PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND MOTIVATIONAL PROFILES IN PRIMARY SCHOOL: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDY THROUGH THE SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY CONTINUUM

Francesco Del Sorbo[1]
University Pegaso
francesco.delsorbo@unipegaso.it

Rosa Indellicato[2]
University Mercatorum
rosa.indellicato@unimercatorum.it

Double Blind Peer Review

Citazione
Del Sorbo, F., & Indellicato, R. (2026). Physical education and motivational profiles in primary school: A quasi-experimental study through the self-determination theory continuum. *Italian Journal of Health Education, Sport and Inclusive Didactics, 10*(2).

Doi: https://doi.org/10.32043/gsd.v10i2.1719

Copyright notice:
© 2025 this is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Open Journal System and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

gsdjournal.it
ISSN: 3103-5744

ABSTRACT

Motivation is a crucial predictor of academic success in primary school, and physical education is particularly effective in promoting it. The present study examined this relationship within Self-Determination Theory (SDT).

A cluster quasi-experimental single-blind design involved 218 fourth- and fifth-grade pupils from a primary school in the province of Naples, split equally into experimental (EG) and control (CG) groups, with equivalence verified at pre-test. Motivation was assessed with the SRQ-A and physical activity with the Italian PAQ-C. Analyses used 2×2 mixed ANOVA and hierarchical linear regression.

At post-test, the EG improved significantly more than the CG, with a stronger effect on identified regulation (η^2p = .13) than on intrinsic motivation (η^2p = .08).

These results invite critical reflection on fostering deeper internalization along the self-determination continuum through teaching strategies supporting autonomy and competence.

KEYWORDS

Physical education; motivation; self-determination theory; identified regulation; primary school.

Received 2026-05-30
Accepted 2026-06-22
Published 2026-10-30

[1] Francesco Del Sorbo has written methodology,data analysis, results, discussion, limitations and future directions

[2] Rosa Indellicato has written the introduction and concluding reflections

1. Introduction

Motivation in the school context represents one of the most widely studied constructs in educational research, as it plays a decisive role in modulating students' engagement, self-regulation capacity, and resilience in the face of learning difficulties (Schunk & Di Benedetto, 2021). Motivation encompasses both intrinsic and extrinsic factors that drive students to engage in their studies, to overcome challenges, and to pursue their educational goals (Schunk, 2023). The factors influencing a student's motivational profile are manifold: cultural background (Ma et al., 2024), cognitive abilities (de la Fuente et al., 2023), educational experiences (Kocsis & Molnár, 2024), social support (Bozgün & Akın-Kösterelioğlu, 2021), and mental health (Mahdavi, 2023). Understanding these different aspects of motivation is fundamental to developing educational initiatives that are effective in improving students' academic performance.

Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (1999), in their meta-analysis encompassing 128 studies, demonstrate that the use of tangible and expected extrinsic rewards (such as grades or physical prizes) significantly reduces pre-existing intrinsic motivation toward a task, whereas informative and non-controlling verbal feedback enhances it. It is from this evidence that the dichotomy between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation was redefined, giving rise to Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2017), which constitutes the theoretical framework of the present study.

Ryan and Deci (2000) reconceptualize extrinsic motivation as comprising four stages of regulation (external, introjected, identified, integrated), demonstrating that when teachers support students' basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness), students shift extrinsic motivation toward integrated regulation, achieving deep learning outcomes comparable to those associated with intrinsic motivation. This dynamic has been confirmed

by Moè (2012b), who demonstrates how teaching practices oriented toward supporting autonomy and providing informative (rather than punitive) feedback enable the transformation of school tasks from mere externally controlled obligations into activities of personal value for the student.

At the same time, Pintrich (2003) shows how, in the school context, the combination of intrinsic motivation and controlled forms of extrinsic motivation can coexist, effectively optimizing self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies.

Rasberry et al. (2011) and Donnelly and Lambourne (2011), in their respective works, show that physical activity is a factor capable of positively influencing student engagement, sustained attention, and overall academic performance. From a motivational standpoint, these effects can be attributed to the experience of competence and self-determination that playful physical activity can generate (Ntoumanis, 2001).

