Abstract

The aim of this research was to highlight the impact of online education on teaching and learning English as a foreign language among students aged 12-19, and to research the importance of learner autonomy and motivation in the online teaching – learning process. In order to collect data from the 81 subjects, members of five different classes and age groups, a questionnaire created in Google Forms was used. The questionnaire was designed to provide information about the students’ attitude and motivation for studying English in an online context, autonomy and effort invested in the learning process. Student progress was measured using the end of semester grades of the first semester of the 2019/2020 year compared to those of the first 2020/2021 semester. Results reveal the importance of perceived choice as a factor that supports learner autonomy and learner motivation. The limitations of the study are due to the fact that the students’ level of English and their previous knowledge of the subjects studied online had not been tested beforehand as the current pandemic situation was not foreseeable.
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Introduction

The year 2020 has brought about changes none of us could have predicted, unless you were maybe a physicist researching network theories. The emerging situation was seen as a possibility to experience new circumstances, platforms, teaching methods. We were so concerned with how we were performing under the given circumstances that it was not until we met with our students face-to-face that we realized to what extent they had been affected. This was the moment it was decided we needed numbers to reflect what we had been suspecting.

In September 2020 when it was clear we would continue to use the online space for the teaching-learning process, we decided to carry out a research delving into learning English online during the Covid-19 season. There were two research questions we were eager to find answers to:

• Based on the compared grades and questionnaire results, how has learning English entirely online affected students’ achievement and what is their perception of this period?

• What are the learner characteristics which influenced student achievement the most?

It was supposed that learning English online was not a complete failure and that the majority of our students were able to cope with and make full use of the given circumstances. It was also presumed that transferring the teaching-learning context online has affected more those pupils who lacked or showed low levels of intrinsic motivation and displayed low levels of learner autonomy. Furthermore, those learners who did not prove to be autonomous learners in control of the learning situation would be the ones who had experienced failure. Presumably, more young learners were affected negatively than older students.

The term that is repeatedly used in this paper is motivation, so we will start by giving it a definition. Motivation is a ‘general’ (Ellis, 1985: 100) type of modifiable factor, i.e. it may change through the years, during the language learning process. This unstable individual learner variable
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stands for a complex of features, attitudes, beliefs or prejudice each learner brings to the learning situation.

For the present research we considered the theories put forward by Deci & Ryan (1985) who distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic motives for performing an activity. Their work in the field of psychology later led to the development of the self-determination theory (referred to as SDT). This theory highlights the important role intrinsic motivation plays in achieving success in any activity. According to this theory three basic, universal and innate psychological needs should be fulfilled in order to achieve a positive outcome in an educational setting. As long as the individual, in the present case the learner, is offered the possibility to make their own choices about how to acquire knowledge, is presented with opportunities to develop the skills necessary to succeed and all this in an environment which supports growth, most certainly aims will be fulfilled.

### Purpose

The present research emerged from the unforeseeable situation created by the Covid-19 virus: transferring the teaching-learning process completely online. It is important to be noted that in the Nagy Mózes High School in Kézdivásárhely, Romania, the teaching-learning process has always been a face-to-face activity. What is more, there has not previously existed a well-defined platform to be used for online education.

After the first week of quarantine it was believed that the teaching-learning process should be resumed. The teachers took part in online courses targeting online education while at the same time holding classes for their students, experimenting and testing different platforms, learning sites.

The idea of carrying out a research was sparked after the first month of online education, when positive feedback was received about the whole process. It was decided that a research be conducted in this topic to investigate the effect of learning English online on students’ academic results.

Furthermore, we were interested to find out their perception of this period of learning English online. It is important to mention here that it is student perception of the online learning process and not performance that is being discussed. We were curious to see whether they were interested in the activities offered, whether they felt competent while performing them, whether they felt they had a choice about performing them. It was also important to research whether the students thought this process was useful to them and how much effort, if any, they put into this process.

There are, however, two other aspects which remain to be examined in a further research. At the beginning of the research process two other factors which, as it is believed now, might have influenced student perception were overlooked: pressure and relatedness. In this context pressure would refer to the students’ tension or anxiety as far as the learning English online process is concerned. Researching relatedness would provide us with information about the relationships they had with peers and even teachers during this period.

Last, but not least, we were keen to examine the learner characteristics which influenced student achievement the most. It was supposed that the age factor plays a crucial role in this process, that younger students would be more affected than the older ones by the transition of the English language learning context to online.

