



Vol.7 No.2 (2024)

Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching

ISSN : 2591-801X

Content Available at : <http://journals.sfu.ca/jalt/index.php/jalt/index>

Statistically speaking, are students situationally engaged and motivated in the statistics classroom?

David Santandreu Calonge ^A	A	<i>Department of Academic Development, Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates</i>
Linda Smail ^B	B	<i>Computational Systems Program, College of Interdisciplinary Studies, Zayed University, United Arab Emirates</i>
Firuz Kamalov ^C	C	<i>School of Engineering, Applied Science and Technology, Canadian University Dubai, United Arab Emirates</i>

Keywords

Flow;
mathematics;
situational engagement;
statistics;
United Arab Emirates.

Abstract

The aim of the present exploratory study was to examine students' situational engagement and motivation in the statistics classroom at Zayed University, in Dubai, United Arab Emirates (UAE). Two instruments were used for this purpose: a) experience sampling method (ESM), and b) the validated Mathematics Motivation Questionnaire (MMQ). This study employed two samples, at the undergraduate level (2nd and 4th Semesters). Participants consisted of 100 students enrolled in Statistics I and Statistics II (Probability and Structure of Randomness). The results indicate that, apart from challenge and effort, emotional engagement is not significantly different across different activities. The results also indicate increases in intrinsic value and utility value and decreases in test anxiety. Finally, results indicate higher engagement and effort when social interaction is purposely planned and fostered, such as in small groups. On the contrary, individual class activities seem to generate slightly lower levels of engagement and effort. These findings have significant implications for educators and researchers who seek to enhance students' engagement and motivation in their statistics courses.

Correspondence

david.santandreu@mbzuai.ac.ae ^A

Article Info

Received 14 September 2023
Received in revised form 31 August 2024
Accepted 4 September 2024
Available online 16 September 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.2.37>

Introduction

The study of student situational engagement and motivation is gaining increased traction in the research literature (Tan et al., 2021; Rivera & Garden, 2021). Situational engagement is contextual and is often described as moments in time when students are entirely focused on a teaching and learning activity (Inkinen et al., 2020) and experience important levels of challenge, skill, and interest (Schneider et al., 2016). A considerable amount of literature has been published on engagement. These studies have, however, mainly focused on overall engagement, cognitive, behavioural, or emotional engagement in regular classrooms at the undergraduate level (Mendini & Peter, 2018). More recently, several studies have begun to examine *momentary engagement* in science classes and *optimal learning moments* (Upadaya et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2020; Rosenberg et al., 2020; Dietrich et al., 2019; Janna et al., 2019; Schmidt et al., 2018; Schneider et al., 2016).

In fact, Inkinen et al. (2020) posited that students experienced elevated levels of situational engagement during approximately 15% of the time spent in the classroom. What is less clear is what happens during the remaining 85% of the time. Although there is emerging qualitative and quantitative research on situational engagement and motivation in various disciplines and published research in which motivation and/or engagement in the mathematics classroom at university level were investigated, assessed, or measured (Hammad et al., 2022; Lim et al., 2022; Park & Han, 2021; Tossavainen et al., 2021; Goldin, 2017; Sundre et al., 2012), a search of the literature revealed a paucity of studies which (a) seek to answer the research questions and (b) use the methodology set for this study 1. at tertiary level, 2. in the statistics classroom, and 3. in the context of the UAE. The present study seeks to address this gap, as it contributes to literature (1) by combining situational measures of engagement in the mathematics/statistics classroom using the Experience Sampling Method (ESM) and the Mathematics Motivation Questionnaire (MMQ).

This article has been divided into five sections. The first section deals with the literature review and gives a brief overview of situational engagement and motivation. The second section is concerned with methodology. Section Three presents and analyses the results. The fourth section discusses the results and presents its limitations. Section Five concludes the study.

Related research

Situational engagement

Research on situational engagement originates from the concept of *flow*, "the experience of complete absorption in the present moment" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2009, p. 195). According to flow theory, a flow moment emerges when there is an activity with clear goals and immediate feedback. It requires a dynamic fragile equilibrium of intensely focused concentration, driven by interest (in the subject area, topic, domain, teaching and learning activity), perceived skill/capabilities, and challenge (tasks that provide

opportunities for action). The flow moment can be sustained (often referred to as directed motivational currents) or repeated only if students continue to engage progressively with more complex activities, tasks, and challenges (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2009). That is, to be actively engaged and motivated in a teaching and learning activity face-to-face (F2F) and/or online, students should experience (1) situational interest, which sets the foundation for continuing motivation and subsequent learning (Shernoff et al., 2014), (2) challenge in the activity or task, and (3) should perceive that they have the (acquired) skill or competence (s) to tackle the task.

Studies by Inkinen et al. (2020), Renninger et al. (2018), Goldin (2017), Shernoff et al. (2014), and Olitsky (2007) have shown, for instance, that discussing and/or solving a math problem individually, with a classmate or within a group can trigger situational interest and engagement. Results of a study by Choi et al. (2007) showed that a flow experience had direct and indirect positive consequences on the achievement of the learning outcomes. Additionally, Hong et al. (2017) argued that intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, flow experience, and learning progress were positively correlated. As student engagement in learning is often intricate, the concept of flow has been investigated in several modalities (online, blended) and in various educational and geographical contexts (Pearce et al., 2005; Shin, 2006; Choi et al., 2007; Esteban-Millat et al., 2014; Hong et al., 2017) to identify similarities. Pearce et al. (2005) uncovered for instance a series of flow-paths and patterns related to the online interactions that occurred in the classroom. Several patterns of situational engagement were also identified by Upadaya et al. (2021) and Schnitzler et al. (2021) in F2F classes, which indicates that levels of engagement (and experience) within and between students in one classroom and with similar tasks can vary significantly (Martin et al., 2020; Pöysä et al., 2018).

Situational engagement and motivation in mathematics

While situation engagement has been studied extensively in the context of scientific learning (Lavonen et al., 2021; Pöysä et al., 2018; Upadaya et al., 2021), research related specifically to engagement in mathematics and statistics courses has been very limited. Situational engagement in solving math problems was investigated by Inkinen et al. (2020) as part of a wider inquiry into ten scientific practices at the high school level. It was found that solving math problems elicited an above-average level of situational engagement. A comparison of STEM project-based learning to traditional approaches showed greater positive affective mathematics engagement in terms of mathematical self-acknowledgement (Lee et al., 2019). Student engagement in linear algebra courses was shown to improve using the activity, discussion, and exercise cycle style of teaching, with cognitive engagement, affective engagement and behavioural engagement being particularly affected. A few studies examined mathematics situational engagement in various scenarios outside the traditional classroom setting (Bond, 2020; Lindstedt et al., 2020; Vainikainen et al., 2015). Similarly, several studies investigated the use of technology to improve situational engagement with the majority finding

a positive correlation (Attard et al., 2020; Gil-Doménech & Berbegal-Mirabent, 2019).

Student engagement in mathematics at the macro level has received greater attention. Several studies investigated the relationship between engagement and academic achievement. Wang et al. (2021), for instance, conducted two longitudinal studies seeking to understand the role of metacognition and motivation in predicting adolescents' engagement in math learning over time. Similarly, a longitudinal study of middle school students showed that students who were more alike in their engagement attained similar factor patterns regardless of their achievement level (Skilling et al., 2021). An investigation into the relationship between student engagement and mathematics achievement based on a survey of 295,416 high school students showed a positive correlation between engagement and higher levels of academic achievement, with cognitive engagement having the strongest association with achievement (Fung et al., 2018). Given the lack of studies that examine situational engagement specifically in mathematics and statistics courses in Higher Education, the present research fills an important gap in the literature.