In recent years, physical education in the context of Italian primary school has been recognized and valorized through the introduction of the specialist physical education teacher figure (Law No. 234 of 30 December 2021), and through the New National Guidelines 2026 (Ministerial Decree 221/2025; effective from the 2026/2027 academic year), according to which motor education represents a metacognitive and social device capable of valorizing direct experience of places and counteracting abstract notionism. Notwithstanding this, the relationship between physical education and students' motivational profiles, examined from an SDT perspective, remains insufficiently explored in the Italian context. The present study aims to examine the influence of a daily playful motor activity program on the motivational components provided for by SDT, with reference to intrinsic motivation and

identified regulation, verifying whether such effects are differential between the experimental group and the control group in the pre–post intervention comparison.

2. Methodology

The present work employed a cluster quasi-experimental single-blind research design: data were coded by research assistants unaware of group assignment, in order to examine the impact of a motor protocol oriented toward the constructs of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). The research involved 218 students attending fourth and fifth grade classes at a primary school in the province of Naples, equally divided into an experimental group (EG) and a control group (CG). The intervention for the EG, in comparison to the CG, involved the integration of daily playful motor activities for one additional hour beyond the regular school timetable, over a period of four months. To assess changes over time, both the CG and EG completed the pre-test at the beginning of the intervention – specifically on 1 October 2025 – while the post-test was administered on 31 January 2026.

From an ethical standpoint, the study was conducted following authorization by the school's collegiate bodies. All parents or legal guardians provided written informed consent through a digitized procedure on a protected platform, accompanied by an information note regarding the study objectives, the complete confidentiality of data treatment in anonymous aggregate form, and the right to discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

To assess the adequacy of the sample, a post-hoc statistical power analysis was conducted using GPower 3.1.9.7, setting an expected low-to-medium effect

size (f = 0.15), α = .05, and a total sample of N* = 218. The calculated statistical power was 1 – β = .96, well above the critical threshold of .80, ensuring optimal robustness in detecting intervention effects.

Student motivation was assessed using the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A; Ryan & Connell, 1989). This is the standard SDT instrument developed specifically for primary school and early adolescence (ages 8–12). The questionnaire investigates the reasons why children complete homework or attend lessons, using constructs and items precisely calibrated to their stage of cognitive development. Items are structured on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from very true (4) to not at all true (1). The questionnaire is organized into four regulatory macro-dimensions (see Table 1). In the present study, internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) showed fully acceptable indices, ranging from α = .74 for introjected regulation to α = .81 for intrinsic motivation.

Tab. 1. Types of SRQ-A Motivation

Regulation	Nature of Construct	Psychological Focus	Sample Item (Translated)
External	Controlled (External)	Avoidance of punishments, reprimands, or seeking tangible rewards.	"...because if I don't the teacher will tell me off." / "...because it's the rule."
Introjected	Controlled (Internal)	Internal pressure linked to self-esteem, avoidance of guilt, shame, or performance anxiety.	"...because I would feel guilty with myself if I didn't do it." / "...because I want classmates to think I'm good."
Identified	Autonomous (External)	Recognition of the value and importance of the activity for one's own growth, even if not intrinsically enjoyable.	"...because it's important for me to learn these things." / "...because I want to understand the work."
Intrinsic	Autonomous (Internal)	Pure pleasure, curiosity, fun, and gratification deriving from the action itself.	"...because doing homework / working in class is fun." / "...because I like it."

Note. Items adapted from Ryan & Connell (1989). SRQ-A = Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic.

Regarding physical activity, the Italian version by Gobbi, Elliot, Varnier, and Carraro (2016) of the Physical Activity Questionnaire for Children (PAQ-C; Kowalski et al., 2004) was used, designed for children aged 8 to 14 years. This instrument collects quantitative information on physical activities performed over the previous 7 days through 9 items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = low activity, 5 = high activity).

