

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## Modeling temporality in person and variable centered approaches.

### Journal Item

#### How to cite:

Tempelaar, D; Rienties, Bart; Giesbers, G and Nguyen, Quan (2023). Modeling temporality in person and variable centered approaches. *Journal of Learning Analytics* (in press).

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© [not recorded]



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](https://oro.open.ac.uk)

Tempelaar, D., Rienties, B., Giesbers, G., Nguyen, Q. (2023). Modeling temporality in person and variable centered approaches. *Journal of Learning Analytics*.

## **MODELING TEMPORALITY IN PERSON AND VARIABLE CENTERED APPROACHES**

Abstract: Learning analytics needs to pay more attention to the temporal aspect of learning processes, especially in self-regulated learning (SRL) research. In doing so, learning analytics models should incorporate both the duration and frequency of learning activities, the passage of time, and the temporal order of learning activities. However, where this exhortation is widely supported, there is less agreement on its consequences. Temporal aspects of learning processes could be presented as events, but does paying tribute to temporal aspects necessarily imply that event-based models are to replace variable-based models, and whether analytic discovery methods could or even should substitute traditional statistical methods? Our contribution will reason that we do not require such a paradigm shift to give temporal aspects the position it deserves. First, we argue that temporal aspects can be well integrated into variable-based models that apply statistical methods by carefully choosing appropriate time windows and granularity levels. Our second argument is that in addressing temporality in learning analytic models that describe authentic learning settings, heterogeneity is of crucial importance in both variable and event-based models. Variable-based person-centered modeling where a heterogeneous sample is split into homogeneous subsamples is suggested as a solution. Our conjecture is illustrated by an application of dispositional learning analytics, describing authentic learning processes over an eight-week full module of 2,360 students.

Key words: Temporal analysis; Learning analytics; Dispositional learning analytics; Time; Event-based models.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The call for a paradigm shift (Saint et al., 2022) in applications of Learning Analytics (LA) follows an earlier call for strengthening the role of temporality in LA applications (Chen et al., 2018; Knight et al., 2017). Paying more attention to the time dimension in LA models and using appropriate LA methods incorporating time dimensions are a widely welcomed voices in the LA community. The appeal is primarily aimed at achieving more balance in the state of contemporary LA research, where static models seem to be dominant. The suggestion by Reimann (2009) to improve balance by integrating temporal aspects in existing working methods and combining variable-centered methods, which investigate relationships between independent and dependent variables, and event-centered methods that model whether, when, and for how long events take place, found their way into LA-based studies such as Han et al. (2020), Pardo et al. (2017) and Author2 (2022).

In contrast, the paradigm shift proposed by Saint et al. (2022) as a conclusion to their systematic literature review of temporally-focused analytics of self-regulated learning (SRL), introduces such a radical change that it can only be seen as a call for an opposite imbalance. The proposed 'framework of directives and questions to aid researchers' (Saint et al., 2022) steers the LA user, in a context where time plays a crucial role, inevitably towards the use of analytic discovery methods as process or sequence mining with learning events rather than learning-related variables acting as the subjects of these models. There is no escaping the impression that taking this route is better featured as creating a new imbalance in the opposite direction as the previous one rather than restoring balance. Referring to Reimann's (2009, p. 242) call: '*I argue in this paper that an event-based view of process and change is an important addition to the variable-centric approach.*' The power is clearly in the combination of the two, not in the individual components by themselves.

In this paper, we shall argue, and support with an empirical example, that the renunciation of traditional, variable-oriented statistical methods in favor of discovery methods based on event data is by no means necessary to give the time aspect a proper place in LA modelling. Nor is it in line with the original analyses about an inadequate role of time in our models, as put forward in Reimann (2009), Reimann et al. (2014) and Molenaar and Wise (2022), that seek the incorporation of temporality in existing explanatory theories: "*In the absence of explanatory theory, using sequence and process mining methods for exploratory purposes on learning data is helpful for detecting potential regularities worth explaining. However, patterns of regular event sequences are only conceptually interesting if they are sufficiently explained in theoretical terms.*" (Reimann et al., 2014, p. 538).