It was believed that the research would reveal a connection between failure and lack of learner autonomy, on the one hand and lack of motivation (either intrinsic or extrinsic) on the other hand. Our hypothesis was that those students who exhibit intrinsic motivation for learning English, who are autonomous learners and who feel that they are in control of their environment, did not suffer during online education. Presumably, they saw it as a challenge and handled it as one.

### Research design and Methods

#### The Instrument

In order to collect the data necessary for this research it was decided to use an instrument created by Ryan & Deci (2000) ‘intended to assess participants’ subjective experience related to a target activity’, in this case, learning English online. A template for the questionnaire is available online on the SDT website1 which was founded by Richard Ryan, Edward Deci, Shannon Hoefen Cerasoli and Kelly Lemos. There are several ready-made questionnaires and templates on the website which are free to use for research purposes. Each
questionnaire page contains the scale, the description of the scale, a key and references for further reading. These questionnaires can be tailored to the needs of the research.

It was chosen to adapt the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (referred to as IMI)\(^2\) which is a consistent and reliable instrument designed to assess the learners’ subjective perception related to learning English online during the covid-19 pandemic situation. The questionnaire shared with the learners was created in Google Forms and administered online to a group of 83 students.

The subjects of the present research were informed both orally and by the questionnaire that the data gathered would be used only for the purposes of this research. Moreover, they were reassured that not completing or scoring low on the questionnaire will in no way affect their school results. The students were informed that their participation was voluntary and the answers would remain confidential.

The questionnaire was administered online and the average time of completing it was 15 minutes. The language of the questionnaire was English, however assistance in Hungarian was provided for students aged 12-15.

The Learning English Online Questionnaire contains two sections: the first one, consisting of two questions, provides information about the subjects’ age and name, while the second part is made up of 35 items which collect information into five different categories and one open ended question related to whether students felt there was a difference between learning English online as compared to other subjects. For the 35 items the subjects had to choose on a scale from 1 to 5 how true the statements are for them: 1 meaning not true at all, 3 somewhat true, 5 completely true.

Results were collected into five categories: interest/enjoyment, value/usefulness, perceived choice, effort/importance and perceived competence. There are seven sub-categories to collect information into proposed by Ryan and Deci in the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory scale description from which we chose to use only the five above mentioned ones for the present research. At the time the scale was created we did not consider that the other two sub-categories, namely relatedness and pressure/tension would be relevant for the study.

- **Value/ usefulness**
  Items 1, 4, 8, 9, 13, 22, 27, 30, 32 belong to this sub-category. Scoring high at this category means the subjects feel that learning English online had a considerable amount of value for them, which reflects extrinsic motivation. It also indicates the degree of perceived usefulness shown by the learners.

- **Perceived choice**
  Eight items of the questionnaire (2, 11R, 12, 16R, 25R, 29R, 31R, 34) belong to this sub-category, five of which need to be reverse scored as they are negative statements. The items of this category are meant to check to what extent the learners felt they had a choice about learning English in an online setting.

- **Interest/enjoyment**
  Items number 3, 5, 10, 20, 21R, 26, 28 of the questionnaire indicate whether the learners are involved and intrinsically motivated for learning English online. Item 21R is a negative statement whose score was reversed when analysing the results.

- **Effort/Importance**
  The five items (6, 14, 17R, 19, 23R) of this sub-category had as a role to reflect the effort the students put into learning English online. A further aim was to present the degree to which the learners thought this activity was important. Items 17 and 23 are negative statements which need to be reverse scored.

- **Perceived competence**
  Items number 7R, 15, 18, 24, 33, 35 collect information about the learners’ perceived competence. This sub-category provides information about how efficient and skilful the subjects perceived to have performed during the English lessons.

**Official school records**

It was decided to use the official school records containing the students’ end of semester results in English for the first semester of 2020 and the first semester of 2021 to examine in what ways was student performance in English influenced by the fact that learning was transferred online.
Subjects

The subjects of the research were 83 learners aged 12-19, all of them students of Nagy Mózes High School, Kézdivásárhely, Romania. Previous to the pandemic situation these students had never taken part in online learning.

On March 23rd 2020, when the teaching process was moved online the Zoom video conferencing service was chosen as there was no consensus about which platform to be used. Later, our school decided to move teaching to the Google Classroom and we have been using the whole G Suite ever since.

800 students attend Nagy Mozes High School. However, in the present study it was decided to include only those learners who studied English with us during the online period. The pandemic situation, especially the quarantine period and teaching online was a novelty both for my students and us. Our main interest was to find out their opinion and perception about this period.