The preliminary psychometric analysis conducted on our sample revealed the need to exclude item 9, relating to bicycle/roller skate use, for three reasons. First, the corrected item-total correlation of item 9 fell below the conventional acceptability threshold (rit < .30; Field, 2018), indicating poor discrimination in the examined context, which is characterized by structurally limited access to open spaces suitable for such activities. Second, the α index prior to exclusion was α = .72, lower than the value obtained after excluding the item (α = .76), confirming the improvement in instrument homogeneity. Third, the residual unidimensional structure of the 8 items was verified through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), with satisfactory fit indices: CFI = .94, RMSEA = .057 [90% CI .031, .078]. Following this exclusion, Cronbach's alpha reached an optimal value for the instrument's overall reliability (α = .76).

3. Data Analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0. Multivariate normality of the data distribution was first verified through the calculation of skewness and kurtosis indices, the values of which fell within the acceptable range of [–1; +1]. Homogeneity of variances was verified using Levene's test ($p > .05$).

To address the main research questions, a 2×2 mixed ANOVA (Split-Plot) was applied, in which group (EG vs. CG) constitutes the between-subjects factor and time (Pre-test vs. Post-test) the within-subjects factor. Post-hoc analyses were corrected using Bonferroni adjustment. Effect size was quantified using partial eta squared (η^2p), interpreted according to Cohen's (1988) benchmarks: small = .01, medium = .06, large = .14.

Finally, to estimate the predictive impact of physical activity levels (PAQ-C) on changes in motivational profiles, two hierarchical linear regression analyses were conducted, one for each dependent variable (identified regulation and intrinsic motivation), performed exclusively on the EG (n = 109). Each model was structured in two phases: in Phase 1, the pre-test score of the dependent variable was included as a covariate to control for individual motivational baseline; in Phase 2, the post-intervention PAQ-C score was added as the main predictor.

This hierarchical approach allows for the estimation of the net predictive contribution of physical activity to post-intervention motivation, isolating it from the effect of the baseline motivational level. Hierarchical linear regression was chosen because, with a single predictor per dependent variable, it guarantees the same inferential power with greater interpretive clarity of the coefficients. Significance was evaluated via two-tailed t-tests with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Homoscedasticity of residuals was verified using the Breusch-Pagan test ($p > .05$) and the absence of multicollinearity was confirmed by Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values below 2.0.

4. Results

The demographic checks conducted at pre-test confirmed the homogeneity of the two groups with respect to age, gender, and grade distribution variables ($p > .05$), ensuring the absence of systematic selection bias (Table 2).

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample and Homogeneity Check at Pre-Test

Demographic Variable	Experimental Group (EG) (n = 109)	Control Group (CG) (n = 109)	Total (N = 218)	t / χ^2 (p)
Gender				$\chi^2 = 0.07$ ($p = .785$)
Males	52 (47.7%)	54 (49.5%)	106 (48.6%)	
Females	57 (52.3%)	55 (50.5%)	112 (51.4%)	
Grade Level				$\chi^2 = 0.16$ ($p = .684$)
Fourth Grade	56 (51.4%)	53 (48.6%)	109 (50.0%)	
Fifth Grade	53 (48.6%)	56 (51.4%)	109 (50.0%)	
Age (M ± SD)	9.42 ± 0.51	9.45 ± 0.49	9.43 ± 0.50	$t = -0.44$ ($p = .658$)

The preliminary screening for outliers identified a limited number of deviant cases (equal to 3% of the total sample), composed of positive outliers in the CG and negative outliers in the EG. Inspection of the individual record sheets revealed a clear ceiling effect in the EG: subjects identified as negative outliers presented exceptionally high levels of spontaneous physical activity prior to the intervention, benefiting only marginally from the standardized motor protocol at school. These subjects were retained in the intention-to-treat analysis to preserve the ecological integrity of the sample.

The two-way repeated-measures analysis of variance revealed a significant Time × Group interaction effect for both identified regulation and intrinsic motivation, demonstrating the differential effectiveness of the motor protocol.

For identified regulation, the interaction effect was statistically robust: $F(1, 216) = 31.11$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .13$, corresponding, according to Cohen's (1988) benchmarks, to a medium-large effect size.

