

Examining youth engagement during learning activities
that involve work with data: An Experience Sampling
approach

Joshua M. Rosenberg

2018-06-03

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Socializing, working, and even teaching and learning are increasingly impacted by data. These sources of data—either quantitative *or* qualitative—are created by us, for us, and about us. Despite the impacts of data, present opportunities for learners themselves to work with data in educational settings are limited.

Work with data includes broad processes of collecting, creating, modeling data, and even asking questions that can be answered with data. This work, then, is more than just crunching numbers. It is also more than interpreting a figure created by someone else. Rather, work with data is about making sense of phenomena in the world—or solving problems in the world. This focus on phenomena is particularly relevant to those designing and enacting learning opportunities focused on work with data (Lee & Wilkerson, in press; Singer, Hilton, & Schweingruber, 2006; Wild & Pfannkuch, 1999).

Despite not being very widespread, aspects of work with data cut across STEM (Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics) domains: Aspects of work with data are recognized as core competencies across recent curricular documents, particularly the *Next Generation Science Standards* (NGSS Lead States, 2013) and the *Common Core State Standards* (in mathematics; National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Both of these standards highlight the role of authentic work with data.

Past research on work with data has largely been set in mathematics contexts and has focused on mathematical practices, like generating measures of phenomena and creating data models (English, 2012; Lehrer & Romberg, 1996; Lesh, Middleton, Caylor, & Gupta, 2008). There has been some research about work with data in science settings (Lee & Wilkerson, in press; National Research Council, 2012), though this work varies greatly in terms of the nature of work with data (McNeill & Berland, 2017). Findings from this past research broadly suggests that engaging in work with data is powerful in terms of learning both about and how to do mathematics and science. Lehrer and Schauble, summarizing past research on the use of mathematical practices in science contexts, note that work with data “has an exceptionally high payoff in terms of students’ scientific reasoning” (Lehrer & Schauble, 2015, p. 696).

To date, past research shows that using a framework from contemporary engagement theory to characterize students’ experiences has been informative both in research and to practicing educators. Knowing more about how youth engage in work with data is valuable as engagement is a meaningful outcome for STEM learners in its own right (Sinatra, Heddy, & Lombardi, 2015). It may also be an antecedent of changes in other outcomes, such as their well-being, achievement and pursuit of an area of study or career (Wang, Chow, Hofkens, & Salmela-Aro, 2015; Wang & Eccles, 2012). However, research has not examined engagement in work with data. Because engaging in work with data seems to be so potentially beneficial to learners, better understanding the nature of work with data and learners’ engagement in such practices is needed.

The purpose of this study, then, is to examine youth engagement in a variety of learning activities that involve work with data. Engagement is explored in the context of outside-of-school STEM enrichment programs carried out during the summer and work with data is considered in terms of specific aspects identified from

past research, such as asking questions and generating and modeling data. Knowing more about how youth engage can also provide a foundation for subsequent work to explore how particular curricula and engaging experiences for youth spark their interest in work with data, including hobbies and occupations related to data science, but also in STEM domains in general.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The framework for this study is informed by work on STEM-related learning practices, student engagement, and approaches to analyzing complex psychological constructs, like engagement. In this review of literature, I define work with data as a key practice, or learning-related activity, across STEM domains. I also define and justify a multi-dimensional framework for understanding engagement, and then review an approach to analyzing data that is ideal for capturing this multidimensionality.

2.1 Defining Work with Data

Some scholars have focused on a few key pieces of data analysis, connected through the use of “data to solve real problems and to answer authentic questions” (Hancock et al., 1992, p. 337). This focus on solving real problems or answering authentic questions—rather than being taught and learned as isolated skills—is an essential part of work with data having the most educational benefits to learners (National Research Council, 2012; see Lehrer and Schauble [2012] Windschitl, Thompson, & Braaten [2018] for excellent, practice, in-depth examples of work with data being used as part of instructional approaches). This approach has primarily been used by mathematics educators, as reflected in its role in statistics curriculum standards (Franklin et al., 2007). In science settings, where answering questions about phenomena serve as the focus of activities, it shares features of the process of engaging in scientific and engineering practices, but has been less often studied.

