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INTRODUCTION

1 student SEN out of 4 in typically developed classes in high school in Quebec (Commission des droits de la personne et des droits de la jeunesse, 2018)

Positive experiences + success by learning tasks (Block, 2016)

Inclusive teaching models

Positive academic and social impacts (Klavina & Block, 2008)

Motivation?
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Individual interest (II)

Situational interest (SI)

(Hidi & Anderson, 1992)
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

4 phases models

- Triggered SI
- Maintained SI
- Emerging II
- Well-developed II

Short term changes
- Focalisation + persistance
- Reengagement with particular contenu

Predisposition to reengage

(Hidi & Renninger, 2006)
BACKGROUND

Students
- Acceptation
- Interactions
  (Goodwin & Watkinson, 2000; Wallhead et al., 2013)
- Cognitive engagement
  (Chen & Darst, 1999)

Sex differences
Social influence with stereotyped sports
(Chen & Darst, 2002)
OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

Objectives:
- Measure motivation high school SEN
- Compare with peers SI

Hypotheses:
- SI will be different between students with SEN and their peers.
- As well as between boys and girls (Chen & Darst, 2002).
METHODS

Cross-sectional study

Gender
N = 42 students
(16.6 ± 0.5 years)

Girls
14

Boys
28

Student types
*only 1 girl with SEN

Typically developed
33

SEN
9
METHODS
NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS WITH SEN ($N = 9$)

**Motor**
- $N = 1$

**Social**
- $N = 3$

**Affective**
- $N = 2$

**Cognitive**
- $N = 3$
COMPETENCE 2: “interact in various contexts of physical activity practice” (PFEQ, 2010).

LEARNING MODEL: cooperative learning (Johnson & al., 1989).

PEDAGOGICAL INTENTION: to perform a synchronized team choreography (social and motor learning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation modalities</th>
<th>Circus</th>
<th>Synchronized swimming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>$N = 18$</td>
<td>$N = 24$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>75 min</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor vs outdoor</td>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>Indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team size</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation modalities</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Peer to peer and teacher live evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9-items questionnaires (Hidi & Renninger, 2006)

Method

2 scales

- Triggered SI: ex. what we learned today asked me for attention?
- Maintained SI: ex. I would learn more about this activity?
RESULTS

1) Neutral interest for the cooperative learning situation
   \((3.5 \pm 0.5; 3.2 \pm 1.0)\)

2) No difference in triggering and maintaining SI between SEN \((N = 9)\)
   and their peers \((N = 33)\).
RESULTS

$t$ TESTS

3) Boys ($N = 26$) have lower maintaining situational interest than girls ($N = 14$)

![Graph showing triggered and maintained situational interest between boys and girls.](chart)

Triggered and maintained situational interest between boys and girls

- **Boys**
  - Triggering: $3.47 \pm 0.51$
  - Maintaining: $3.03 \pm 1.13$

- **Girls**
  - Triggering: $3.57 \pm 0.45$
  - Maintaining: $3.73 \pm 0.63$

* $p < 0.05$
DISCUSSION

- No difference between SEN and peers (Langlois-Pelletier & al., 2018)

Situational interest have more motivational potential than individual for every student (Hidi & Anderson, 1992).

- Gender differences

Gradual transformation of situational interest to individual interest

(Hidi & Renninger, 2006)

High skills and competence = high situational interest and individual interest

(Chen & Darst, 2002)

Situational interest to Individual interest

Social influences and stereotypes

(Garrett et Wrench, 2018)
To evaluate

SI and II

Capacities and self-efficacy

Student’s characteristics
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