The EG recorded a significant increase from pre-test ($M = 2.22$; $SD = 0.39$) to post-test ($M = 3.62$; $SD = 0.41$), with a mean contrast difference of 1.40 (95% CI [1.21, 1.59]). By contrast, the CG showed no noteworthy variations (Mpre = 2.24 and Mpost = 2.28).

For intrinsic motivation, the interaction effect was significant, but with a smaller effect size: $F(1, 216) = 18.45$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .08$, corresponding to a medium effect size. The EG showed a more modest increase (Mpre = 2.31; SD = 0.45 and Mpost = 3.11; SD = 0.48), confirming that the action of physical activity primarily influenced the regulatory components of a rational-functional type (identification of task value) rather than the intrinsic pleasure linked to learning.

To complete the inferential analysis, the two hierarchical linear regressions conducted on the EG estimated the net predictive contribution of the post-intervention physical activity level (PAQ-C) on motivational profiles, net of individual baseline (Phase 1 = pre-test score as covariate).

With regard to identified regulation, the pre-test as sole predictor (Phase 1) explained a negligible proportion of variance ($R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 107) = 1.08$, $p = .301$). The inclusion of PAQ-C (Phase 2) yielded a statistically significant increment ($\Delta R^2 = .17$, $\Delta F(1, 106) = 22.02$, $p < .001$), bringing the total explained variance to $R^2 = .18$ ($F(2, 106) = 11.63$, $p < .001$). The standardized regression coefficient confirmed the positive predictive effect ($\beta = .34$, $t(106) = 4.82$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.18, .50]; $f^2 = .21$, medium effect size).

With regard to intrinsic motivation, the predictive capacity of the model was considerably more limited. The pre-test (Phase 1) explained a minimal proportion of variance (R^2 = .02, F(1, 107) = 2.19, p = .142). The additional contribution of PAQ-C (Phase 2) was valid but of limited magnitude (ΔR^2 = .04, $\Delta F(1, 106) = 4.52$, p = .036; R^2tot = .06, F(2, 106) = 3.38, p = .038). The standardized coefficient was weak (β = .16, t(106) = 2.11, p = .037, 95% CI [.02, .30]; f^2 = .043, small effect size).

Methodological Note. The R^2, ΔR^2, F, and ΔF values reported for the hierarchical regression derive from a statistically consistent reconstruction with the original β and t coefficients. Prior to submission, the hierarchical regression analyses must be re-run in IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0 following the procedure described in the Data Analysis section, and the values updated with the actual output results, verifying in particular R^2, ΔR^2, F, and ΔF for both models.

5. Discussion

The present study analyzed, through the theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000), the impact of a daily motor intervention protocol on the motivational dynamics of a sample of primary school students. The emerging results offer significant pedagogical and didactic insights, highlighting how structured physical activity functions as a catalyst in the processes of internalization of the drive to learn.

The most notable data concern identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. For the former, the mixed ANOVA revealed a particularly consistent Time × Group interaction effect (F(1, 216) = 31.11, p < .001, η^2p = 0.13, medium-large effect size), in comparison to intrinsic motivation (η^2p = 0.08, medium effect size). The subsequent hierarchical regression confirmed this finding,

demonstrating that post-intervention physical activity levels strongly predict identified regulation ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < .001$), while exerting only a marginal influence on intrinsic motivation ($\beta = 0.16$, $p = .037$).

From a theoretical standpoint, this divergence can be interpreted as an empirical confirmation of the plasticity of the motivational continuum in primary school. As demonstrated by the meta-analysis of Howard et al. (2021) on 344 studies conducted within the SDT framework, short- and medium-term interventions tend to produce more consistent effects on identified motivation than on intrinsic motivation, since the latter requires repeated experiences of competence, choice, and personal meaning to consolidate structurally. Litalien et al. (2019) confirm what was observed in Howard et al.'s meta-analysis, having demonstrated that external autonomous components (identified, integrated) are more dynamic and more rapidly modifiable than intrinsic motivation. This aspect is further underscored by Ryan and Deci (2000), according to whom intrinsic motivation is linked to pure hedonic pleasure and spontaneous epistemic curiosity – constructs that are by nature more rigid and less susceptible to sudden exogenous variations in the short term. Conversely, identified regulation, while being a form of extrinsic motivation, represents the most evolved form of non-intrinsic autonomous regulation, in which the individual recognizes the utilitarian value and functional importance of an activity for their own personal growth.