Work with data has been conceived in different ways. For some specific examples from different domains, see Lee and Wikerson’s (in press) forthcoming summary report for the National Academy of Sciences and Wild and Pfannkuch (1999), Franklin et al. (2007), and Lehrer and Schauble (2004). Because there is not an agreed upon definition of work with data—particularly across subject area domains (i.e., across all of the STEM content areas)—I focus on the core aspects that scholars have most often included in their conceptualizations of work with data. These core components, synthesized from definitions across studies, are better for understanding work with data across STEM content areas—as in the present study—than the components from specific examples, which were developed for use in only one domain. The aspects of work with data that have been articulated in prior studies are distilled into five key aspects (Figure 2.1) for use in this study. They are:

- *Asking questions:* Generating questions that can be answered with empirical evidence
- *Making observations:* Watching phenomena and noticing what is happening with respect to the phenomena or problem being investigated
- *Generating data:* The process of figuring out how or why to inscribe an observation as data about phenomena, as well as generating tools for measuring or categorizing
- *Data modeling:* Activities involving use of simple statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation, as well as more complicated models, such as linear models and extensions of the linear model




Figure 2.1: Work with data in STEM education settings

- *Interpreting and communicating findings:* Activities related to identifying a driving question regarding the phenomena that the question is about

These five synthesized aspects of work with data are not stand-alone practices but are a part of a cycle. This is not only because each aspect follows that before it, but also because the overall process is iterative: For example, interpreting findings commonly leads to new questions and subsequent engagement in work with data. Also, scholars have pointed out some key features of how work with data is carried out that impact their effectiveness as a pedagogical approach. These key features include an emphasis on making sense of real-world phenomena and iterative cycles of engaging in work with data and collaboration and dialogue, through which ideas and intermediate findings are critiqued and subject to critique, and revised over time (McNeill & Berland, 2017; Lee & Wilkerson, in press).

2.2 The role of working with data in STEM learning environments

Working with data can serve as an organizing set of practices for engaging in inquiry in STEM learning settings (Lehrer & Schauble, 2015). Data are both encountered and generated by learners, and so opportunities for learners to work with data provide many opportunities to leverage their curiosity because processes of inquiry can be grounded in phenomena that learners themselves can see and manipulate or phenomena that learners are interested in. Also important, becoming proficient in work with data can provide learners with an in-demand capability in society, owing to the number of occupations, from education to entrepreneurship, that demand or involve taking action based on data (Wilkerson & Fenwick, 2017). Furthermore, becoming

proficient in work with data can be personally empowering because of the parts of our lives—from paying energy bills to interpreting news articles—that use data.

Recent educational reform efforts emphasize work with data (i.e., the scientific and engineering practices in the NGSS and the standards for mathematical practice in the Common Core State Standards). However, work with data is uncommon in many classroom settings, even classrooms emphasizing recent science education reform efforts; McNeill & Berland, 2017; Miller, Manz, Russ, Stroupe, & Berland, in press). As a result, learning environments suited to engaging in work with data, but not explicitly designed to support it, may be valuable to study because they may serve as incubators of these rare and challenging learning activities.

Outside-of-school programs, in particular, are a potentially valuable setting to explore engagement in work with data, because of the combined pedagogical and technical expertise of their staff and the open-ended nature of the activities that are possible to carry out during them. Staff, or youth activity leaders, for these programs includes educators and scientists, engineers, and others with the technical experience. Additionally, the programs were designed to involve learners in the types of real-world practices experienced by experts in STEM disciplines. Attendance in such programs is associated with many benefits to learners (Green, Lee, Constance, & Hynes, 2013; see Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson, Aphthorp, Snow, & Martin-Glenn, 2006, for a comprehensive review). These programs are also a good context for understanding work with data because little research has examined how data are part of the experiences of youth during them.