## 2. TEMPORALITY IN LEARNING ANALYTICS

### 2.1 The role of time in learning

The notion that learning is fundamentally a temporal process, that 'learning unfolds over time', is the departure point of Reimann's (2009) call to pay better tribute to the fact that 'time is precious'. In this, time allows different conceptualizations. First, the notion of temporality as the 'passage of time' refers to the duration and frequency of learning activities (Knight et al., 2017; Molenaar, 2014; Molenaar & Wise, 2022). How often do activities take place, and how much is the time-on-task? A second conceptualization relates to the temporal order of learning

activities: what comes first, and what follows (Author4, 2018)? Concerning both perspectives, Reimann observes that empirical research into learning processes (so not only practices of LA) understates the role of temporality: “... researchers have privileged access to process data, the theoretical constructs and methods employed in research practice frequently neglect to make full use of information relating to time and order.” (Reimann, 2009, p. 239; see also Knight et al., 2017, p. 7).

When matters of temporality are brought to the forefront, both data collection and methodological choices may require a shift. Where LA research is often based on variable-oriented modelling, the introduction of time and specific temporal ordering can profit from event-oriented modelling (Molenaar, 2014; Reimann et al., 2014). Analytical methods best suited for these contexts may require temporal data mining or sequential pattern mining techniques (Reimann et al., 2014; Rizvi et al., 2022).

Two manuscripts by Uzir and co-authors (Uzir et al., 2019; 2020) are leading examples of investigating temporal facets of self-regulated learning. Both focus on estimating students’ time management tactics using trace data. The four different time management tactics discovered in these papers, learning ahead, learning just in time, catching-up and revisiting, all refer to the timing of student learning for the topic of the specific week, thus, are based on the design of the module. In the Uzir et al. (2020) manuscript, time-management tactics are combined with learning tactic components of learning strategies, applying automatic detection based on traces. Saint et al. (2020) provide another example of investigating the temporal facets of self-regulated learning, where the focus is not time management relative to an educational design-based schedule but the allocation of learning activities over the stages of planning and forethought, performance and monitoring, and reflection and evaluation.

## 2.2 Seeking balance

A nuanced approach characterized the earliest calls for more focus on the temporal aspect. After introducing event-centered analysis, Reimann (2009, p. 242) states ‘*I argue in this paper that an event-based view of process and change is an important addition to the variable-centric approach.*’ The complementary nature of the two approaches is made explicit in Reimann’s proposal to combine variable-centered and event-centered methods in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) research. Reimann et al. (2014, p. 529) explain why such a combination is essential, where they warn for ‘*major ontological constraints of solely event-focused theoretical explanations of learning phenomena*’. Since learning often takes place in so-called open systems that have external interactions, the authors infer that ‘*[a]ccounting for events, such as human learning activities, solely in terms of other events—what we call “a flat event ontology”—is not a strategy that can lead to the identification of learning mechanisms.*’ (Reimann et al., 2014, p. 535). A dilemma that can be solved by ‘*... including other levels that provide certain theoretical account of a mechanism and context. Dispositional accounts, such as those based on aptitude, are good candidates for explanations in [self-regulated learning] (SRL) research.*’ (Reimann et al., 2014, p. 536). A last balance to restore is that investigating authentic learning contexts versus short learning episodes taking place in laboratory settings by investigating ‘*perceptually and experientially richer problem-solving environments*’ that ‘*provide for more authentic learning experiences*’ (Reimann et al., 2014, p. 537).

However, much of this nuance is lost in more recent work on the role of time in LA. An example is the systematic literature review of temporally-focused analytics of SRL by Saint et al. (2022). Arguing that the sequential dynamics of processes of SRL ‘*... could not be articulated using traditional count-based statistical methods*’ (Saint et al., 2022, p. 2), the authors decided to use as one of the exclusion criteria for the review: ‘*studies which relied heavily or solely on traditional statistical methods*’. By restricting the focus on research applying

analytic discovery methods only, such as process and sequence mining, there is little left for the wish to combine events with variables and ground the modelling in educational theories of SRL.