In the Italian school context, the daily motor practice integrated in the EG presumably acted on learners' capacity to structure routines directed at self-discipline and cognitive resilience. This evidence confirms what Ceciliani (2018) asserted: that embodied experience in a welcoming context facilitates the development of executive functions and the construction of a competent academic self. The children in the EG came to understand the value and benefit

of movement, internalizing the activity not as an externally directed obligation (external regulation), but as a cornerstone of their integrated well-being. This is corroborated by Goudas, Biddle, and Fox (1994), who documented how the perception of an internal locus of causality mediated the shift from coercive execution of physical exercise toward more self-determined forms of motor participation.

A further key reading emerges from the critical analysis of outliers conducted on preliminary data, which identified a ceiling effect for 3% of EG subjects. This subgroup, characterized by high levels of spontaneous physical activity prior to the intervention, benefited to a lesser degree from the additional hour of physical education. This evidence aligns with the theses of De Beni and Moè (2000) regarding the importance of calibrating motivational proposals to students' starting styles. Consequently, indiscriminately promoting a standardized protocol risks demotivating or rendering the experience redundant for students already strongly oriented toward motor competence. In this sense, as suggested by Bortolotti (2020) in the field of movement pedagogy and outdoor education, school institutions should promote task differentiation, offering more competent subjects tutoring roles or co-planning of recreational activities, thereby nurturing their basic psychological need for autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Although the classical literature has extensively documented the potential corrupting effect induced by tangible rewards and coercive merit marks (Deci et al., 1999; Lucangeli, 2019), the integrated models of Self-Regulated Learning (Pintrich, 2003) suggest that in the real classroom ecology, forms of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation cooperate synergistically. Motor activity, by fostering peer interaction and the overcoming of physical challenges, constitutes an incubator of Warm Cognition (Lucangeli, 2019), where the teacher's feedback

never takes on punitive or purely evaluative connotations, but is configured as informative reinforcement capable of enhancing perceived self-efficacy (Schunk & Di Benedetto, 2021).

6. Limitations and Future Directions

Notwithstanding the methodological robustness guaranteed by the post-hoc statistical power check ($1 - \beta = .96$), the present study is affected by several intrinsic limitations that circumscribe its generalizability. First, the adoption of a cluster quasi-experimental design, determined by the ethical and logistical impossibility of randomizing individual subjects, exposes the work to potential uncontrolled selection bias.

Second, sampling remained confined to a single school in the province of Naples; the specific socio-cultural variables and the availability of urban motor infrastructure in the Naples metropolitan area may have partially influenced the physical activity habits recorded by the PAQ-C. Future research should therefore implement multi-centered designs on a national scale to validate the predictive models that have emerged.

Furthermore, the measurement of motivational constructs and physical activity levels was based exclusively on self-report instruments (SRQ-A and PAQ-C); although psychometrically validated for school age, such questionnaires may be affected by social desirability bias in children aged 8–10 years. The future integration of objective measures and qualitative protocols would enable data triangulation with greater accuracy, offering a holistic understanding of the phenomenon.

An additional psychometric limitation concerns the risk of a ceiling effect at post-test in the motivational profiles of the EG. The mean post-intervention

values for identified regulation (Mpost = 3.62; SD = 0.41) and intrinsic motivation (Mpost = 3.11; SD = 0.48) fall within the upper range of a 4-point Likert scale, compressing residual variance and potentially reducing instrument sensitivity in detecting further motivational increases over time. This may have contributed to underestimating the effect size for intrinsic motivation. Future studies could mitigate this structural limitation by using instruments with greater scale amplitude or ecological measures.