Shortcomings

The study was supposed to involve 100 learners. However, as it was not compulsory to participate, 19 students chose not to complete the questionnaire shared with them online or completed it after the due date. This way their answers could not be taken into account for this research.

Results

The 35 items of the questionnaire could be scored on a scale from 1 to 5; 1 meaning not true at all, 3 somewhat true and 5 completely true. Consequently, scores 3 or above were considered positive scores, a low but positive result as far as my research is concerned.

Table 1. General results

| Interest/Enjoyment | Value/Usefulness | Perceived choice | Effort/Importance | Perceived competence |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Mean score         | 3.72             | 3.66             | 3.20              | 3.62                | 3.58                |
| Scores ≥3          | 68               | 66               | 54                | 69                  | 70                  |
| Results in %       | 83,95            | 81,48            | 66,66             | 85,18               | 86,41               |
| Scores ≤2.99       | 13               | 15               | 27                | 12                  | 11                  |
| Results in %       | 16,02            | 18,52            | 33,33             | 14,82               | 13,59               |

The mean score for the sub-category of interest/enjoyment is 3.72. This is the highest mean score of all five categories. 68 students, meaning 83.95% of the subjects scored 3 or above in this category. This sub-category indicates whether the learners were intrinsically motivated to learn English online, whether they enjoyed doing it just because it was fun.

Scoring high in the value/usefulness sub-category indicates extrinsic motivation: completing the tasks, taking part in the lessons in order to receive good grades, to be able to pass an exam, to improve concentration or to improve themselves in general. 88.48% of the subjects of this study proved to be extrinsically motivated to learn English in a online context. The mean score for this sub-category is 3.66. 66 learners stating that they found the lessons and activities useful for their personal improvement.

3.20 is the mean score for perceived choice, 54 subjects scoring at least 3 on the items which examine whether the learners felt as if they had a choice about learning English online. This sub-category has the lowest mean score among the five sub-categories. Results show that 66.66% of the learners felt that they had some choice about the learning situation and 33.33% believed that it was imposed on them.

The mean score for the effort/importance sub-category is 3.62. Although it is not the highest mean score, it is important to mention that in this sub-category nobody scored 1 and only 4 people scored 2 for item 6 (“It was important for me to do well in this task - learning English online”). The mean score for item 6 is 4.22, which is a high score. 85.18% of the subjects thought they put a lot of effort/energy into the learning process and they tried hard while learning English online.

The mean score for the sub-category dealing with perceived competence is 3.58. Despite the new learning situation 70 out of 81 students stated that they were quite skilled at learning English online and felt quite competent about using the online platforms for learning purposes. For item 7 (“Learning English online was something that I couldn’t do very well”), which needed to be reverse scored, none of the students checked 5 on
the scale, meaning none of them felt this statement was completely true for them. This proves that all the students felt competent to a certain extent even if they had never participated in online lessons before.

Three sub-categories, perceived choice, value/usefulness and perceived competence contain sub-category average scores which are lower than 2. In total there are 5 such scores. The fact that 3 out of 5 (1.00, 1.63, 1.75) belong to perceived choice reflects that the learners felt they did not have enough say about learning English online.

One of the aims of the research was to reveal to what extent has going online with learning English affected learners’ academic results. For this purpose, the learners’ final marks in English language for the first semester of the 2019/2020 academic year were compared with the results of the first semester of the 2020/2021 academic year.

The numbers show that there is no change in the academic results with 55.55% (N=45) of the learners. 16.04% (N=13) show an improvement in their marks as far as English language is concerned. Nevertheless, 28.39% (N=23) of the subjects witnessed a decline in their results.

The numbers following the comparison of the students’ results from the two semesters show that the teaching-learning process did not suffer as a result of transferring it completely online. 70.44% of the learners either reached the same academic achievements or even improved them.

The second research question targeted those individuals who have been affected by going online. Firstly, we will take a look at those who performed poorly during the online period, whose academic results worsened. The numbers show that 23 out of 81 learners (29.56%) witnessed a worsening in their academic results in English. 15 of these 23 learners belong to the 12-15 age group, which means that 65.21% of the lower scoring and under-achieving students are the younger ones.