### **2.3 Authentic settings and different levels of variable-centered approaches: inter-individual, intra-individual and person-centered**

Another methodological debate concerning the design of empirical models of learning processes is the merits of inter-individual analyses versus intra-individual analyses. Inter-individual differences are differences that are observed between people, whereas intra-individual differences are differences that are observed within the same person when they are assessed at different times or in different situations. The plea for greater application of within-person, intra-individual research in educational psychology is derived from Molenaar's contribution to system theory (2004; Molenaar & Campbell, 2009; Voelkle et al., 2014). That contribution focuses on the ergodic theorems of dynamic systems. Ergodicity addresses the question under what conditions the analysis of inter-individual or between-person variation results in the same outcomes as the analysis of intra-individual or within-person variation. The answer is given by the two ergodic conditions: (1) homogeneity, each subject in the population obeys the same statistical model, and (2) stationarity, that statistical model is constant over time (Molenaar, 2004; Molenaar & Campbell, 2009).

According to Howard and Hoffman (2018), both inter-individual analysis (termed variable-centered approaches) and intra-individual analysis (termed person-specific approaches) are poles of a continuum of methodological approaches. They characterize these methodological approaches with two attributes: specificity and parsimony. In that continuum ranging from relative parsimony, the variable-centered pole, to relative richness, the person-specific pole, Howard and Hoffman (2018) position a third approach in the middle: the person-centered approach. In this approach, unobserved heterogeneity in the population is acknowledged and solved by classifying subjects into homogeneous subpopulations. The analysis aims to understand relations with antecedents and consequences on the subpopulation level, just as one would do in the variable-centered approach when the population is homogeneous. Person-centered approaches fall into the middle of the continuum: their solutions are richer but less parsimonious than variable-centered outcomes, describing subpopulations by different models, but are less rich and more parsimonious than person-specific solutions that create models for each subject.

Indeed LA studies taking place in authentic learning settings, as compared to laboratory-based research, are often plagued by strong heterogeneity of the learners (Pardo et al., 2017; Rizvi et al., 2022; Author1, 2020a): in a class, one can expect novice learners and learners with prior knowledge, whereas, in lab research, one can choose the topic to minimize any prior knowledge. Next, authentic settings will prevent repeatedly measuring parts of the learning process, as is common in laboratory research. Heterogeneity asks for analyses of intra-individual type, but a lack of repeated measures will generally exclude such approaches. Therefore, in this study, we argue that in these cases a person-centered approach (Malcom-Piqueux, 2015) is not only a good compromise, it is the only possible modeling approach.

### **2.4 Research objectives**

The main objective of this contribution is to recover (some of) that lost nuance in Saint et al. (2022). In the recognition that the call for more focus on the temporal aspect of learning processes is valid in itself, especially when investigating SRL, we aim to demonstrate two things. First, Reimann's (2009) appeal to combine variable-

centered modeling with a focus on the role of events and their temporary ordering can very well be achieved for SRL-related data by carefully operationalizing measurements related to SRL processes, also in authentic learning settings. Second, we extend this objective by demonstrating that ‘traditional count-based statistical methods’ can be used to make temporal aspects of SRL visible, as long as the choice of measured constructs is based on these temporal aspects of self-regulation. Rephrased in the words of Reimann et al. (2014, p. 538): *‘(EDM) needs to be applied to data that measures theoretically relevant properties and mechanisms. These are not necessarily found in log files of software that has been designed for practical educational rather than research purposes.’*

The theoretical relevance of our demonstration is grounded in the instructional context in which it is situated, as well as the socio-cognitive nature of that instructional context. Our case study investigates SRL in context of a problem-based learning (PBL; Hmelo-Silver, 2004) program. In line with PBL principles, the learning process is subdivided into three consecutive learning phases. The first learning phase is the preparation of the tutorial session in which small groups of students, the tutorial groups, collaboratively try to solve problem tasks. A second learning phase follows later the same week when students prepare a so-called quiz session in which they are asked to demonstrate their mastery of topics learned in the weekly learning cycle. The third and last learning phase refers to preparing for the final examination at the end of the module, where students demonstrate how well they have integrated the several weekly learning cycles by solving integrated problems. Since each of these learning phases are sharply demarcated by the timing of respectively tutorial sessions, quizzes, and final exam, an operationalization of log file data that distinguishes student engagement in subsequent learning phases can be implemented. This operationalization enables to include both passage of time measures (Knight et al. 2017), the intensity of engagement in each learning phase, as well as order of time measures: the relative allocation of engagement over three learning phases. In concrete: as an alternative to detecting sequential, ordering and temporal patterns in self-regulated learning by data-driven discovery methods, resulting in event-based models, this study aims to demonstrate that we can pay tribute to temporality and sequencing of events using traditional, variable-based statistical methods. Central in this approach is the careful selection of time windows and the size of time units, not by discovery methods but as the consequence of the educational design (Molenaar et al., 2022).