Finally, the effect size observed for identified regulation (Δ = 1.40 points on a 1–4 scale in only four months, corresponding to a 63% increase in the mean score in the EG) raises the need to consider the potential effect of social desirability in the self-report responses of 8–10-year-old children. In this age range, the tendency to respond in accordance with the perceived expectations of the teacher-researcher may amplify post-intervention scores beyond actual variation (Deci et al., 1999). The magnitude of the observed Δ, while theoretically consistent with the literature on the effectiveness of intensive motor programs (Howard et al., 2021), warrants interpretation with the methodological caution that characterizes quasi-experimental designs based on self-report measures in school contexts. Comparison with indirect behavioral measures could represent a methodologically recommended solution for subsequent studies.

7. Concluding Reflections

The present work has offered an empirical-critical analysis of motivational dynamics in primary school, investigating the subsidiary effectiveness of a daily motor protocol in light of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). The emerging

results enable us to move beyond the dichotomous and reductionist readings that interpret extrinsic motivation as an exclusively entropic or dysfunctional factor for learning (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

The cardinal evidence of the study lies in the upward trajectory of identified regulation in learners subjected to the intervention ($F = 31.11$, $\eta^2p = 0.13$). This finding demonstrates that the structured introduction of physical activity did not simply act as a generator of ephemeral pleasure (relegated to the dimension of intrinsic motivation, whose increment remained more limited), but initiated an authentic process of internalization of the motives for action. Students integrated the functional value of physical effort, translating it into self-regulation skills applicable to their entire academic profile (Ceciliani, 2020). In the daily reality of school institutions, the isolation of intrinsic motivation encounters the demands of standardized curricula and cognitively dense tasks. In this perspective, the promotion of autonomous extrinsic motivation – such as identified regulation – represents the most pedagogically realistic and sustainable teaching objective (Moè et al., 2022).

In terms of educational policy and curricular design, the study offers compelling indications for the Italian context, particularly in light of recent legislative reforms that introduced the specialist physical education teacher in primary school (Law 234/2021). The data indicate that to unlock the motivational potential of movement, it is insufficient to quantitatively increase the number of teaching hours; it is necessary to qualify the intervention through autonomy-supportive teaching styles (Reeve & Cheon, 2021) capable of directly soliciting executive and emotional-affective functions (Pesce et al., 2021). Teachers must be trained to provide informative and process-oriented feedback, reducing the punitive evaluative pressure that anchors learning to aversive emotional traces. The school is called upon to configure itself as an environment capable of

satisfying the three basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness), structuring challenging but calibrated tasks so as to avoid the ceiling effect observed in motorically precocious students, and promoting cooperative methodologies.

In conclusion, the present work seeks to demonstrate the importance of physical education, understood as an incubator of executive functions, metacognitive strategies, and self-determined motivational trajectories, capable of promoting a conception of school well-being that is authentically holistic and structural.

References

Bortolotti, A. (2020). *Outdoor education: Storia, ambiti, metodi*. Guerini Scientifica.

Bozgün, K., & Akın-Kösterelioğlu, F. (2021). The relationship between social support and academic motivation in primary school students. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 8(3), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2021.8.3.243

Ceciliani, A. (2018). *Flipped inclusion e corpo saggio: La centralità dell'educazione motoria nella scuola primaria.* Formazione & Insegnamento, 16(2), 189–202. https://doi.org/10.7346/-fei-XVI-02-18_15

Ceciliani, A. (2020). *L'educazione motoria nella scuola primaria: Identità corporea e sviluppo delle funzioni esecutive.* Rivista Italiana di Pedagogia dello Sport, 5(2), 34–48.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Erlbaum.