Table 2. Students’ results for the low scoring group

|                      | Interest/ Enjoyment | Value/ Usefulness | Perceived choice | Effort/ Importance | Perceived competence |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Mean score           | 3.65                | 3.52              | 3.15             | 3.50               | 3.49                |
| Scores ≥3            | 19                  | 18                | 13               | 21                 | 20                  |
| Results in %         | 82,60               | 78.26             | 56.52            | 91.30              | 86.95               |
| Scores ≤2.99         | 4                   | 5                 | 10               | 2                  | 3                   |
| Results in %         | 17,40               | 21.74             | 43.48            | 8,70               | 13,05               |

The results of this group of students show that the mean score for the interest/enjoyment sub-category is 3.63, slightly less than that of the whole group. 82.60 % of this group would be considered intrinsically motivated, even though their level of motivation is quite low.

For the value/usefulness sub-category the mean score is 3.52. As it has been stated before, this sub-category stands for extrinsic motivation. Results show that 78.26% of the learners in this group are extrinsically motivated despite not performing well at school.

Perceived choice is present with the lowest mean score, 3.15. Almost half of the students, 43.48% of this group of learners felt that they did not have a choice about the current learning situation. They felt like it was not their decision to participate in the online learning lessons, use the platforms offered. 3.15 is the lowest average score of the five sub-categories.

91.30% of the students from this group felt that they had tried quite hard and had put effort and energy into the online learning process. The mean score for the effort/importance sub-category is 3.50, slightly lower than that of the average for the 81 learners.

The mean score for perceived competence is 3.49, meaning that 86.95% of these learners felt somewhat competent about using the online platforms where the learning was transferred. These learners felt that only after some time into online learning did they experience success.

Although not intended from the beginning, the data collected lead us to interpret the results for the high scoring group of students also. The number of these students is 13 (16.04%). At this point it was decided to include 22 more students in this analysis as these are the ones whose end of semester results for both periods I taken into consideration was 10 (the highest possible mark in the Romanian school system). Logically, these students had no possibility to perform better, as far as the grades are concerned.
Table 3. Students’ results for the two high scoring groups

|               | Interest/Enjoyment | Value/Usefulness | Perceived choice | Effort/Importance | Perceived competence |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Mean score G1 | 3.68                | 3.60             | 3.01             | 3.71              | 3.35                |
| Scores ≥4     | 4                   | 4                | 2                | 7                 | 1                   |
| Scores ≤2.99  | 1                   | 2                | 6                | 2                 | 2                   |
| Mean score G2 | 3.73                | 3.83             | 3.58             | 3.81              | 3.93                |
| Scores ≥4     | 7                   | 13               | 4                | 10                | 11                  |
| Scores ≤2.99  | 4                   | 4                | 2                | 4                 | 1                   |

1 G1=the 13 students whose results got better, G2= the students who had the same grade 10 for both semesters.

We also analyzed the results of the five sub-categories excluding scores ranging from 3 to 3.99. Table 4. contains these results along with the data in percentage calculated for each category.

Table 4. Results ranging from 1-2.99 and 4-5

|               | Interest/Enjoyment | Value/Usefulness | Perceived choice | Effort/Importance | Perceived competence |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Scores ≥4     | 27                  | 28               | 7                | 20                | 19                  |
| Results in %  | 67,5\(^1\)          | 65,11            | 20,58            | 62,5              | 63,33               |
| Scores ≤2.99  | 13                  | 15               | 27               | 12                | 11                  |
| Results in %  | 32,5                | 34,88            | 79,41            | 37,5              | 36,66               |

\(^1\) Percentage was calculated out of the total number of students for each sub-category.

The numbers show that more than 60% of the students were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to learn English in an online context. They invested energy in the process and perceived it as important. Furthermore, the majority of the subjects even felt competent about what they were doing. Nevertheless, there is one sub-category for which 20,58% of the subjects considered for this analysis scored low, and that is the perceived choice.

Table 5. Intrinsic motivation index for the 81 students

| Level of motivation | Mean scores | No Students |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|
| low                 | ≤2.99       | 9           |
| medium              | 3-3.99      | 58          |
| high                | ≥4          | 14          |

Table 5. presents the intrinsic motivation index for the 81 students in total. There are 9 subjects who exhibit a low motivation index (≤2.99), and 14 learners who scored ≥4 in total for the five sub-categories. The majority of students, 58 learners, scored between 3 and 3.99, thus expressing a medium level of intrinsic motivation.

As a next step, in Table 6, the data received from the comparison of three groups was analyzed: G1= the group with improved marks (N=13), G2= the group with the same marks of 10 for both semesters (N=23), G3= the group with worsened marks (N=23). The table contains only the results in % for scores ≥3 as 3 already indicates the presence of motivation.