The second component of grounding measures on relevant theoretical principles stems from the social-cognitive nature of PBL (Hmelo-Silver, 2004). In such instructional philosophy of student-centered learning, a crucial consideration is: what learning skills do students need to be successful learners in a PBL program? The skill of being a self-regulated learner is generally regarded as a key disposition for PBL (Loyens et al., 2013). This is in line with Reimann et al. (2014)’s recommendation to include aptitudes, the set of students’ skills, abilities and will to learn, as ‘other levels’ in the form of dispositional accounts to complement event-based data as candidates for explanation in SRL research. Learning styles, epistemic beliefs and attitudes are introduced in Reimann et al. (2014) as being crucial for SRL. Our perspective is largely overlapping but slightly broader: to pay tribute to all facets of social constructivism, aptitudes were included that cover a range of affective, behavioral and cognitive dispositions. These include cognitive learning processing strategies and metacognitive learning regulation strategies, cognitive motivational constructs of both adaptive and maladaptive types, behavioral engagement constructs, again of adaptive and maladaptive types, and epistemic learning emotions as affective measures. Following Reimann et al. (2014), we regard these aptitudes as sufficiently static to assume stationarity over the entire module period. That supposition allows us to measure aptitudes at the very start of the module, and regard these as students’ entry characteristics.

Incorporating stationary learning aptitudes into a model that describes the evolvement of learning events over time is the second main goal of this contribution. Our solution is grounded on variables-based modeling, after

transforming event-based measures into variables. That transformation refers to both the passage of time and order of time types of events. To our knowledge, integrating learning aptitudes into event-based models is still unexplored.

The solutions that compose this contribution aim to provide confirmative answers to the following research questions. RQ1: can we design models of learning processes that incorporate temporal facets using time windows and granularity derived from the educational design? RQ2: do these models need to be event-based or are variable-based models fit for incorporating temporal facets? RQ3: if we opt for creating learning profiles that enable learning feedback or educational interventions framed in terms of essential aptitudes for self-regulated learning, what are the perspectives of event-based and variable-based solutions?

### **3. METHODS**

#### **3.1 Context and setting**

This study took place in a large-scale introductory mathematics and statistics module for first-year undergraduate students in a business and economics program in the Netherlands, with a study load of 20 hours per week, for a period of eight weeks. This module was a compulsory first module for all first-year students and often a stumbling block for students with limited mathematics affinity. The educational system is best described as ‘blended’ or ‘hybrid’ according to the principle of flipped class design. The main component was face-to-face: PBL, where students learn in small groups (14 students), coached by a content expert tutor. Participation in tutorial groups was required and constituted around 2 x 2 hours per week. Weekly, pre-recorded online lectures introduce the key concepts of that week. The remaining 14 hours were self-study, which was supported by printed materials (i.e., textbooks) and two interactive e-tutorials: Sowiso (<https://sowiso.nl/>) and MyStatLab (Author4, 2016; Author2, 2019; Author1, 2015, 2017, 2020a, 2020b). This design was based on the philosophy of student-centered education, placing the responsibility for making educational choices primarily on the student. In line with the principles of PBL, feedback from our LA applications was shared with students and tutors. In their bilateral contact with the students of their tutorial groups, the tutors also take care of the ‘prompting’ when needed: they discuss the consequences of the feedback and options to improve. Since this prompting takes place in tutorial sessions, it remains unobserved.