Conceptual framework

Expectancy value theory is a psychological model that describes how individuals make decisions. The theory posits that people evaluate different options by considering the expected outcome (the average outcome if the option was chosen many times) and the value (or desirability) of that outcome. The overall evaluation of an option is the product of these two factors: the expectancy value. Expectancy-value theory (EVT, Eccles et al., 1983) is also a key theory on student motivation and achievement. Expectancy value theory can, therefore, be used to understand and predict a wide range of behaviours, including educational choices, career decisions, and health behaviours.

Additionally, it can help to explain why people may choose to engage in certain activities despite the potential costs or challenges involved. According to EVT, the expected value of an action is determined by two factors: the probability that a particular outcome will occur, and the value that the person places on that outcome. EVT posits that (1) expectancies students have about their success in a specific task ("Can I actually do this task?"), a positive answer would predict better performance and increased motivation to select more challenging tasks (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002, p. 111), and (2) reasons or task-related value beliefs ("Why should I do this task?") are critical to student engagement and motivation in the classroom. Recent research indicated, however, that (a) engagement is malleable (Upadyaya et al., 2021; Dietrich et al., 2019) and (b) motivation also often fluctuates during class periods. To reflect these latest findings, Eccles and Wigfield (2020) relabelled EVT as Situated Expectancy-Value Theory (SEVT) to give higher prominence to the fact that expectancy-value beliefs are "situationally sensitive and interact over short periods of time" (Beymer et al., 2022, p. 2).

Purpose of the study and research questions

The overall aim of the current study is to build on previous research by investigating situational engagement and motivation in the statistics classroom at the university level in the UAE. For the purposes of this study, the authors adopted Martin et al.'s (2017) definition of motivation "as the inclination, energy, emotion, and drive relevant to learning, working effectively, and achieving" (p. 152).

The present study seeks answers to the following three research questions:

- RQ1. To what degree are students in the statistics classroom situationally engaged and motivated?
- RQ2. Does the type of activity students were engaged in influence their level of engagement, effort, persistence, experience of flow, and anxiety?
- RQ3. Is there a correlation between the level of engagement across different dimensions of situational engagement?

Materials and methods

Participants and procedure

The study initially enrolled 100 students across two classes: 17 students in a 4th-semester Statistics II course and 83 students in a 2nd-semester Statistics I course. These were convenience and purposeful samples at Zayed University (ZU).

Different data collection points

Although 100 students were enrolled in the study, only 78 responded to the demographic survey. This reduction in sample size (from 100 to 78) can be attributed to non-response or incomplete participation in the initial demographic survey. In other words, 78 surveys were fully completed and considered for the statistics of the demographic variables - 17 students from the 4th-semester Statistics II course and 61 students from the 2nd-semester Statistics I course. The first sample comprised 17 students in a 4th semester Statistics Course (Statistics II), with a Mean age $M = 19$, $SD \pm 0.87$; range: 17-21 years. Demographics (17.6% male / 82.4% female). Overall, the first sample data comprised 38 survey responses (MMQ) and 108 ESM responses.

The second sample consisted of 61 students in a 2nd-semester Statistics Course (Statistics I), with a Mean age $M = 17.9$, $SD \pm 0.78$; range: 17-21 years. Demographics (9.8%, 90.2 % female). Overall, the second sample data consisted of 146 survey responses (MMQ) and 391 ESM responses. The class length was 90 minutes for both samples.

MMQ participation:

- **MMQ-Start (N=84):** At the start of the experiment, 84 students participated in the MMQ-start. This sample size is larger than the 78 who completed the demographic survey because not all students who participated in the MMQ completed the demographic survey, and vice versa.
- **MMQ-End (N=100):** By the end of the study, all 100 students had completed the MMQ. This increase in sample size reflects full participation in the MMQ at the conclusion of the study, even though some students may have missed the demographic survey earlier and the MMQ-start, they took part in the other stages of the study, i.e., the ESM.

ESM responses:

- The ESM was administered at two points during each class: 45 minutes into the class (N=277 responses) and at the end of the class (N=222 responses) for 3 weeks. These sample sizes reflect the number of ESM responses collected, not individual participants. Since each student provided multiple responses across the different time points and activities for 3 weeks, the response count exceeds the number of individual students. Therefore, the difference in sample sizes (277 vs. 222) is due to varying participation at different points in the class session, possibly influenced by factors such as class engagement and attendance.

Ethical clearance was sought and obtained on 27 November 2022. [Ethics Approval Number: ZU22_089_F]. A consent form was sent to all participating students for signature, before starting the experiment.

Fredricks and McColskey (2012) argued that “most current methods” did “not adequately capture the dynamic and interactive nature of engagement” (p. 779). Moreover, Rosenberg et al. (2020) stated that situational engagement was “often studied using single time-point surveys—which may not account for the dynamic nature of learners’ situational engagement” (p.4). Others, such as Morris et al. (2019), indicated that retrospective surveys were not as accurate as the Experience Sampling Method (ESM). as they often under-reported negative experiences and over-reported positive experiences (p. 4).

This study therefore used (1) the Mathematics Motivation Questionnaire or MMQ (Fiorella et al., 2021) and (2) the Experience Sampling Method (ESM) to collect, by means of self-report, actual, real-time data for three weeks.

- (1) **MMQ:** Originally designed to gauge secondary students’ motivation in mathematics classes, the 19-item validated MMQ was adapted by Fiorella et al. (2021) from the 25-item validated SMQ (Science Motivation Questionnaire) designed by Glynn et al. (2011). The nonlinear SEM reliability coefficients of the five MMQ constructs indicate

good to excellent values and range from .76 to .91. Cronbach’s α for the five constructs are Intrinsic value (3 items, .85); Self-regulation (4 items, .72); Self-efficacy (4 items, .86); Utility value (4 items, .89); Test anxiety (4 items, .78). Considering that results above 0.7 are deemed acceptable, a value close to .9 suggests that the consistency of the results obtained by the MMQ questionnaire was relatively high.

- (2) **ESM** was used to capture graduate students’ situational engagement and motivation in math classrooms, *in situ/online* and in the moment (s) they were occurring (Hektner et al., 2007) to minimise memory biases. Students were asked to specify whether they were [in the classroom] or [online].

Measures

- (1) **MMQ:** The 19 items of the MMQ are divided into five categories: (a) intrinsic value, described by Eccles and Wigfield (2020) as “anticipated enjoyment one expects to gain from doing the task or purposes of making choices and as the enjoyment one gets when doing the task” (p. 11); (b) self-regulation; (c) self-efficacy; (d) utility value, or “how well a particular task fits into an individual’s present or future plans” (Eccles & Wigfield, 2020, p. 12); and (e) test anxiety.

Example items were “I like math that challenges me” (intrinsic value), “I put enough effort into learning the math” (self-regulation), “I believe I can master the knowledge and skills in the math course” (self-efficacy), “I think about how learning math can help my career” (utility value), and “I am nervous about how I will do on the math tests” (test anxiety). A demographics section was added to the MMQ and collected information about participants’ gender, nationality (Emirati/non-Emirati), year of study, GPA, major, number and titles of mathematics courses currently taken, and most recent score at a math exam.

The MMQ was administered online on 30 January 2023 (=start of the experiment, *pre*) and a second time on 19 February 2023 (= three weeks later, *post*).

- (2) **ESM:** Interval contingent notification triggers (Van Berkel et al., 2017) - *experience* questions (one-to-five Likert scales) were simultaneously sent to all students (online and face-to-face) by email (Google forms) at 45 minutes (into the class, break time) for all samples and one question and four statement items were sent to all samples at the end of each class with a notification expiry time set at 5 minutes, to reduce participants’ burden and avoid interrupting students’ situational engagement. Research by Sahami Shirazi et al. (2014) on 200 million notifications from more than 40,000 users indicated that the

probability of a participant not clicking on a notification five minutes after receiving it was 17% (p. 3058).