Table 6. Compared results for G1, G2 and G3

| Groups | Interest/ involvement | Value/ usefulness | Perceived choice | Effort/ importance | Perceived Competence |
|--------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| G1     | 92,30\(^1\)           | 84,61             | 53,84            | 84,61             | 84,61               |
| G2     | 82,60                 | 82,60             | 91,30            | 82,60             | 95,65               |
| G3     | 82,60                 | 78,26             | 56,52            | 91,30             | 86,95               |

\(^1\) Data is presented in %

Compared results show that more learners belonging to G1 were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to learn English in an online context than in G2 and G3. All members of G2 except two believed that they had choice about learning English online. Despite receiving lower marks, 91,30% of the members of G3 felt that they had invested effort and energy into the learning process as they felt it was important.
As a last step in data interpretation, we took a look at the intrinsic motivation index for the members of G1, G2 and G3. It was needed to do this as the previous step indicated that it is the members of G2, those who had final marks 10 for both semesters, who displayed both high levels of intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, invested a lot of effort into this learning process, believed they had performed well during this period and, most importantly, felt they had quite a great amount of choice, which in fact refers to learner autonomy.

Table 7. IMI for G1, G2 and G3

|       | G1 | G2 | G3 |
|-------|----|----|----|
| Scores >3 | 11 \(^1\) | 23 | 19 |
| Result in % | 84.61 | 100 | 82 |

\(^1\) Number of students

The results presented in Table 6 show that all the students belonging to G2, meaning those who had grades 10 for both semesters, were 100% motivated to learn English in an online context.

Finally, we would like to present the data collected using the open ended question. This question was not compulsory and students could choose between completing it either in English or in their mother tongue, Hungarian. In total 37 answers were collected, out of which 17 in English. 34 learners were of the opinion that learning English online was different than learning any other subject as the classes were more “interesting”, “enjoyable”, “fun” and “less stressful” (words used by the learners). One person believed that it was acceptable for the time being, but would not like to do it again. Two learners expressed total dislike as far as learning English online was concerned in comparison with other subjects.

At this point, we would like to draw attention to item 8 of the questionnaire: “I would be willing to learn English online again because it has some value for me”. 21 people (25.92%) are sure they do not wish to participate and only 29 students (35.80%) believe they would choose to learn English online again. The majority of the learners, 33 students (40.74%), are quite indecisive about this statement.

Discussion

According to the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) autonomy is a complex notion incorporating the individual’s ownership over their actions, their choices, interest in the activity in question, and last but not least a perception of usefulness and value. Consequently, an autonomous online learner of English could be defined as one who shows interest, first of all, in learning English as a foreign language and secondly, in performing it in an online context. This learner would be an intrinsically motivated one, who takes part in the online lessons not because of some kind of external control, reward or punishment but simply because they enjoy the online lessons and see it as a possibility to improve.

Furthermore, SDT advocates that besides autonomy, students need to feel competent about what they are doing and need to have a sense of belonging, connection with the peers and the teacher in order to create a successful learning environment. It is important to stress that it is a perception, a feeling that Ryan and Deci are talking about, not actually proving to be competent in a specific activity.

Taking the learning process into the online world at first resulted in a sense of isolation, loss of connection with peers. Thanks to the creativity of teenagers, the majority found a way to reestablish these lost connections which were helpful during the learning process also as the support offered resulted in raising student awareness as far as learning styles are concerned.

The first research question intended to reveal, based on compared grades and IMI results, in what ways has learning English entirely online affected students’ achievement and what the students’ perception of this period was. Looking at the intrinsic motivation index for the 81 learners as a group, we would say this process was not negative, since there are 58 students who were motivated at a medium level. Moreover, there were 14 learners who exhibited a high level of intrinsic motivation. As far as their academic results are concerned, 28.39% of the students experienced a decline. With no previous research to compare with, we cannot decide whether this amount is within the usual achievement fluctuation or not. We would say that, given the unprecedented learning situation in the times of covid-19, the majority of the subjects of the research could cope with learning English online.

Secondly, we wished to find out the characteristics of the learners who were the most affected. According to the present research, mostly younger students (aged 12-15) were more affected than older ones. We believe,
this is due to the fact that students aged 12-13 had just started learning in an institutionalized context how to operate certain programs, how to use certain platforms, applications enhancing learning.