As stated before, this study distinguished three relatively distinct learning phases in terms of the timing of learning. In phase 1, students prepare for the first tutorial session of the week. The face-to-face time of tutorial sessions was used to discuss solving ‘advanced’ mathematical and statistical problems and required preceding self-study by students to enable participation in discussion. Phase 1 was not formally assessed, other than that such preparation allowed students to actively participate in discussing the problems in the tutorial session. Phase 2 was preparing the quiz session at the end of every module week, except the first week. Those quizzes were primarily formative in nature, providing students feedback on their mastery of the mathematical and statistical topics covered that week at the end of the weekly learning cycle. However, to stimulate students to participate in the quizzes, they also contained a summative component, contributing 17.5% of the total score. Quizzes were administered online and consisted of test items that were drawn from the same item pools applied in the practicing mode. This approach was chosen to encourage students with limited prior knowledge to make intensive use of the e-tutorials.

Phase 3 consisted of preparing for the final exam, in the eight week of the module. Phase 3 included formal, graded assessments. Therefore, students' timing decisions related to the amount of preparation in each of the three phases.

## **3.2 Participants**

We included 2,360 first-year students from academic years 2020/2021 and 2021/2022 in this study who had been active in at least one digital platform. Of these students, 39% were female, 61% male, 21% had a Dutch high school diploma, and 79% were international students. Amongst the international students, neighboring countries of Germany (31.5%) and Belgium (13.3%) were well presented, as well as other European countries. In addition, 5.1% of students were from outside Europe. High school systems in Europe differ strongly, most notably in the teaching of mathematics and statistics (i.e., the Dutch high school system has a strong focus on statistics, whereas this topic is completely missing in high school programs of many other countries). Next, all countries distinguish between several levels of math education in high school: preparing for sciences, social sciences, or humanities. To enter this international business program, prior mathematics education preparing social sciences is required. At the same time, 35.7% of the students followed the highest track in high school, adding to the diversity in prior knowledge in the current sample. Therefore, it was crucial that the first module offered to these students was flexible and allowed for individual learning paths with frequent, interactive feedback on students' learning strategies and tasks.

Beyond a final written exam, student assessment included a student project in which students analyzed personal learning disposition data statistically. To this end, students administered several questionnaires addressing affective, behavioral and cognitive aspects of aptitudes at the start of the module, and received personal data sets for their project work some weeks later.

Both modules were delivered under COVID-19 conditions. In the 20/21 module, no on-campus meetings could take place, so that all sessions took place online. In the 21/22 module, the COVID-19 regime was less severe, and sessions were hybrid, with synchronous in-class as well as online participation. Data from both modules were aggregated into one overall dataset.

## **3.3 E-tutorial trace data**

Trace data were collected from both e-tutorial systems (Sowiso, mathematics, and MyStatLab, statistics), and Canvas, which was used as the university-wide generic learning management system to provide general information and links to Sowiso and MyStatLab. Both Sowiso and MyStatLab are e-tutorials based on the instructional method of mastery learning (Author1, 2017). However, the two systems do differ strongly regarding the possibilities to collect trace data. MyStatLab offers students and instructors several dashboards that summarize students' progress in the module in terms of mastery of individual exercises and chapters, but does not provide time-stamped use data. In contrast, Sowiso provides time-stamps of every individual event initiated by the student and mastery data, allowing for full integration of temporality in the design of learning models. In this study, we therefore restricted the analysis to Sowiso event data: 1,360,756 individual events by 2,360 students.

The building blocks of the e-tutorial are assignments or exercises students are expected to solve. These assignments are grouped in packages, and packages are grouped in topics. The order of assignments within packages, and the order of packages within topics, are fixed, determined by the logic of the discipline, calculus.



Assignments are parametrized: calling an assignment a second time will generate an equivalent problem with different parameters. Students can call two different learning aids: solutions and hints. A solution is a fully worked-out example of the assignment. It does not bring any mastery, but after learning from the worked example, students can repeat the attempt to solve an equivalent assignment. Hints provide support in a single solution step. The events distinguished in Sowiso are:

- *Attempt*: starting a new assignment;
- *Mastered Attempt*: successful finishing an assignment, achieving full mastery;
- *Finished Package*: successful finishing a complete package of assignments, achieving full mastery;
- *Solution*: calling a worked-example for an assignment;
- *Hint*: calling a hint for a single solution step in an assignment.