2.3 What We Know (And Do Not Know) About How Youth Work with Data

There is a good amount of past research on cognitive capabilities as outcomes from working with data. Much of this (laboratory-based) research has focused on how children develop the capability to inductively reason from observations (Gelman & Markman, 1987). Other research has focused on the development of causal, or mechanistic, reasoning, among young children (Gopnik et al., 2001; Gopnik & Sobel, 2000), often from a Piagetian, individual-development focused tradition (i.e., Piaget & Inhelder, 1969). A key outcome of engaging in work with data has to do with how learners account for variability (Lehrer, Kim, & Schauble, 2007; Petrosino, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003; Lesh, Middleton, Caylor, & Gupta, 2008; Lee, Angotti, & Tarr, 2010), arguably the main goal of engaging in work with data (Konold & Pollatsek, 2002). From this research, we know that learners can develop the capacity to reason about variability (and covariability).

Past research has also shown that there are strategies that can support work with data. These include the design of technological tools and the development of curricula. From this research, we know about specific strategies and learning progressions for learners to develop this capability, such as the role of measurement in exposing learners in a direct way to sources of variability (Petrosino et al., 2003), role of simulation to learn about sampling distributions (Stohl & Tarr, 2002), and use of relevant phenomena, such as manufacturing processes, such as the size of metallic bolts, which can help learners to focus on “tracking a process by looking at its output” (Konold & Pollatsek, 2002, p. 282).

Finally, past research has shown that different aspects of work with data pose unique opportunities and challenges. Asking empirical questions requires experience and ample time to ask a question that is both able to be answered with data and which is sustaining and worth investigating (Bielik, 2016; Hasson & Yarden, 2012). Making observations and generating data, such as of the height of the school’s flagpole, requires negotiation not only of what to measure, but how and how many times to measure it (Lehrer, Kim, & Schauble, 2007). Regarding modeling, not only teaching students about models, such as that of the mean, but also asking them to create them, are valuable and practical (Lehrer & Schauble, 2004; Lehrer, Kim, & Jones, 2011), but also time-intensive. Interpreting findings, especially in light of variability through models, and communicating answers to questions, means not only identifying error but understanding its sources, and can be supported through exploring models that deliberately represent the data poorly, but can be instructive for probing the benefits and weaknesses of models (Lee & Hollebrands, 2008; Lehrer, Kim, & Schauble, 2007).

Despite the past research that has been carried out, how learners and youth participate in different aspects of work with data in terms of engagement theory has not been examined. Consider the practice of modeling data, commonly described as a—or *the*—key part of many data analyses (Konold, Finzer, & Kreetong, 2017). When modeling data, learners may use data they generated and structured in a data set on their own, or may model already-processed, or use already-plotted, data (McNeill & Berland, 2017). How challenging do students perceive the different enactments of these activities to be and how do learners perceive their competence regarding them? Importantly, how hard are learners working? How much do they feel they are learning? Knowing more about these beliefs, characteristics, and processes could help us to develop informed recommendations for teachers and designers intending to bring about opportunities for learners to engage in work with data in a better-supported way that is sustained over time.

2.4 Engagement in General and in STEM Domains

In this section, the nature of engagement is discussed in terms of general features that have been identified across content area domains, conditions that support engagement, and differences between engagement in general and in STEM settings. This is followed by a discussion of two key features of engagement: its dynamic, or context-dependent, characteristics and its multidimensional nature. Finally, I describe methods for capturing these two features *empirically* through an approach called the Experience Sampling Method, or ESM, and describe how multidimensional data, collected by ESM, can be analyzed.

Engagement is defined in this study as active involvement, or investment, in activities (Blumenfeld et al., 2004). Explaining how learners are involved in activities and tasks is especially important if we want to know about what aspects of work with data are most engaging (and in what ways), and therefore can serve as exemplary for others advancing work with data as well as those calling for greater support for engagement. Apart from being focused on involvement, engagement is often thought of as a meta-construct, that is, one that is made up of other constructs (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012; Skinner, Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009). By defining engagement as a meta-construct, scholars characterize it in terms of cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions that are distinct yet interrelated (Fredricks, 2016).

We know from past research that the cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions of engagement can be distinguished (Wang & Eccles, 2012; Wang & Holcombe, 2012) and that while there are long-standing concerns about the conceptual breadth of engagement (Fredricks et al., 2016), careful justification and thoughtful use of multidimensional engagement constructs and measures is warranted. Engagement is also considered to be changing in response to individual, situation or moment contextual factors, Skinner and Pitzer’s (2012) model of motivational dynamics, highlighting the community, school, classroom, and even learning activity, shows the context-dependent nature of engagement on the basis of the impacts of these factors on learners’ engagement.