Furthermore, those students who scored low in the perceived choice sub-category and displayed low levels of learner autonomy also had a sense of failure to a certain extent. This was due to the fact that they could not take control of the learning situation probably because they felt helpless when making choices. These were the learners who did not own the learning process, who did not understand their role in this process. These learners would not prepare for classes unless they were monitored either by their parents or teachers. In some situations not even then.

Considering the results which stand at the two extreme ends of the scores, ranging from 1-2.99 and 4-5, it is important to mention that the majority of students seem to be motivated, though they scored low for the perceived choice category. This fact could indicate that had they had a choice about the learning situation their intrinsic motivation index would have been higher. Supporting students to take control over a learning situation and helping them to claim ownership over the learning process would be vital in raising autonomous learners.

The results of the low-scoring group of 23 students show that 43.48% did not feel they had too much choice about the learning situation, while the results of the remaining 56.52% mean scoring just above 3 indicates that their perception of choice was also quite low. Results in perceived choice on its own does not account for the low marks, but taking into account their mean scores in interest/enjoyment, value/usefulness, effort/importance and perceived competence, which are just above 3, it could be said that this group of learners was partially motivated to learn English in an online context. Despite feeling rather competent and even putting a fair amount of effort into the learning process, the fact that these learners did not claim ownership over this process prevented them from feeling successful. In the light of the above mentioned, we would say it is understandable why their results in English worsened during online education.

Analyzing the results as a whole, we would not pronounce satisfied with the achievements of the online learning scenario. Even though 53.33% of the learners showed no change and 17.11% even displayed an improvement in their marks we would be reluctant to say this is what success looks like. This conclusion was reached, first of all, due to the fact that all mean scores for all five categories range from 3.20 to 3.72. Individual responses for the sub-categories did range from 1.00 to 5.00, on the whole students seem to be “somewhat” motivated to learn English in an online scenario.

Taking into consideration the answers the 37 students provided to the open ended question, we would say that the learning English online was not as successful as we had supposed. It was presumed that teaching a foreign language online was different from teaching any other school subject due to the fact that there is an abundance of platforms, apps, websites which cater to students’ needs. Student answers do support this presumption, however, it is clear, if they had a choice, they would not repeat the online learning scenario.

A mean score of about 3 could also suggest that students fear to lose face value. Firstly, either because admitting to not being motivated or not having invested enough effort into the learning process would make them look less. Secondly, it could also suggest indecisiveness. All this despite having been informed that the results will be used only for the purposes of the present research. However, in total there are only six people who scored 3-3.99 to all five categories, the remaining 75 subjects’ scores ranges from 1 to 5.

Conclusions

In the present research we wished to find out in what ways has learning English entirely online affected students’ achievement. Furthermore, we were interested in the students’ perception of the Covid-19 English online learning period. Last, but not least, we also wanted to know what learner characteristics influenced student achievement the most.

Based on the general IMI results it was obvious that the subjects experienced a lack of choice as far as learning English online is concerned and this influenced negatively their perception about this learning situation. This result came somewhat as a surprise as both participating to and holding online classes during the spring of 2020, when the quarantine began, was optional. Consequently, there was no protocol for absence monitoring and grading.

Seeing that the lowest mean score appeared for the perceived choice sub-category we looked at the compared academic results for all learners and decided to analyze the lowest scoring group (G3) and the highest scoring group (G1). Although at first it was not planned to, we included in the analysis another group of students (G2), those whose results did not change as they had already received the highest possible mark 10.
Results showed once again that even the low scoring group presented different levels of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation along with displaying a high level of perceived competence, but what they perceived as a problem was the lack of choice they had in this learning context. Even G1 felt the need for more choice about the learning situation. The only group which considered they had a choice was G2.

Perception of choice is a factor that supports learner autonomy. Based on the data G2 provided us with, it can be said that it is not enough for the learners to be both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to learn English, they also need to develop learner autonomy, to understand that they are in control of their own learning, of their choices. As long as learners do not realize this, they do not take over the learning process.

To conclude, we would say that the majority of the learners shoved different levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, they also expressed that the afore mentioned learning process was one that they considered important and useful as far as their academic results and further learning is considered. Analyzing all the results, we need to say that these students did not all manage to reach total success due to the fact that they felt they were not in control of the learning situation, they did not own it, did not have a choice about it. Although numbers do show that more young students were affected negatively by transferring learning English online, we would say it was a question of learner autonomy and not learner competence.
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