Students were asked (1) to give thought to and reflect on the lecture and the activities of the past minutes and (2) to rate the items within five minutes. Then, they were asked similar questions at the end of the class. See Tables A and B in the Appendix.

Analytic plan

Statistical analysis

The collected data were coded, entered, and analysed using the statistical package SPSS version 28. Statistical tests with p-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Descriptive statistics were employed to describe all items of the questionnaire. T-tests, paired t-test, or ANOVA were also used to examine the correlations between the different constructs measured by the Likert scale items.

For the MMQ, we computed the mean and standard deviation for each statement that was all positively worded, and then we constructed the below subscales:

1. Intrinsic Value (Items 1-3)
2. Self-Regulation (Items 4-7)
3. Self-Efficacy (Items 8-11)
4. Utility-Value (Items 12-15)
5. Test Anxiety (Items 16-19)

To score each subscale, the mean score (and standard deviation) of the statements that belong to each subscale was calculated, without the need to reverse-score any statement.

For the ESM scale, the average scores for the dimensions for both the ESM at 45 minutes and the ESM were computed at the end of class.

Results

Demographic characteristics

100 students enrolled in two classes were selected for the experiment. Out of the 100 students, 78 answered the demographic survey, leading a sample size of 78, with 88.5% being female and 11.5% male. Table 1 shows that most participants are in their first year of study (78.2%), while the rest are in their second year. Most participants are Emirati (96.2%), while only a small percentage are non-Emirati. In terms of high school type, most participants attended private schools (59%), followed by public schools (34.6%), and a small percentage attended both. Regarding majors, the most popular one is Computational Systems (56.4%), followed by Business Transformation (28.2%), Social

Innovation (11.5%), and Sustainability (3.8%). Lastly, in terms of courses, most participants were enrolled in Statistics I (78.2%), while 21.8% were enrolled in the Probability and Structure of Randomness course (Statistics II).

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants.

Variable	Labels	Total Participants	
		No.	%
Gender	Female	69	88.5
	Male	9	11.5
Study year	1 st year	61	78.2
	2 nd year	17	21.8
Nationality	Emirati	75	96.2
	Non-Emirati	3	3.8
Type of High School	Public	27	34.6
	Private	46	59.0
	Both Public and Private	5	6.4
Major	Public	27	34.6
	Computational Systems	44	56.4
	Business Transformation	22	28.2
	Social Innovation	9	11.5
Course	Sustainability	3	3.8
	Statistics I	61	78.2
	Statistics II	17	21.8

Table 2 provides additional information about the participants (age, experience with Math, GPA).

Table 2. Participants' characteristics.

Variable	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	78	17	21	18.15	.913
How many mathematics courses did you take in high school?	78	1	12	3.47	2.771
What was your score on the mathematics section of the EmSAT (The Emirates Standardised Test)?	69	580	2000	991.68	254.210
How many mathematics courses have you taken at ZU?	78	1	7	1.62	1.108
Current (semester) GPA	74	1	4	3.45	.610

MMQ

First, the descriptive statistics for the MMQ statements were calculated: Out of the 100 students enrolled in the study, 84 were present during the start of the experiment, while all of them were present during the last day of the experiment. This explains the difference in the total number of answers between MMQ-Start and MMQ-End, as shown in Table 3.

An analysis of the MMQ-Start data revealed that the students had moderately high levels of motivation for learning math. The mean scores for each item ranged from 2.94 to 4.01, with a standard deviation ranging from 1.02 to 1.52. Notably, the students reported the highest levels of motivation for "putting enough effort into learning math" (mean = 4.00) and the lowest levels of motivation for "being concerned that other students are better in math" (mean = 2.94).

Table 3. Comparison of MMQ scores between start and end of experiment: Student attitudes towards learning Math. (Fiorella et al., 2021).

MMQ Items	MMQ-Start (N=84)		MMQ-End (N=100)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I enjoy learning math	3.56	1.29	3.58	1.30
2. I find learning math interesting	3.56	1.27	3.68	1.24
3. I like math that challenges me	3.15	1.40	3.30	1.31
4. I put enough effort into learning the math	4.00	1.02	4.03	1.11
5. If I am having trouble learning the math, I try to figure out why	3.64	1.22	3.69	1.16
6. I use strategies that ensure I learn math well	3.76	1.05	3.81	1.05
7. I prepare well for math tests and quizzes	3.99	1.18	3.9	1.03
8. I am confident I will do well on math assignments and projects	3.63	1.04	3.71	1.10
9. I am confident I will do well on math tests	3.62	1.16	3.49	1.15
10. I believe I can master the knowledge and skills in the math course	3.76	1.13	3.76	1.14
11. I believe I can earn a grade of "A" in the math course	4.01	1.04	3.84	1.23
12. I think about how the math I learn will be helpful to me	3.59	1.20	3.58	1.27
13. I think about how I will use math I learn	3.42	1.22	3.51	1.27
14. I think about how learning math can help me get a good job	3.50	1.24	3.61	1.27
15. I think about how learning math can help my career	3.69	1.15	3.64	1.22
16. I become anxious when it is time to take a math test	3.63	1.26	3.33	1.30
17. I am nervous about how I will do on the math tests	3.58	1.25	3.29	1.27
18. I worry about failing math tests	3.29	1.52	2.83	1.41
19. I am concerned that the other students are better in math	2.94	1.43	2.67	1.30

Items 13, 14, and 15, which relate to how learners perceive the usefulness of math in their lives and career, have high mean scores, suggesting that respondents are motivated to learn math because they see its relevance to their future.

On the other hand, Items 17 and 18, which reflect anxiety and worry towards math tests and performance, have lower mean scores compared to other items, indicating that respondents are less anxious about math tests at MMQ-End than MMQ-Start.

Analysis of the MMQ-End data revealed a slight decrease in the students' motivation levels for learning math. The mean scores for each item ranged from 2.67 to 3.84, with a standard deviation ranging from 1.03 to 1.41. Notably, the students reported the highest levels of motivation for "preparing well for math tests and quizzes" (mean = 3.90) and the lowest levels of motivation for "being concerned about failing math tests" (mean = 2.83).

Overall, the results suggest that the students had moderately high levels of motivation for learning math at the beginning of the course, but that their motivation levels decreased slightly by the end of the three weeks. These findings may have implications for math educators and suggest the need for interventions to sustain students' motivation levels throughout the course.

Next, we calculated the descriptive statistics for the constructs, i.e., MMQ Dimensions, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that the mean scores for all five subscales slightly increased or remained stable from MMQ-Start to MMQ-End. The standard deviations for each subscale were relatively consistent across MMQ-Start and MMQ-End,

Table 4. Comparison of MMQ dimension scores at start and end of experiment.

MMQ Dimensions	MMQ-Start (N=84)		MMQ-End (N=100)		P-Value (Paired t-test)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Intrinsic Value	3.42	1.22	3.52	1.21	0.439
Self-Regulation	3.85	0.86	3.86	0.89	0.864
Self-Efficacy	3.76	0.96	3.69	1.06	0.783
Utility Value	3.55	1.03	3.58	1.13	0.815
Test Anxiety	3.36	1.13	3.03	1.12	0.033

indicating that the variability in responses did not change significantly over time. However, the Test Anxiety subscale showed a notable decrease in mean score from MMQ-Start to MMQ-End. These results suggest that the study had a positive impact on students' attitudes towards math learning and reduced their test anxiety levels.

