It shows that attainment value did not emerge at all within the coding. Neither amotivation nor motivation students provided segments that were coded as directly pertaining to attainment value. Intrinsic value was implied within 18.55 percent of data segments and raised by 55.68 percent of motivation respondents. For example, a female S1 student, aged 15, explained that she is motivated for an exercise, when “it excites me”. A male S3 student pointed out that he feels motivated about the lessons in Kinyarwanda and Geography since he understands them as well as “enjoys them”.

Utility value was by far the most common value facet. It was implied within 32.70 percent of all motivation data segments. Around 71.59 percent of motivation respondents provided answers that were interpreted as utility value. Withing utility value, the most common facets implied were education related. 40.91 percent of respondents referred to school utility and 37.50 percent implied learning utility. Examples of school utility include answers by a female S1 student. She found exercises useful because “I want to see if the answers I gave are right or wrong”. We interpreted her statement to be about class exercises as preparatory measures for future school exams. Unlike school utility, learning utility was a data driven category, which we defined as the perceived usefulness of a learning challenge for one’s own learning progress. For example, a male S1 student is getting motivation for an exercise that “makes me learn what I didn't know”. Similarly, a female S1 student explained that she is motivated about a task “because I gain knowledge”. In both cases, however, it was not specified why this additional knowledge was useful. Most likely, they found it useful because it would have helped them pass upcoming exams. In this case, the actual usefulness of those exercises would have been that of school utility. However, it is conceivable that those exercises might have been perceived useful for other reasons as well. The motivational effects of learning utility may therefore depend on the actual usefulness students associate with. In this respect, learning utility are similar to outcomes goals discussed below. The education unrelated utility facets were less common (10.54 percent of motivation segments) than the education-related ones (22.17 percent). Daily utility was the least common coding category being associated with only about 7.95 percent of motivation respondents. For example, a male S3 student might have perceived the subjects of English and Kinyarwanda as useful “because we use it in the everyday life”. General utility was more common with about 15.91 percent of motivation students. For example, a female S2 student referred to a number of school subjects explaining that they are “preparing [me] for the future”. Social utility was associated with about 13.64 percent of motivation students. A coding segment in that category read “I am motivated because I am able to explain it to others that didn't understand” (female S1 student). As we interpreted the segment, the student was motivated for the class exercise she had in mind because she could explain it to her peers. It was therefore useful for her (social-status) goal (see discussion of goals below) of getting appreciation and approval by her friends and class mates. The ‘other’ subcategory within the utility category refers to segments that did not seem to fit other subcategories. For example, a male S3 student put forward the segment “it will help me with something”. However, the student did not specify the nature of usefulness he associates with the exercise he had in mind. A male S1 student expressed to experience extrinsic motivation since he stated in the questionnaire “I might get rewarded”. External rewards were raised only by few students. To keep the coding frame manageable, we therefore decided against including rewards as a separate category.

Even though value may predominantly be associated with motivation rather than amotivation, it appeared within the amotivation dataset, nonetheless. As table 2 highlights it was associated with only about 24.10 percent of amotivation respondents. Here, it mainly emerged in the form of lack of value as determinant of amotivation. As table 3 specifies, value only emerged in form of utility value within the amotivation dataset. Again, daily and general utility hardly emerged in the amotivation coding. Learning and social utility did not account for codings at all. Students associated amotivation with (lack of) school utility especially and what we coined perceived uselessness. The former was associated with about 7.23 percent of amotivation respondents. Lack of school utility may be especially the result of subjects being low-stake subjects, which do not form part of the national examinations. As a male S2 student explained, they are not motivated for subjects that we will not be asked in the national exam”. Also, exercises that do not help students to find out where they stand are considered not useful. As a female S3 student in subjects associated with amotivation “the teacher gives you the exercise but does not mark it”. Without any feedback from teachers on their learning progress students would not know where to focus on in their exam preparations. The data-driven category of perceived useless was associated with about 16.87 percent of amotivation students. It was thus the mist common utility facet within the amotivation dataset. We defined perceived uselessness as the perception that a learning unit is not only without any daily, general, school, or social utility but in fact without any use at all. Perceived uselessness may be a subjective experience. For example, a male S1 student associates amotivation with exercises where “I don't see any value for me”. For a female S1 student those exercises are activities “I don’t have anything to gain”. A female S2 student also pointed out that tasks associated with amotivation have no “value”.