Engagement in STEM settings shares characteristics with engagement across disciplines, yet there are some distinct aspects of it (Greene, 2015). While one type of engagement—behavioral—is associated with achievement-related outcomes, many STEM practices call for engagement in service of other outcomes, especially around epistemic and agency-related dimensions (Sinatra et al., 2015). For example, many scholars have defined scientific and engineering practices as cognitive practices, which involve applying *epistemic considerations* around sources of evidence and the nature of explanatory processes (see Berland et al. 2016, Stroupe, 2014; Miller et al., in press).

The emphasis on developing new knowledge and capabilities through engaging in STEM practices must be reflected in how the cognitive dimension of engagement is measured. Because of the importance of constructing knowledge to engagement in STEM practices, then, cognitive engagement is defined for this study in terms of learning something new or getting better at something. While sometimes defined in terms of extra-curricular involvement or following directions, behavioral engagement is defined in this study as working hard on learning-related activities (Fredricks et al., 2004; Singh, Granville, & Dika, 2002). Finally, affective engagement is defined as affective responses to activities, such as being excited, angry, or relaxed (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012).

Finally, there are some key conditions that facilitate engagement. Emergent Motivation Theory (EMT; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), provides a useful lens for understanding these conditions. From EMT, a key condition for engagement that can change dynamically, from moment to moment, is how difficult individuals perceive an activity to be, or its *perceived challenge*. Another key condition is how good at an activity individuals perceive themselves to be, or their *perceived competence*. What is most important—and necessary in terms of being engaged—is being both challenged by and good at a particular activity.

Past research has supported this conjecture (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). As one empirical example, Shernoff et al. (2016) demonstrated that the interaction of challenge and competence was associated with positive forms of engagement. These findings suggest that learners' perceptions of the challenge of the activity, and their perceptions of how skillful they are, are important conditions that co-occur with learners' engagement. Conceptualizing perceptions of challenge and competence as conditions, rather than factors that influence engagement, is in recognition of their co-occurrence within individuals, in that youth experience engagement and their perceptions of the activity (perceived challenge) and of themselves (perceive competence) together and at the same time. Thus, these two conditions (challenge and competence) are considered together with engagement in this study, as described in the section below on analyzing multidimensional data on engagement.

2.5 Youth characteristics that may effect their engagement

Past research suggests learners or youths' characteristics, such as their interest in the domain of study, impact their cognitive, behavioral, and affective engagement (Shernoff et al., 2003; Shernoff et al., 2016; Shumow, Schmidt, & Zaleski, 2013). These are both moment-to-moment, context-dependent conditions that support engagement (like those discussed above, perceptions of challenge and competence) as well as youth-specific factors. These factors are at the level of individual differences (i.e., youths' more stable interest in STEM domains), and may impact engagement, as described in this section.

A factor that can support engagement concerns teacher support for specific learning-related practices (Strati, Schmidt, & Maier, 2017). Particularly concerning work with data, which is demanding not only for learners but also teachers (Lehrer & Schauble, 2015; Wilkerson, Andrews, Shaban, Laina, & Gravel, 2016), sustained support from those leading youth activities is an essential component of learners being able to work with data. Thus, how youth activity leaders plan and enact activities related to work with data can have a large impact on students' engagement. Furthermore, because of the importance of work with data across STEM domains, carrying out ambitious activities focused on work with data may plausibly have a large impact on the extent to which youth engage in summer STEM program settings. Consequently, this study considers work with data through the use of a coding frame that characterizes the extent to which teachers are supporting specific STEM practices in their instruction, including aspects of work with data.