- In terms of intrinsic value, there was a slight increase in mean scores from 3.42 to 3.52, indicating that students may have found math more enjoyable and interesting as they progressed through the study. This is a positive result, as intrinsic motivation is a key factor in learning and academic achievement.
- The self-regulation subscale showed no significant change, with mean scores remaining consistent at 3.85 and 3.86. This indicates that students maintained their level of effort and use of learning strategies throughout the study.
- The self-efficacy subscale showed a slight decrease in mean scores from 3.76 to 3.69. This could indicate that students may have become less confident in their ability to learn math as they progressed through the study. However, the difference in mean scores is not large enough to draw any definitive conclusions.
- The utility value subscale showed a small increase in mean scores from 3.55 to 3.58. This suggests that students may have become more aware of the usefulness of math in their lives and future careers as they progressed through the study.
- Finally, the test anxiety subscale showed a significant decrease in mean scores from 3.36 to 3.03. This is a positive result as it indicates that students may have become less anxious about math tests as they progressed through the study.

As it can be seen from Table 4, there is a significant difference between the means of MMQ-Start and MMQ-End for the Test Anxiety subscale ($p=0.033$). The mean score for Test Anxiety decreased from 3.36 ($SD=1.13$) at MMQ-Start to 3.03 ($SD=1.12$) at MMQ-End, indicating that students reported less anxiety towards math tests after completing the study.

For the other subscales (Intrinsic Value, Self-Regulation, Self-Efficacy, and Utility-Value), there is no significant difference between the means of MMQ-Start and MMQ-End. The mean scores for these subscales remained relatively stable over time, indicating that the intervention did not significantly affect students' motivation towards math in these areas.

The results suggest that the intervention was effective in reducing students' anxiety towards math tests but did not significantly impact their motivation towards other aspects of learning math.

To answer RQ1, MMQ scores were computed, which is the average of all items in the MMQ scale (MMQ-End). The mean score of 3.54 on the MMQ suggests that, on average, students have a moderate level of motivation and engagement in mathematics. The standard deviation of 0.71 indicates that there is some variability in the scores, with some students having higher levels of motivation and engagement than others.

A t-test to compare the mean scores on the MMQ across different groups of students was run, such as by semester of study and course enrolment. The t-test was 2.153 (p-value= 0.031) indicating a statistically significant difference in the mean MMQ scores between students in their second or fourth semester of study. Therefore, based on these results, it can be concluded that students in their fourth semester of study, enrolled in Statistics II (mean of 3.80), have a significantly different level of situational engagement and motivation than students in their second semester of study enrolled in Statistics I (mean of 3.45).

T-tests were then used to compare the mean scores on the MMQ's five subscales across different groups of students; the two groups are by semester of study and by course level. The results are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of MMQ subscale mean scores across different groups of students.

	P-value	t	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Intrinsic Value	0.07	1.66	0.46	0.28	-0.09	1.01
Self-Regulation	0.05	0.97	0.20	0.21	-0.21	0.61
Self-Efficacy	<0.001	2.98	0.70	0.24	0.24	1.17
Utility-Value	0.40	2.14	0.55	0.26	0.04	1.06
Test Anxiety	0.23	-0.56	-0.14	0.26	-0.66	0.37

For the Intrinsic Value, Utility-Value, and Test Anxiety subscales, the t-tests were not significant at the 0.05 level (p-value of 0.07, 0.40, and 0.23, respectively). This suggests that there may be no statistically significant differences in mean scores between the two groups being compared by semester of study and by course as well.

For the Self-Regulation and Self-Efficacy subscales, t-tests were significant (p-value of 0.05 and p-value < 0.001, respectively), suggesting that there is a statistically significant difference in mean scores between the two groups (per semester of study and by course).

EMS: (EMS-45 minutes and EMS-End)

Table 6 presents the frequency and percentage of the types of activities that students reported engaging in during the last few minutes of the class at two different time points: 45 minutes into the class and at the end of the class.

At 45 minutes into the class, the most frequently reported activities were calculating and collaborating in small groups, each reported by 31.5% of students, followed by listening (24.1%). On the other hand, at the end of the class, the most frequently reported activity was listening (38.9%), followed by collaborating in small groups (27.8%) and writing (9.3%). These results suggest that the types of activities that students engage in change over the course of the class, with a shift towards more listening and less calculating as the class progresses.

Table 6. A comparison of student activities at 45 minutes and end of class.

Activity	ESM at 45 minutes (N=277)		ESM end of class (N=222)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Calculate	90	32.5	37	16.7
Write	22	7.9	29	13.1
Listen	60	21.7	55	24.8
Collaborate	51	18.4	63	28.4
Explain	2	.7	6	2.7
Interpret	45	16.2	26	11.7
Other (for instance asking questions, design scientific inquiry, etc.)	7	2.5	6	2.7

The differences in situational engagement based on the type of activity have been studied by several authors (Lavonen et al., 2021). However, it has not been done in the context of university mathematics/ statistics courses. To fill this gap in the literature, we measured situational level of interest, challenge, motivation, and importance in student studies and future goals with respect to several common classroom activities. The Experience Sampling Method was carried out twice during each lecture - once at the 45-minute mark and once at the end of the lecture. The summary of the results collected at the 45-minute mark is presented in Table 7.

As shown in Table 7, the mean level of interest, challenge, and motivation differs across activities. There is no single activity that dominates situational engagement across different dimensions. Listening was the highest-rated activity in terms of interest. Surprisingly, listening was also deemed as the most challenging activity followed closely by calculating. Calculating was also rated as the most motivating activity. Other activities were deemed the most important for students' studies and future goals.

The p-values of the one-way ANOVA test are shown in the last column of Table 7. Since all the p-values are above 0.05, the results show that there is no significant difference in the sample means of the activities. Concretely, the results suggest that all the activities hold the same level of interest, challenge, motivation, and importance in studies and goals.

The lack of difference between calculating and other activities is a somewhat surprising revelation, given that calculating is at the core of mathematics. Moreover, calculating is traditionally believed to be the most challenging activity in mathematics courses. However, this belief is not supported by our results, as other activities, such as listening and interpreting, are rated equally challenging by the students.

Table 7. Comparison of average levels of situational engagement across different classroom activities as measured at the 45-minute mark.

Activity	Calculate	Write	Listen	Collaborate	Interpret	Other	p-value
Frequency	90	22	60	51	45	7	
Interesting	3.62	3.36	3.88	3.53	3.42	3.14	0.193
Challenging	3.52	3.18	3.57	3.31	3.42	2.29	0.068
Motivating	3.33	2.73	2.97	3.12	3.20	3.00	0.195
Studies	4.14	3.95	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.71	0.454
Goals	3.46	3.36	3.57	3.14	3.40	3.86	0.403

The summary of the results collected at the end of the lecture is presented in Table 8. Students' situational engagement, effort, desire to continue the activity, and involvement are measured for various activities performed at the end of the lecture. As shown in Table 8, calculating, interpreting data, and other activities are rated as the most engaging while explaining is rated the lowest. Calculating is the highest-rated activity in terms of effort, followed by other activities and interpreting.

The results show that while calculating is often rated near the top of situational dimensions, there is no significant separation between calculating and the remaining activities. Since all the p-values are above 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in sample means of the activities across different situational dimensions. Specifically, there is no evidence in our results to suggest that calculating required more effort than the other activities. As mentioned above, it is a surprising observation, given that calculating is traditionally considered the activity which requires the most effort. The results collected at the end of the lecture are in line with those collected at the 45-minute mark. This suggests that the differences in engagement scores were primarily due to individual differences rather than the activities themselves. The lack of significant differences between the activities indicates that engagement levels were consistent regardless of the activity in which participants were engaged in. The same applies to all other dimensions of the ESM.

