Deltagande i undersökningen för eleverna är frivilligt och svaren anonyma.
Om du har frågor kan du kontakta mig och/eller min handledare via mail.
Mail till mig, Calle Ljungberg: cl222uh@student.lnu.se
Mail till handledare, Christina Rosén: christina.rosen@lnu.se

Mvh Calle

Link to online version of the Questionnaire:
https://goo.gl/forms/8u6xB72rA2sueJo82 (link is now closed)

Appendix 2 Questionnaire

The following questions are in both Swedish and English, try to answer them the best you can. You may answer the questions in either Swedish or English.

Allmän information / General information

1. Kön / Gender
   Man / Male   Kvinna / Female   Annat / Other

2. Läsår / School year
   Årskurs 7 / Year 7   Årskurs 8 / Year 8   Årskurs 9 / Year 9
   Årskurs 1 gymnasiet / Year 1 high school   Årskurs 2 gymnasiet / Year 2 high school
   Årskurs 3 gymnasiet / Year 3 high school

3. Vilken skola går du på / What school are you attending?
Frågor / Questions

4. Hur många timmar använder du dator/iPad/mobiltelefon i skolan per dag? / How many hours do you use a computer/iPad/smartphone in school on a daily basis?
Mindre än 1 / Less than 1
1 – 2 2 – 3 3 – 4 4 – 5 Mer än 5 / More than 5
5. Hur många timmar använder du dator/iPad/mobiltelefon på fritiden per dag? / How many hours do you use a computer/iPad/smartphone in your spare time on a daily basis?
Mindre än 1 / Less than 1
1 – 2 2 – 3 3 – 4 4 – 5 Mer än 5 / More than 5
6. I vilka ämnen använder du dator/iPad/mobiltelefon? / In which subjects do you use computers/iPads/smartphones?
Biologi Engelska Fysik Geografi Historia Idrott och hälsa
Kemi Matematik Naturkunskap Religionskunskap
Samhällskunskap Svenska Teknik
7. Spelar du dator och/eller tv-spel? / Do you play any computer and/or video games?
Ja / Yes Nej / No
8. Om ja, vilket/vilka spel spelar du? / If yes, what game/games do you play?
9. På en skala från 1-5, uppskatta hur gärna du skulle vilja använda spel som ett verktyg för lärande, där 1 är lägst och 5 är högst. / On a scale from 1-5, rate how much you would like to use games as a tool for learning, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest.
1 2 3 4 5
10. På en skala från 1-5 uppskatta hur mycket spel som ett verktyg för lärande skulle motivera dig, 1 är lägst och 5 är högst / On a scale from 1-5 rate how much using games as a tool for learning would motivate you, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest.
1 2 3 4 5
11. Har ni använt något spel som medel för lärande i skolan? / Have you used any game as a tool for learning in school?
Ja / Yes Nej / No
12. Om ja, vilket eller vilka spel har ni använt? / If yes, which game/games have you used?
13. Vad är viktigast för dig när du spelar ett spel på fritiden? Ranka följande påståenden efter vilket som du tycker är viktigast, 5 är viktigast och 1 är minst viktigt / What is most important for you when you play a game during your spare time? Rank the following statements in the order you think is most important, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important.
Pris/belöning / Rewards.
Vinna och/eller få erkännande från andra. / Winning and/or getting recognition form others.
Att lära dig något du har nytta av / Learning something useful.
Att du har valt spel och det passar dina behov och/eller värderingar. / You have chosen the game and the game fits your needs and/or values.
Att spelet intresserar dig och/eller är kul. / That the game is interesting and/or fun.
14. Vad är viktigast för dig när du använder ett spel i skolan som medel för lärande? Ranka följande påståenden efter vilket som du tycker är viktigast, 5 är viktigast och 1 är minst viktigt
What is the most important for you when you play a game as a tool for learning in school?
Rank the following statements in the order you think is most important, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important.
Pris/belöning / Rewards.
Vinna och/eller få erkännande från andra. / Winning and/or getting recognition form others.
Att lära dig något du har nytta av / Learning something useful.
Att du har valt spel och det passar dina behov och/eller värderingar. / You have chosen the game and the game fits your needs and/or values.
Att spelet intresserar dig och/eller är kul. / That the game is interesting and/or fun.
15. Vad är viktigast för dig när du lär dig engelska? Ranka följande påståenden efter vilket som du tycker är viktigast, 5 är viktigast och 1 är minst viktigt
What is the most important for you when learning English?
Rank the following statements in the order you think is most important, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important.
Betyget/annan belöning / The grade/other reward
Att jag blir bra på engelska och/eller andra tycker jag är bra på engelska / That I become good at English and/or other people think I am good at English.
Engelska kan vara användbart i framtiden. / Speaking English will be useful in the future.
Jag tycker det är viktigt att lära mig engelska. / I think English is important to learn.
Jag tycker engelska är intressant och/eller kul. / I think English is interesting and/or fun.
16. På vilket sätt tycker du att du lär dig engelska bäst? / In what way do you think you learn English the best?
Thank you so much for your participation!