Other factors that impact youths' engagement are individual characteristics and differences. In recognition of differences among learners in their tendency to engage in different (higher or lower) ways in specific activities based in part on individual differences (Hidi & Renninger, 2006), learners' interest in STEM before the start of the programs is also considered as a factor that can impact engagement. Knowing about whether and to what extent youths' interest *before* participating in summer STEM programs explains their engagement *during* them is a key question on its own right. It is also important in terms of properly understanding the effects of other factors, such as working with data, above and beyond the effect of pre-program interest. In addition to this interest, gender and the racial and ethnic group of students is also considered, as past research has indicated these as factors that influence engagement in STEM (Bystydzienski, Eisenhart, & Bruning, 2015; Shernoff & Schmidt, 2008). To include the racial and ethnic group of students, being part of an under-represented minority (URM) group is considered. To sum up, youths' pre-program interest, gender, and URM group membership are considered as individual factors that may impact youths' engagement.

2.6 Challenges of Measuring Engagement as a Contextually-Dependent and Multidimensional Construct

Because of the way engagement has been thought of as having context-dependent characteristics and being multi-dimensional, it is challenging to use engagement (when conceptualized in such a way) in empirical studies. One methodological approach that has benefits in terms of both the context-dependent and multi-dimensional nature of engagement is the ESM. A number of scholars have explored or extolled benefits to its use in their recent work (e.g., Strati et al., 2017; Turner & Meyer, 2000; Sinatra et al., 2015).

This study employs the Experience Sampling Method (ESM; Hektner, Schmidt, & Csikszentmihalyi, 2007) where learners answer short questions about their experience when signaled. ESM involves asking (usually using a digital tool and occasionally a diary) participants short questions about their experiences. ESM is particularly well-suited to understanding the context-dependent nature of engagement because students answered brief surveys about their experience when they were signaled, minimally interrupting them from the activity they are engaged in and also seeking to collect measures about learners' experience when signaled (Hektner, et al., 2007).

The ESM approach is both sensitive to changes in engagement over time, as well as between learners and allows us to understand engagement and how factors impact it in more nuanced and complex ways (Turner & Meyer, 2000). Though time-consuming to carry out, ESM can be a powerful measure that leverages the benefits of both observational and self-report measures, allowing for some ecological validity and the use of closed-form questionnaires amenable to quantitative analysis (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987). Despite the logistic challenge of carrying out ESM in large studies, some scholars have referred to it as the *gold standard* for understanding individual's subjective experience (Schwarz, Kahneman, & Xu, 2009).

Research has shown us how the use of ESM can lead to distinct contributions to our understanding of learning and engagement. This work also suggests how ESM can be put to use for the purpose of the present study. For example, Shernoff, Csikszentmihalyi, Schneider, and Shernoff (2003) examined engagement through the use of measures aligned with flow theory, namely, using measures of concentration, interest, and enjoyment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). In a study using the same measures of engagement (Shernoff et al. (2016) used an observational measure of challenge and control (or environmental complexity) and found that it significantly predicted engagement, as well as self-esteem, intrinsic motivation, and academic intensity. Schneider et al. (2016) and Linnansaari et al. (2015) examined features of optimal learning moments or moments in which students report high levels of interest, skill, and challenge, as well as their antecedents and consequences. Similar to ESM in that through its use engagement can be studied in a more context-sensitive, still other scholars have used daily diary studies to examine engagement as a function of autonomy-supportive classroom practices (Patall, Vasquez, Steingut, Trimble, & Pituch, 2015; Patall, Steingut, Vasquez, Trimble, & Freeman, 2017). This past research that used ESM (or daily diary studies) to study engagement has shown that ESM can be used to understand fine-grained differences in learning activities, such as the aspects of work with data that are the focus of this study.

Other research shows us that there are newer approaches to analyzing ESM data that can contribute insights into the context-dependent nature of engagement in a more fine-grained way. For example, Strati et al. (2017) explored the relations between engagement to measures of teacher support, finding associations between instrumental support and engagement and powerfully demonstrating the capacity of ESM to understand some of the context-dependent nature of engagement. Similarly, Poysa et al. (2017) used a similar data analytic approach as Strati et al. (2017), that is, use of crossed effects models for variation within both students and time points, both within and between days. These studies establish the value of the use of ESM to understand the context-dependent nature of engagement and that such an approach may be able to be used to understand engaging in work with data. Additionally, these recent studies (particularly the study by Strati and colleagues) show that how effects at different levels are treated, namely, how variability at these levels is accounted for through random effects as part of mixed effects models, is a key practical consideration for the analysis of ESM data.