Table 8. Comparison of average levels of situational engagement across different classroom activities as measured at the end of the class.

Activity	Calculate	Write	Listen	Collaborate	Explain	Interpret	Other	p-value
Frequency	37	29	55	63	6	26	6	
Engaged	4.00	3.90	3.82	4.08	3.67	4.08	4.00	0.657
Effort	4.24	3.90	3.93	3.92	3.17	4.04	4.17	0.098
Continue	3.76	3.31	3.27	3.63	3.50	3.42	3.83	0.322
Involved	3.54	3.28	3.09	3.54	3.00	3.23	4.17	0.108

Next, to answer RQ2, frequency and percentage of each response for each activity were computed from those who answered *true for me* and *very true for me* to the ESM-END,

as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. A comparison of student activities at 45 minutes and end of class.

Activity	I was engaged with the topic at hand	I put in a lot of effort	I wish we could still continue with the work for a while	I was so involved that I forgot everything around me
Calculate (37)	26(70.3%)	30 (81.1%)	23 (62.2%)	17 (45.9%)
Write (29)	17 (58.6%)	19 (65.5%)	13 (44.8%)	11 (37.9%)
Listen (55)	41 (74.5%)	38 (69.1%)	23 (41.8%)	18 (32.7%)
Collaborate (63)	47 (74.6%)	40 (63.5%)	34 (54.0%)	35 (55.6%)
Explain (6)	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	1 (16.7%)
Interpret (26)	21 (80.8%)	20 (76.9%)	13 (50.0%)	9 (34.6%)
Other (6)	4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (50.0%)	4 (66.7%)

Table 9 indicates that for each of the activities, most participants who answered "true for me" or "very true for me" reported being engaged with the topic at hand. The activity that generated the highest percentage of such responses was collaborating in a small group (74.6%), while the lowest was explaining phenomena scientifically (66.7%). Additionally, for most activities, most participants who answered "true for me" or "very true for me" reported putting in a lot of effort, with the highest percentage being for calculating (81.1%). Regarding the desire to continue with the work, the activity with the highest percentage of positive responses was, again, collaborating in a small group (54%), while the lowest was interpreting data and evidence scientifically (50%). Finally, for the statement "I was so involved that I forgot everything around me," the activity that generated the highest percentage of affirmative responses was, once again, collaborating in a small group (55.6%).

Across all activities, the percentage of participants who reported being engaged with the topic at hand and putting in a lot of effort was generally high. This suggests that the activities were generally effective at capturing participants' attention and encouraging them to invest effort. Furthermore, the activities that involved more open-ended inquiry, such as interpreting data and evidence scientifically and asking questions and designing scientific inquiry, had slightly lower levels of engagement and effort compared to the activities that involved more straightforward tasks, such as calculating and writing.

ESM Dimensions were also examined, as indicated in Table 10, to gauge whether the types of activity students were engaged in influenced their level of engagement, interest, effort, motivation, persistence, experience of flow, being involved:

Table 10. Mean scores of EMS subscales at 45 minutes and end of class.

ESM at 45 minutes (N=277)			ESM End of Class (N=222)		
Dimension	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Dimension
Interesting	3.59	1.12	3.96	0.86	Engaged
Challenging	3.42	1.13	3.97	0.83	Effort
Motivating	3.13	1.13	3.50	1.09	Continue (persistence)
Studies	4.13	0.90	3.36	1.10	Involved
Goals	3.41	1.16			

The mean scores for interest, engagement/challenge, effort/motivation, and continuation (persistence) were all higher at the end of the class compared to 45 minutes into the class. Specifically, the mean score for interest was 3.96 (SD=0.86) at the end of the class, compared to 3.59 (SD=1.12) at 45 minutes. The mean score for engagement/challenge was 3.97 (SD=0.83) at the end of the class, compared to 3.42 (SD=1.13) at 45 minutes. The mean score for effort/motivation was 3.50 (SD=1.09) at the end of the class, compared to 3.13 (SD=1.13) at 45 minutes. Finally, the mean score for persistence was 3.84 (SD=0.98) at the end of the class, compared to 3.47 (SD=1.12) at 45 minutes.

The standard deviations for each dimension are similar across the two-time points, which suggests that the variability in students’ responses did not change significantly over time. Again, a statistical analysis would be needed to confirm this. Overall, these findings suggest that participants may become more interested, engaged, motivated, and persistent as a class progresses, but the changes may be relatively small. It is also worth noting that these findings are based on self-reported data collected using the ESM, which may be subject to response biases or other limitations.

To obtain further insight regarding various dimensions of situational engagement and to attempt to answer RQ3, we considered their pairwise correlations. The results of the ESM at the 45-minute mark are shown in Table 11, where the values above the diagonal represent the Pearson correlation and the values below the diagonal represent the corresponding p-values. As shown in Table 11, all the correlations are relatively weak albeit in most cases statistically significant. The correlation between students’ assessment of the level of interest and the level of challenge is 0.00986. The corresponding p-value is 0.87 which indicates that there is no relation between student interest and challenge in the activities. While the lack of relation is expected in certain cases, it is surprising in others. For instance, the correlation between motivation and interest level is 0.16, which is very low. It is a surprising result, given that one would expect student motivation to be strongly correlated with interest in the activity.

Table 11. Pairwise correlations between different dimensions of situational engagement as measured at the 45-minute mark.

	Interesting	Challenging	Motivating	Studies	Goals
Interesting	1	0.010	0.163*	0.344*	0.352*
Challenging		1	-0.085	0.161*	0.157*
Motivating			1	0.142*	0.210*
Studies				1	0.376*
Goals					1

*p<0.05

Similarly, the pairwise correlations between various dimensions of situational engagement measured at the end of the lecture are presented in Table 12, to answer RQ3. The correlations between different aspects of situational engagement are stronger than in Table 11. In particular, the correlation between the level of engagement in activity and the amount of effort is 0.54. The correlation between the desire to continue an activity and the amount of involvement

is 0.58. The relatively strong correlations are expected in some cases while surprising in others. For instance, the correlation between engagement and effort is somewhat surprising given that activities that require a lot of effort may be expected to reduce students’ enthusiasm regarding the activity. On the other hand, a low correlation between effort and the desire to continue an activity is less surprising.

Table 12. Pairwise correlations between different dimensions of situational engagement as measured at the end of the class.

	Engaged	Effort	Continue	Involved
Engaged	1	0.53754*	0.33554*	0.44686*
Effort		1	0.21937*	0.42007*
Continue			1	0.56749*
Involved				1

*p<0.05

Comparison of different dimensions of situational engagement between the two courses is provided in Tables 13 and 14. As shown in Table 13, there is little difference in situational engagement between the Statistics I and Statistics II courses measured at the 45-minute mark. The mean values of the engagement levels are similar across all dimensions except *challenge*. The students on the Statistics II course (Year 2) found their activities to be on average significantly more challenging, which is normal as this is an advanced course (4th Semester, Year 2). Situational engagement in terms of interest, motivation, and importance for their future goals was on average the same for both courses.

Table 13. Comparison of ESM-45 minutes among students by course.

Courses	Statistics I	Statistics II	p-value
Frequency	222	53	
Interesting	3.58	3.68	0.549
Challenging	3.23	4.23	<0.000001
Motivating	3.13	3.15	0.906
Goals	3.41	3.43	0.892

The comparison of situational engagement between the two courses measured at the end of each lecture is presented in Table 14. As shown in Table 14, there is little difference in situational engagement between the two courses. In particular, the mean level of engagement, effort, desire to continue, and involvement is essentially the same for the two courses. The p-values indicate that any difference in values is not statistically significant.