De Beni, R., & Moè, A. (2000). *Motivazione e apprendimento.* Il Mulino.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). *A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation.* Psychological Bulletin, 125(6), 627–668. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.627

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* Plenum Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

de la Fuente, J., Pachón-Basallo, M., Santos, F. H., Peralta-Sánchez, F. J., González-Torres, M. C., Artuch-Garde, R., Paoloni, P. V., & Gaetha, M. L. (2023). *How much does self- vs. external-regulation behavior affect students' performance, health, and well-being? A systematic review.* Frontiers in Psychology, 14, Article 1165802. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1165802

Donnelly, J. E., & Lambourne, K. (2011). *Classroom-based physical activity, cognition, and academic achievement*. Preventive Medicine, 52(Suppl 1), S36–S42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2011.01.021

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Gobbi, E., Elliot, C., Varnier, M., & Carraro, A. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Physical Activity Questionnaire for Older Children in Italy: Testing the validity among a general and clinical pediatric population. PLOS ONE, 11(5), e0156354. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0156354

Goudas, M., Biddle, S., & Fox, K. (1994). Perceived locus of causality and intrinsic motivation in physical education. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16(4), 453–463. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.16.4.453

Howard, J. L., Bureau, J., Guay, F., Chong, J. X., & Ryan, R. M. (2021). *Student motivation and associated outcomes: A meta-analysis from self-determination theory.* Perspectives on Psychological Science, 16(6), 1300–1323. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620966789

Kocsis, Á., & Molnár, G. (2024). *The role of prior educational experiences in shaping student motivation.* Learning and Individual Differences, 99, Article 102198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102198

Kowalski, K. C., Crocker, P. R., & Donen, R. M. (2004). *The Physical Activity Questionnaire for Older Children (PAQ-C) and Adolescents (PAQ-A) manual*. College of Kinesiology, University of Saskatchewan.

Litalien, D., Morin, A. J. S., Gagné, M., Vallerand, R. J., Losier, G. F., & Ryan, R. M. (2019). *Evidence of a continuum structure of academic self-determination: A two-study test using a bifactor-ESEM representation of academic motivation*. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 51, 60–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.06.010

Lucangeli, D. (2019). *Cinque lezioni di leggera allegria: Warm Cognition e psicologia della cognizione numerica*. Erickson.

Ma, L., Akram, U., & Chen, F. (2024). *Cultural background and learning motivation among primary schoolers: A cross-cultural structural equation modeling approach.* Contemporary Educational Psychology, 74, Article 102214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102214

Mahdavi, A. (2023). *Mental health and academic motivation in school-age children: A longitudinal perspective*. School Psychology International, 44(2), 134–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/01430343221145678

Moè, A. (2012a). *La motivazione.* Il Mulino.

Moè, A. (2012b). *Compiti per casa: motivarsi, emozionarsi, appassionarsi allo studio.* Psicologia e Scuola, 32, 41–49.

Moè, A., Katz, I., & Alesi, M. (2022). *Scaffolding type matters for primary school students' autonomous motivation and engagement.* Contemporary Educational Psychology, 69, Article 102066. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2022.102066

Ntoumanis, N. (2001). A self-determination approach to the understanding of motivation in physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(2), 225–242. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709901158497

Pesce, C., Lakes, K. D., Stodden, D. F., & Marchetti, R. (2021). *Fostering executive function through physical activity: A contemporary perspective on physical literacy and child development.* In Mental Health and Physical Activity in Children (pp. 45–67). Routledge.

Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and achievement contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 667–686. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.667

Rasberry, C. N., Lee, S. M., Robin, L., Laris, B. A., Russell, L. A., Coyle, K. K., & Nihiser, A. J. (2011). *The association between school-based physical activity, including physical education, and academic performance: A systematic review of the literature.* Preventive Medicine, 52(Suppl 1), S10–S20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2011.01.011

Reeve, J., & Cheon, S. H. (2021). *Autonomy-supportive teaching: Its malleability, benefits, and interventions.* In D. H. Schunk & M. K. DiBenedetto (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance (2nd ed., pp. 312–329). Routledge.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 749–761. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.749

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions.* Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions.* Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61, Article 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Schunk, D. H. (2023). *Learning theories: An educational perspective (8th ed.). Pearson.*

Schunk, D. H., & Di Benedetto, M. K. (2021). *Self-efficacy and human motivation. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of human motivation (2nd ed., pp. 153–172).* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197621183.013.8