One powerful and increasingly widely used way to examine context-dependent constructs, such as engagement, is the use of *profiles of*, or groups of variables that are measured. This profile approach is especially

important given the multidimensional nature of engagement. In past research, profiles are commonly used as part of what are described as person-oriented approaches (see Bergman & Magnusson, 1997), those used to consider the way in which psychological constructs are experienced together and at once in the experiences of learners. Note that in the present study, ESM involves asking youth about to report on their experience at the time they were signaled (rather than, for example, before or after the program, which traditional surveys are well-suited for).

In this study, *profiles of engagement* are used in the service of understanding how students engage in work with data in a more holistic way. There are some recent studies taking a profile approach to the study of engagement (i.e., Salmela-Aro, Moeller, Schneider, Spicer, & Lavonen, 2016a; Salmela-Aro, Muotka, Alho, Hakkarainen, & Lonka, 2016b; Van Rooij, Jansen, & van de Grift, 2017; Schmidt, Rosenberg, & Beymer, 2018), though none have done so to study youths' engagement in work with data.

The profile approach has an important implication for how we analyze data collected from ESM about youths' engagement, in particular when we consider how to understand engagement as a multi-dimensional construct, and one with momentary, or instructional episode-specific, conditions (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). We know from past research that engagement can be explained in terms of different patterns among its individual components (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997), in the present case its cognitive, behavioral, and affective components. Because learners' engagement includes cognitive, behavioral, and affective aspects experienced together at the same time, it can be experienced as a combined effect that is categorically distinct from the effects of the individual dimensions of engagement. This combined effect can be considered as profiles of engagement.

Past studies have considered profiles of cognitive, behavioral, and affective aspects of engagement. For example, to account for the context-dependent nature of engagement, some past studies have used other measures to predict engagement, such as use of in-the-moment resources and demands (Salmela-Aro et al., 2016b) and the use of instructional activities and choice (Schmidt et al., 2018). A potential way to extend this past research is to account for not only engagement (cognitive, behavioral, and affective), but also its key conditions (challenge and competence). This is especially important since a profile approach emphasizes the holistic nature of engagement and the impact of not only external but also intra-individual factors. Accordingly, youths' perceptions of the challenge of the activity and of their competence at it are used along with the measures of engagement to construct profiles of engagement. Thus, the profiles of engagement include youths' responses to five ESM items for their cognitive, behavioral, and affective engagement and their perceptions of how challenging the activity they were doing is and of how competent at the activity they are.

2.7 Need for the Present Study

While many scholars have argued that work with data can be understood in terms of the capabilities learners develop and the outcome learners achieve, there is a need to better understand learners' experiences working with data. The present study does this through the use of contemporary engagement theory and innovative methodological and analytic approaches. Doing this can help us to understand work with data in terms of learner's experience, which we know from past research impacts what and how students learn (Sinatra et al., 2015). Knowing more about students' engagement can help us to design activities and interventions focused around work with data. In addition to this need to study engagement in work with data through the lens of engagement, no research has yet examined work with data in the context of summer STEM programs, though such settings are potentially rich with opportunities for highly engaged youth to analyze authentic data sources.




Figure 2.2: A conceptual framework for this study and research questions

2.8 Conceptual Framework and Research Questions

To sum up, the present study is about how learning activities involving various aspects of work with data can be understood in terms of engagement. Its context is out-of-school-time STEM enrichment programs designed to meet guidelines for best practices. The conceptual framework in the present study is presented in Figure 2.2 and is laid out in the remainder of this section.

There are five aspects of work with data synthesized from past research (i.e., Hancock et al., 1992; Lehrer & Romberg, 1996; Wild & Pfannkuch, 1999):

1. Asking questions or identifying problems
2. Making observations
3. Generating data
4. Data modeling
5. Interpreting and communicating findings

In Figure 2.2, engagement in work with data is associated with different profiles of engagement. The theoretical framework for the profile approach suggests that engagement is a multi-dimensional construct consisting of cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions of engagement and perceptions of challenge and competence. In addition, a pre-program measure of youths' pre-program interest in STEM, along with youths' gender and URM status, are hypothesized to be associated with the profiles and the relations of work with data and the profiles.