Discussion

This exploratory study set out with the aim of investigating situational engagement and motivation in the statistics classroom at the university level in the UAE. The present study sought answers to three research questions: (1) To what degree are students in the statistics classroom situationally engaged and motivated? (2) Does the type of activity students were engaged in influence their level of

Table 14. Comparison of ESM-end among students by course.

Course	Statistics I	Statistics II	p-value
Frequency	168	54	
Engaged	4.00	3.85	0.269
Effort	3.98	3.94	0.773
Continue	3.47	3.59	0.473
Involved	3.34	3.43	0.616

engagement, effort, persistence, experience of flow, and anxiety?, and (3) Is there a correlation between the level of engagement across different dimensions of the situational engagement?

The Mathematics Motivation Questionnaire (MMQ) was administered to 84 students at the beginning of the study and to 100 students at the end of the study to measure changes in their motivation for mathematics. Pre- to post-course comparisons were done by descriptive statistics, T-tests, paired t-test, and/or ANOVA. Additionally, the Experience Sampling Method (ESM) was used in each class for three weeks to collect, by means of self-report, real-time data. ESM results' standard deviations and Pairwise correlations' coefficients were analysed to obtain further insight regarding various dimensions of situational engagement.

With respect to the first research question, a slight increase in mean scores for intrinsic value was found, indicating that students found math more enjoyable and interesting as they progressed through the course. The self-regulation subscale showed no significant change, indicating that students maintained their level of effort and use of learning strategies throughout the course. The self-efficacy subscale showed a slight decrease in mean scores, suggesting that students may have become less confident in their ability to learn math as they progressed through the course. The utility value subscale showed a small increase in mean scores, indicating that students may have become more aware of the usefulness of math in their lives and future careers (EVT's "Why should I do this task?"). Finally, the most obvious finding to emerge from the analysis is that the test anxiety subscale showed a significant decrease in mean scores, indicating that students became less anxious about math tests as they progressed through the study.

Overall, the results suggest that students' motivation for and engagement with math improved slightly over the course of the study, with increases in intrinsic value and utility value, and decreases in test anxiety. However, there were no significant changes in self-regulation and self-efficacy. These findings have important implications for educators and researchers in the field of mathematics education who seek to enhance students' motivation for mathematics, and more specifically statistics.

With respect to the second research question, consistent with literature (Olitsky, 2007; Shernoff et al., 2014; Calonge & Safiullin, 2015; Goldin, 2017; Inkinen et al., 2020; Hultberg et al, 2018; Renninger et al., 2018), and based on

the frequency and percentage of each response for each activity, this research found that participants' levels of (emotional) engagement and [effort] for the activities that involved more classroom interaction (e.g., small cooperative groupwork) were consistently higher. Conversely, activities that were more individually focused, such as explaining phenomena scientifically, seemed to generate slightly lower levels of engagement and effort.

Another trend that was observed is that participants' desire to continue with the work for a while after the end of the activity appears [persistence] to be lower overall, with only about half of the participants indicating a desire to continue for most activities. Additionally, for most activities, fewer participants reported being so involved [flow] that they forgot everything around them, suggesting that while participants were engaged with the class and the active learning activities, they were still aware of their surroundings to some extent.

With respect to the third research question, what stands out in the ESM dimensions results is that students may become more interested, engaged, motivated, and persistent as a statistics class progresses, which may be due to increased student-student and student-professor interactivity. However, the differences between the means for each dimension are relatively small, ranging from 0.37 to 0.84, which indicates that the changes in these dimensions over time may not be large or significant. Future research could use more rigorous statistical analyses to confirm these findings and explore potential moderators of the observed changes in students' experiences over time.

Practical implications

Situational engagement in the statistics classroom is undoubtedly multifaceted, contextual, and dynamic. Based on our results, we propose several implications for practice. First, stronger emotional engagement with statistics courses can be fostered by purposely designing classroom opportunities that create and maximise interaction between academics and students (e.g., active lecturing, teamwork with active guidance) or video-based learning using knowledge tracing (Shehata et al., 2023). Second, increasing the number of problem-solving formative assessments (problem-based teaching, e.g., *calculating*, and *interpreting data*, rated as the most motivating and engaging activities), providing, and discussing constructive feedback, in class and among students with the use of chatbots (Kamalov et al., 2023; Calonge et al., 2023; Rudolph et al., 2023a, 2023b) may help students comprehend and better synthesise content, may further decrease test anxiety, and thus improve the class experience, cognitive and behavioural engagement, satisfaction, self-efficacy, and motivation.

Third, as *listening* was rated very high in terms of interest but considered the most challenging activity, we recommend chunking every lecture with active learning strategies as advocated by Freeman et al. (2014) in a meta-analysis of 225 studies of undergraduate education across all the STEM areas, by for instance asking students to (a) apply statistics to authentic phenomena that may be of interest to them, such

as climate change, inflation, wealth distribution, healthcare, etc., (b) use Python tools such as Jupyter Notebook or SymPy (Kamalov et al., 2023; Calonge et al., 2023), (c) explain data visualisations, (d) practise statistical modelling, etc. Finally, as *explaining* was rated “most challenging” and “least engaging”, providing additional opportunities to present in pairs or teams with peer and instructor feedback may boost students’ confidence and improve their expectancies about their success in a specific task (EVT’s “Can I actually do this task?”).

Limitations

The scope of this study was limited in terms of institution ($n=1$), the number of participants, and course availability. With a small purposive sample size, caution must be applied, as the findings cannot be extrapolated to all contexts, all students in all statistics courses. Despite this limitation, statistics, a foundational STEM subject, is often perceived as challenging and abstract. Students across various cultures and educational systems face similar difficulties in understanding and applying statistical concepts. Moreover, the digital age has heightened the importance of data analysis and interpretation. A study from the UAE, a rapidly developing nation with a strong focus on technology and innovation, can provide valuable insights into global trends in data literacy education. In conclusion, a study on student engagement and motivation in statistics classrooms at a single UAE university, while focused on a specific context, can offer valuable insights with broad implications for higher education worldwide. Additionally, despite using ESM to help reduce general recall bias, as survey respondents participated of their own volition, there may be possible self-selection bias in the resulting data. A natural progression of this work would be to use multiple sources of data, such as behavioural observations or physiological measures, to assess students’ experiences more objectively in the classroom.

Conclusions

This exploratory study has identified significant factors that impact situational engagement and motivation in the statistics classroom, including instructor-student and student-student interactions, varied active learning strategies, tools and activities, and application of knowledge to real phenomena. Expectancy-Value Theory offers valuable insights into the dynamics of student engagement in the statistics classroom in higher education. By acknowledging the significance of students’ beliefs in their ability to succeed (expectancy) and the perceived importance of the subject matter (value), educators can better tailor their teaching strategies and course materials to enhance motivation and student engagement. Recognising that students are more likely to engage actively when they believe in their capabilities and see the relevance of statistics in their academic and future professional pursuits is pivotal. Moreover, the Expectancy-Value Theory reminds us that fostering a supportive, active, and encouraging learning environment is equally essential, as it can positively influence students’ perceptions of their own competence and the value of the subject.

Ultimately, integrating the principles of this theory into pedagogical practices can lead to more motivated and engaged statistics students, thereby enhancing the quality of education, and preparing them for success in their future careers. These actionable insights could be used to inform instructional design and classroom management in statistics courses to better align with student engagement and preferences. As educators and students adapted to the challenges of emergency remote teaching and learning during COVID (Calonge et al., 2022), they now need to consider AI as a powerful tool for engagement and motivation (Kamalov et al., 2023, Calonge et al., 2023). Students and educators can, for instance, use AI to create simulations and visualisations that bring statistical concepts to life. Students can also interact with chatbots (Kamalov et al., 2023, Calonge et al., 2023, Hultberg et al., 2024; Firat, 2023), question, explore, analyse and visualise real-world datasets in a more engaging way, fostering curiosity and a deeper understanding.

