Two data-driven coding categories that emerged during the analysis and then added to the coding frame were ‘other motivational factors’ and ‘consequences’. We defined the former as motivational determinants other than those (proximal) cognitive-affective factors implied by expectancy-value theory. However, segments in this category were oftentimes particularly difficult to explain. Within the motivation data, we associated it with about 28.41 percent of students, but it accounted for only about 6.29 percent of data segments. An important additional factor seemed to involve teachers. For example, a male S3 student points out a source of motivation for a classroom activity involves a teacher that “teaches it well” so that he understands well what is expected from him. A second strand of additional factor may concern study habits. A male S1 student explained that he would gain expectancy beliefs “when I am doing a lot of exercises”. A female S1 student traced her motivation back to the fact that “I would ask for explanation”. Thus, help-seeking behaviour was a source of motivation. A female S2 student pointed out the motivational benefits of parental support. As she explained, “they give me enough school materials and pay for my school fees on time”, which might have found motivating. We defined consequence as the behavioural and cognitive implications of (a)motivation. We assigned this category to segments provided by about 43.18 percent of motivation students. A male S1 student explained that motivation “helps me to work harder”, which was an example for the positive behavioural effects of motivation. A female S3 student experienced that “it helps us to think more”, which was an example of the cognitive effects of motivation. Jointly, these examples provide further evidence that Rwandan students indeed conceived an understanding of *ishyaka* (motivation), that resembled important aspects of motivation. Behavioural and cognitive engagement has been coined as “outward manifestations of motivation” (Skinner et al., 2009, p. 224).

Within the amotivation data, other factors were a more common theme that emerged during the coding. This category was associated with about 57.83 percent of students. It also accounted for a significantly higher fraction of the data segments compared to the motivation data. It was applied to about 26.47 percent of segments. Similar to the motivation data, study habits also seemed to constitute an important factor to explain amotivation. n the case of amotivation, however, I was especially the lack of appropriate study habits that seemed to lead to amotivation. For example, a female S1 student mentioned that she experienced amotivation when “I might not have read for the given subject”. Being ill-prepared thus may explain why students lack motivation. It could be that the proximal cognitive-affective factors such as expectancy beliefs mediate the effects of being unprepared on classroom motivation. Another female S1 student mentioned she experienced amotivation “because I was not paying attention the time of the explanation”. It suggests that past disengagement in class made her fall behind within the subject, which in turn increased her subsequent experience of amotivation. Within the literature, the existence of “causal feedback loops” (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 765) that support or hamper students’ classroom engagement have been highlighted. We interpreted statements to refer to the consequential effects of amotivation in about 37.35 percent of amotivation students. The behavioural consequences of amotivation were often described as “laziness” (female S1 student). A male S1 student mentioned that “I don't want to hear about what the teachers are telling me” in the case of amotivation. As just outlined, disengagement may further increase amotivation in future.