In reference to research questions 2-5, the ESM responses that make up the profiles are associated with different "levels." These *levels*, or groups, which may introduce dependencies that violate statistical assumptions of the independence of the responses, are commonly considered in the Hierarchical Linear Modeling (also known as multi-level or mixed effects modeling) literature as *random effects* (Gelman & Hill, 2007; West, Welch, & Galecki, 2015). In this study, there are three levels that can be modeled as random effects to account for the dependencies they introduce: Youth, instructional episode (which are indicators for the moments—or segments—in which youth are asked to respond to the ESM signal), and the program. Thus, these are not predictor variables, but rather are levels present given the approach to data collection and the nature of the sample. Interpreting their effects is not a goal of this study, but accounting for them in the

models used, as in this study, is important and is done via random effects.

Pre-program interest, gender, and URM status are predictor variables at the youth level. The aspects of work with data are predictor variables at the instructional episode level. There are no predictor variables at the program level, in part due to the small number of programs (and the resulting low statistical power of any variables added at this level). To summarize, pre-program interest, gender, and URM status, and the aspects of work with data are used as predictor variables, while the three levels (youth, instructional episode, and program) are accounted for in the modeling strategy.

The five research questions, then, are:

1. What is the frequency and nature of opportunities for youth to engage in each of the five aspects of work with data in summer STEM programs?
2. What sources of variability are there for the profiles of engagement?
3. What profiles of engagement emerge from data collected via ESM in the programs?
4. How do the five aspects of work with data relate to profiles of engagement?
5. How do youth characteristics relate to profiles of engagement?

Chapter 3

Method

3.1 Context

The setting for the present study was nine out-of-school STEM programs during 2015 in the Northeast United States. Two *intermediary organizations* which were contracted by the local school districts to administer the summer programs. The two intermediaries were responsible for soliciting and enrolling youth; establishing guidelines for the design of the programs, and the goals of the programs; and providing training and professional development for the staff, hereafter referred to as youth activity leaders.

There was a difference between the two intermediary organizations, namely, one *separated academic and enrichment-related activities*, whereas, in the other, the *academic and enrichment components were more integrated*, which may have program-related effects on youths' engagement. Many of the programs aim to involve youth in work with data. These learning environments bring together youth activity leaders, educators, and those with technical expertise in STEM domains. Youth spent around three hours per day for four days per week for the approximately four-week programs, which were taught by youth activity leaders and scientists, engineers, and other community members with technical expertise.

3.2 Participants

Participants consisted of 203 youth. Participants were from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds (see Table 3.1). The mean age of participants was around 13 years old (from youth whose age was available: $M = 12.71$, $SD = 1.70$, $min. = 10.75$, $max. = 16.36$). Detailed demographic characteristics of youth are presented in Table 3.1.

3.3 Procedure

Before the start of the programs, youth completed a pre-survey that included questions about their experience in STEM, intention to pursue a STEM major or career, and other motivation and engagement-related measures.

At the beginning of the programs, youth were introduced to the study and the phones used for data collection related to the ESM. As indicated in the earlier section, ESM is a method of data collection that involves asking youth to respond to short questions on phones (that were provided as part of the study). In particular, youth were signaled at random times (within intervals, so that the signals were not too near or far apart) in order to obtain a sample of their experience throughout the program. ESM data were collected two days each week, for three weeks (weeks 2-4 of the program). In all of the programs, about equal video-recording time

Table 3.1: Demographic characteristics of youth

Youth	Percentage
Sex	
Male	50
Female	50
Race/Ethnicity	
Hispanic	48
White	6
Black	36
Multi-racial	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	7
Parent Education	
High School or Below	79
Graduated from College (B.A. or B.S.)	21

was dedicated to classroom and field experiences. This detail is noteworthy because programs associated with one of the intermediaries rotated between classroom and field experience days, while the other used the first half of each day for one and the second for the other. Each day, youth were signaled four times. These signals were at the same time for all of the youth within their program, but at different times between programs and between days within programs (with the constraint that no two signals could occur less than ten minutes apart).