Chatbots, as virtual teaching assistants, can summarise and paraphrase key points and complex concepts (e.g. Bayesian statistics, Nonparametric statistics, etc.), provide immediate feedback and practice on assignments, upcoming exams and quizzes, allowing students to adjust their learning strategies on the go. This personalised feedback loop can boost motivation, learning, and highlight areas for revisions and improvement. However, universities need to proactively develop transparent and applicable policies and strategies to integrate AI into courses and programs effectively, as AI can fundamentally alter teaching methods, requiring a reimagining of curriculum design and delivery. This includes faculty and student training to avoid faculty resistance, and as students become more familiar with AI tools, they may demand their integration, pressuring universities to adapt quickly. Clear policies on the ethical uses of AI, quality assurance (of learning) and ongoing evaluation are also needed to ensure AI augments rather than hinders the learning experience (Van Wyk, 2024). Rudolph et al. (2024) summarised it as “the promise of unprecedented learning enhancements and the peril of crucially important ethical dilemmas” (p. 19).

By embracing AI thoughtfully and strategically, we can create a dynamic, motivating and engaging statistics classroom that fosters a deeper understanding and appreciation for this crucial subject. It is a new frontier, a somewhat still uncharted territory, and like any revolution or crisis, it requires us to be adaptable, agile, forward-thinking, and innovative.

Data availability statement: The datasets used/analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Ethical approval

The questionnaire and methodology for this study were approved by the Research Ethics committee of Zayed University (UAE) (Ethics approval number: ZU22_089_F).

Acknowledgements

The authors of this article are deeply grateful to Zayed University colleagues who contributed to the success of this research project.

References

- Attard, C., & Holmes, K. (2020). "It gives you that sense of hope": An exploration of technology use to mediate student engagement with mathematics. *Heliyon*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02945>
- Beymer, P. N., Benden, D. K., & Sachisthal, M. (2022). *Exploring the dynamics of situated expectancy-value theory: A panel network analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/vmn9e>
- Bond, M. (2020). Facilitating student engagement through the flipped learning approach in K-12: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103819>
- Calonge, D. S., Connor, M., Hultberg, P., Shah, M. A., & Aguerrebere, P. M. (2022). Contactless higher education: a SWOT analysis of emergency remote teaching and learning during COVID-19. *Journal of Educational Studies and Multidisciplinary Approaches*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.51383/jesma.2022.22>
- Calonge, D. S., & Safiullin, A. F. (2015). Can culturally, disciplinarily and educationally diverse (D3) teams function and be creative? A case study in a Korean university. *Educational Studies*, 41(4), 369-392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2015.1018871>
- Calonge, D. S., Smail, L., & Kamalov, F. (2023). Enough of the chit-chat: A comparative analysis of four AI chatbots for calculus and statistics. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 346-357. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.22>
- Choi, D. H., Kim, J., & Kim, S. H. (2007). ERP training with a web-based electronic learning system: The flow theory perspective. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 65(3), 223-243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.10.002>
- Dietrich, J., Moeller, J., Guo, J., Viljaranta, J., & Kracke, B. (2019). In-the-moment profiles of expectancies, task values, and costs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1662. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01662>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 109-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859>
- Eccles (Parsons), J. S., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.
- Esteban-Millat, I., Martínez-López, F. J., Huertas-García, R., Meseguer, A., & Rodríguez-Ardura, I. (2014). Modelling students' flow experiences in an online learning environment. *Computers & Education*, 71, 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.09.012>
- Fiorella, L., Yoon, S. Y., Atit, K., Power, J. R., Panther, G., Sorby, S., ... & Veurink, N. (2021). Validation of the Mathematics Motivation Questionnaire (MMQ) for secondary school students. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 8(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00307-x>
- Firat, M. (2023). What ChatGPT means for universities: Perceptions of scholars and students. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 57-63. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.22>
- Fredricks, J. A., & McColskey, W. (2012). The measurement of student engagement: A comparative analysis of various methods and student self-report instruments. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 763-782). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410-8415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.131903011>
- Fung, F., Tan, C. Y., & Chen, G. (2018). Student engagement and mathematics achievement: Unraveling main and interactive effects. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55(7), 815-831. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22139>
- Gil-Doménech, D., & Berbegal-Mirabent, J. (2019). Stimulating students' engagement in mathematics courses in non-STEM academic programmes: A game-based learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 56(1), 57-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1330159>
- Glynn, S. M., Brickman, P., Armstrong, N., & Taasobshirazi, G. (2011). Science motivation questionnaire II: Validation with science majors and nonscience majors. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 48(10), 1159-1176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20442>
- Goldin, G. A. (2017). Motivating desires for classroom engagement in the learning of mathematics. In C. Andrà, D. Brunetto, E. Levenson, & P. Liljedahl (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in maths classrooms* (pp. 219-229). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49232-2_21
- Hammad, S., Graham, T., Dimitriadis, C., & Taylor, A. (2022). Effects of a successful mathematics classroom framework on students' mathematics self-efficacy, motivation, and

- achievement: A case study with freshmen students at a university foundation programme in Kuwait. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 53(6), 1502-1527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020739X.2020.1831091>
- Hektner, J. M., Schmidt, J. A., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2007). *Experience sampling method: Measuring the quality of everyday life*. Sage.
- Hong, J. C., Hwang, M. Y., Tai, K. H., & Lin, P. H. (2017). Intrinsic motivation of Chinese learning in predicting online learning self-efficacy and flow experience relevant to students' learning progress. *Computer assisted language learning*, 30(6), 552-574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1329215>
- Hultberg, P. T., Calonge, D. S., Kamalov, F., & Smail, L. (2024). Comparing and assessing four AI chatbots' competence in economics. *Plos One*, 19(5), e0297804. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297804>
- Hultberg, P. T., Calonge, D. S., & Lee, A. E. S. (2018). Promoting long-lasting learning through instructional design. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 18(3). <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v18i3.23179>
- Inkinen, J., Klager, C., Juuti, K., Schneider, B., Salmela-Aro, K., Krajcik, J., & Lavonen, J. (2020). High school students' situational engagement associated with scientific practices in designed science learning situations. *Science Education*, 104(4), 667-692. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21570>
- Janna, I., Christopher, K., Barbara, S., Kalle, J., Joseph, K., Jari, L., & Katariina, S. A. (2019). Science classroom activities and student situational engagement. *International Journal of Science Education*, 41(3), 316-329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1549372>
- Kamalov, F., Calonge, D. S., & Gurrib, I. (2023). New era of artificial intelligence in education: Towards a sustainable multifaceted revolution. *Sustainability*, 15(16), 12451. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612451>
- Kamalov, F., Calonge, D. S., Leung, H. H., Johnson, J., & El Khatib, Z. (2023, May). Leveraging computer algebra systems in calculus: A case study with SymPy. In *2023 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON54358.2023.10125196>
- Lavonen, J., Ávalos, B., Upadyaya, K., Araneda, S., Juuti, K., Cumsille, P., ... & Salmela-Aro, K. (2021). Upper secondary students' situational interest in physics learning in Finland and Chile. *International Journal of Science Education*, 43(16). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2021.1978011>
- Lee, Y., Capraro, R. M., & Bicer, A. (2019). Affective mathematics engagement: A comparison of STEM PBL versus non-STEM PBL instruction. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 19, 270-289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42330-019-00050-0>
- Lim, L., Lim, S. H., & Lim, W. Y. R. (2022). A Rasch analysis of students' academic motivation toward Mathematics in an adaptive learning system. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(7), 244. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12070244>
- Lindstedt, A., Koskinen, A., McMullen, J., Ninaus, M., & Kiili, K. (2020, December). Flow experience and situational interest in an adaptive math game. In *International conference on games and learning alliance* (pp. 221-231). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63464-3_21
- Martin, A. J., Ginns, P., & Papworth, B. (2017). Motivation and engagement: Same or different? Does it matter? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 55, 150-162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.03.013>
- Martin, A. J., Mansour, M., & Malmberg, L. E. (2020). What factors influence students' real-time motivation and engagement? An experience sampling study of high school students using mobile technology. *Educational Psychology*, 40(9), 1113-1135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1545997>
- Mendini, M., & Peter, P. C. (2019). Research note: The role of smart versus traditional classrooms on students' engagement. *Marketing Education Review*, 29(1), 17-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2018.1532301>
- Morris, B. J., Owens, W., Ellenbogen, K., Erduran, S., & Dunlosky, J. (2019). Measuring informal STEM learning supports across contexts and time. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 6(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-019-0195-y>
- Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2009). Flow theory and research. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Synder (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 195- 206). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0018>
- Olitsky, S. (2007). Promoting student engagement in science: Interaction rituals and the pursuit of a community of practice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(1), 33-56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20128>
- Park, J. H., & Han, S. (2021). Exploring the factors of situational interest in learning mathematics. *The Mathematical Education*, 60(4), 555-580. <https://doi.org/10.7468/mathedu.2021.60.4.555>
- Pearce, J. M., Ainley, M., & Howard, S. (2005). The ebb and flow of online learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 21(5), 745-771. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.02.019>
- Pöysä, S., Vasalampi, K., Muotka, J., Lerkkanen, M. K., Poikkeus, A. M., & Nurmi, J. E. (2018). Variation in situation-specific engagement among lower secondary school students. *Learning and Instruction*, 53, 64-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.07.007>
- Renninger, K. A., Ren, Y., & Kern, H. M. (2018). Motivation, engagement, and interest: "In the end, it came down to you and how you think of the problem". In *International*

handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 116-126). Routledge.

Rivera, E. S., & Garden, C. L. P. (2021). Gamification for student engagement: A framework. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(7), 999-1012. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1875201>

Rosenberg, J., Beymer, P. N., Phun, V., & Schmidt, J. (2020, December 29). *How does situational engagement vary between learners, situations, and classrooms? Findings from the use of intensive longitudinal methods and cross-classified, multi-level models*. OSF Preprint. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/pj2v8>

Rudolph, J., Ismail, F., & Popenici, S. (2024). Higher education's generative artificial intelligence paradox: The meaning of chatbot mania. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(6), 1-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.53761/54fs5e77>

Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023a). War of the chatbots: Bard, Bing Chat, ChatGPT, Ernie and beyond. The new AI gold rush and its impact on higher education. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 364-389. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.23>

Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023b). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education?. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 342-363. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>

Sahami Shirazi, A., Henze, N., Dingler, T., Pielot, M., Weber, D., & Schmidt, A. (2014, April). Large-scale assessment of mobile notifications. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 3055-3064). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557189>

Schmidt, J. A., Rosenberg, J. M., & Beymer, P. N. (2018). A person-in-context approach to student engagement in science: Examining learning activities and choice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 55(1), 19-43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21409>

Schneider, B., Krajcik, J., Lavonen, J., Salmela-Aro, K., Broda, M., Spicer, J., ... & Viljaranta, J. (2016). Investigating optimal learning moments in US and Finnish science classes. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 53(3), 400-421. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21306>

Schnitzler, K., Holzberger, D., & Seidel, T. (2020). All better than being disengaged: Student engagement patterns and their relations to academic self-concept and achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-020-00500-6>

Shehata, S., Calonge, D. S., Purnell, P., & Thompson, M. (2023, July). Enhancing video-based learning using knowledge tracing: Personalizing students' learning experience with ORBITS. In *Proceedings of the 18th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications (BEA 2023)* (pp. 100-107). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.bea-1.8>

Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2014). Student engagement in high school classrooms

from the perspective of flow theory. In M. Csikszentmihalyi (Ed.), *Applications of flow in human development and education* (pp. 475-494). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9094-9_24

Shin, N. (2006). Online learner's 'flow' experience: An empirical study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(5), 705-720. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00641.x>

Skilling, K., Bobis, J., & Martin, A. J. (2021). The "ins and outs" of student engagement in mathematics: shifts in engagement factors among high and low achievers. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 33(3), 469-493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-020-00313-2>

Sundre, D., Barry, C., Gynnild, V., & Ostgard, E. T. (2012). Motivation for achievement and attitudes toward mathematics instruction in a required calculus course at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. *Numeracy*, 5(1), 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1936-4660.5.1.4>

Tan, A. L., Gillies, R., & Jamaludin, A. (2021). A case study: Using a neuro-physiological measure to monitor students' interest and learning during a micro bit activity. *Education Sciences*, 11(8), 379. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11080379>

Tang, X., Lavonen, J., Schneider, B., Krajcik, J., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2020). High school students' optimal learning moments: A network analysis approach. *2020 American Educational Research Association (AERA) conference*. San Francisco, CA, USA <https://helda.helsinki.fi/server/api/core/bitstreams/bb986f27-98a4-4f4f-b2c9-f627d267c407/content>

Tossavainen, T., Rensaa, R. J., & Johansson, M. (2021). Swedish first-year engineering students' views of mathematics, self-efficacy and motivation and their effect on task performance. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 52(1), 23-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020739X.2019.1656827>

Upadyaya, K., Cumsille, P., Avalos, B., Araneda, S., Lavonen, J., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2021). Patterns of situational engagement and task values in science lessons. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 114(4), 394-403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2021.1955651>

Vainikainen, M. P., Salmi, H., & Thuneberg, H. (2015). Situational interest and learning in a science center mathematics exhibition. *Journal of Research in STEM Education*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.51355/jstem.2015.6>

Van Berkel, N., Ferreira, D., & Kostakos, V. (2017). The experience sampling method on mobile devices. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 50(6), 1-40. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3123988>

Van Wyk, M. M. (2024). Is ChatGPT an opportunity or a threat? Preventive strategies employed by academics related to a GenAI-based LLM at a faculty of education. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.1.15>

Wang, M. T., Binning, K. R., Del Toro, J., Qin, X., & Zepeda,

C. D. (2021). Skill, thrill, and will: The role of metacognition, interest, and self-control in predicting student engagement in mathematics learning over time. *Child Development*, 92(4), 1369-1387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13531>

Appendices

Appendix A. Questions asked at 45 minutes (all samples)

Items				Multiple choice
1. Select the type of activity you were doing in the last few minutes				- Calculating - Writing - Listening - Collaborating in a small group - Explaining phenomena scientifically - Interpreting data and evidence scientifically - other
Question				Likert Scale
2.	"Did you find the activity you were doing"	Interesting	Challenging	Motivating
3.	"How important was this activity for your studies?"			
4.	"How important was this activity in relation to your future goals/plans?"			

Appendix B. Questions asked at the end of each class (all samples)

Item	Select the type of activity you were doing in the last few minutes	
	- Calculating - Writing - Listening - Collaborating in a small group - Explaining phenomena scientifically - Interpreting data and evidence scientifically - other	
Construct	Item	Likert Scale
1. engagement with the task at hand	"I was engaged with the topic at hand"	1=not true at all for me; 2=not true for me; 3=neutral; 4=true for me; 5=very true for me.
2. a. effort and persistence	"I put in a lot of effort"	
b. effort and persistence	"I wish we could still continue with the work for a while"	
3. experience of flow or having been totally absorbed by the activity	"I was so involved that I forgot everything around me"	