The programs were video-recorded by research team members on the days during which ESM data were collected. So that the measures relating the video-recording and ESM data can be matched, the videos included a signal from the video-recorder that identified the ESM signal to which youth responded.

3.4 Data Sources and Measures

Data sources consist of ESM measures of engagement and youths' perceptions of themselves and the activity, pre-survey measures of youths' interest, youths' demographic information, and the video-recordings of programs.

3.4.1 ESM measures of engagement for the profiles

Measures for engagement were created from five ESM questions, three serving indicators for the experience of engagement and two for the conditions of engagement. The three indicators for engagement were for learning (for the cognitive engagement construct), working hard (for behavioral engagement), and enjoying (for affective engagement). The variables for the conditions are for perceived challenge and perceived competence.

All five items are ultimately used to construct the profiles of engaged. Each of the ESM items consisted of the item text and the following four item response options, of which youth were directed to select one: Not at all (associated with the number 1 on the survey; 1), A little (2), Somewhat (3), and Very Much (4), as presented in Table 3.2. Note that because these items are measured using single-item indicators (which is common in studies using ESM; Hektner et al., 2007), information about the reliability and validity information for these measures is not included.

Table 3.2: ESM measures for profiles

Construct	Item
Cognitive engagement	As you were signaled, were you learning anything or getting better at something?
Behavioral engagement	As you were signaled, how hard were you working?
Affective engagement	As you were signaled, did you enjoy what you are doing?
Perceived challenge	As you were signaled, how challenging was the main activity?
Perceived competence	As you were signaled, were you good at the main activity?

Table 3.3: Coding Frame for Work With Data

Code	Description
Asking questions	Discussing and exploring topics to investigate and pose questions.
Making observations	Watching and noticing what is happening with respect to the phenomena or problem being investigated.
Generating data	Figuring out how or why to inscribe an observation as data and generating coding frames or measurement tools.
Data modeling	Understanding and explaining phenomena using models of the data that account for variability or uncertainty.
Interpreting and communicating findings	Discussing and sharing and presenting findings.

3.4.2 The five key aspects of work with data

Different aspects of work with data are identified from video-recordings. Specifically, codes for work with data were generated on the basis of the activity that the youth activity leaders were facilitating. The activity youth activity leaders were facilitating were from the STEM-Program Quality Assessment (STEM-PQA; Forum for Youth Investment, 2012), an assessment of quality programming in after school programs. I then identified the specific activities that corresponded to the five aspects of work with data, as defined in Table 3.4. Details on the reliability of this measure is described next; more information on how the measure aligns with the original STEM-PQA on which this measure is based are presented in Appendix A.

Raters contracted by American Institute of Research (AIR) were trained in the use of the Program Quality Assessment tool (PQA)—the broader assessment tool for which the STEM-PQA is a supplement. Raters completed a four-hour online training module on the overall PQA tool and then attended an in-person two-day training led by a trainer from the David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality, the tool’s publisher, where they learned about the instrument, trained on its use, and then established inter-rater reliability with a master coder. For the STEM-PQA, three of the same raters contracted by AIR to code the (overall) PQA measure used the STEM-PQA supplement to score one video segment, for which there were no disagreements on scoring for any of the items. The programs were divided up among all of the raters, so raters coded some of the videos for all of the programs. When the raters encountered a situation that was difficult to score, they would all discuss the issue by telephone or more often by email after viewing the video in question and reach a consensus on how to score the specific item. Note that these codes were unique to each signal to which youth responded (but were not unique to each youth, as youth in the same program were signaled at the same time).

3.4.3 Survey measures of pre-interest in STEM

Measures of youths’ pre-interest are used as youth-level characteristics that predict the profiles of engagement. In particular, three items adapted from Vandell, Hall, O’Cadiz, and Karsh (2012) were used, with directions for youth to rate their agreement with the items’ text using the same scale as the ESM items: Not at all (associated with the number 1 on the survey), A little (2), Somewhat (3), and Very Much (4). Reliability and validity information on this scale is presented in Vandell et al. (2008).

This measure was constructed by taking the maximum value for the scales for the different content areas (science, mathematics, and engineering), so that the value for a youth whose response for the science scale