Figure 1 provides an impression of one of the attempts, an assignment about multivariate functions, with in the lower end of the graph the follow-up steps: Check the given solution, consult a Theory page, call a Solution or call a Hint.


Week6: Functions of two variables: Basic notions

### Visualizing bivariate functions (exercise id: 1549)

Consider the function

$$f(x, y) = e^{-x^2 - y^2}.$$

Its graph is displayed in the figure below.



At a particular point  $(a, b)$  the level curve going through that point is the unit circle. What is the value  $f(a, b)$ ?

$f(a, b) =$

✓ Check

Theory

Solution

Hint

Figure 1. Example of an attempt of an assignment in SOWISO

The respective time window and granularity are entirely determined by the instructional design. There are seven weekly topics, like functions of one variable, derivatives, functions of two variables, and optimization, which are hierarchically ordered. Every topic consists of about ten packages; packages contain five to ten assignments. Within each topic, we distinguish three subsequent learning phases, which are demarcated by the moment of the tutorial session, quiz session and final exam. This way, the trace database contains 21 measurements for *Attempts*: *AttWk1TG*, *AttWk1Qz* and *AttWk1Ex* for the three learning phases of the week1 topic, *AttWk2TG*, *AttWk2Qz* and *AttWk2Ex* for the three learning phases of the week2 topic, and so on. In a similar way, 21 measures for *Mastered Attempts*, *Finished Packages*, *Solutions* and *Hints* can be distinguished.

### 3.4 Disposition data

*Motivation and Engagement Wheel measures.* The instrument Motivation and Engagement Survey (MES), based on the Motivation and Engagement Wheel framework (Martin, 2007), breaks down learning cognitions and learning behaviors into four quadrants of adaptive versus maladaptive types and cognitive (motivational) versus behavioral (engagement) types. *Self-Belief*, *Learning Focus*, and *Valuing School* shape the adaptive, cognitive factors or positive motivations. *Persistence*, *Task Management*, and *Planning* shape the adaptive, behavioral factors or positive engagement. The maladaptive cognitive factors or negative motivations are *Uncertain Control*, *Failure Avoidance*, and *Anxiety*, while *Self-sabotage* and *Disengagement* are the maladaptive behavioral factors or negative engagement. Figure 2 gives insight into the four quadrants of learning motivation and engagement.




Figure 2. Adaptive and maladaptive learning cognitions and behaviors

*Learning attitudes.* Attitudes and beliefs toward learning quantitative topics are assessed with a revised version of the SATS instrument (Survey of Attitudes Toward Statistics, Author1, 2007). This instrument, based on the Expectancy X Value Theory (EVT), distinguishes *Affect*, cognitive competence (*CognCompetence*), *Value*, expected difficulty in learning, reversed (*NoDifficulty*), *Interest* and planned *Effort*.

*Learning process and regulation strategies.* Learning processing and regulation strategies, shaping SRL, were based on Vermunt's (1996) student's learning pattern (ILS) instrument. Our study focused on the two domains of cognitive processing strategies and metacognitive regulation strategies. Both components were composed of five scales. The five processing strategies were ordered in line with the SAL research framework (see Han et al., 2020): from deep approaches to learning at the one pole, where students are aiming towards understanding, to stepwise or surface approaches to learning at the opposite pole, where students are aiming to reproduce material in a test rather than actually understanding it.

- *Critical Processing*: students form own opinions when learning,
- *Relating and Structuring*: students look for connections, make diagrams,
- *Concrete Processing*: students focus on making new knowledge concrete, applying it
- *Analyzing*: students investigate step by step,
- *Memorizing*: students learn by heart.

The first two components shape the deep approach, the last two the stepwise approach. Likewise, the five metacognitive regulation strategies describe how students regulate their learning processes and allow positioning students in the spectrum from self-regulation as the main mechanism to external regulation. The scales are:

- *SRL Process*: Self-regulation of learning processes,
- *SRL Content*: Self-regulation of learning content,
- *ERL Process*: External regulation of learning processes,
- *ERL Content*: External regulation of learning results,
- *Lack Regulation*: Lack of regulation.

*Achievement emotions.* The Control-Value Theory of Achievement Emotions (CVTAE, Pekrun, 2006) postulates that achievement emotions differ in valence, focus, and activation. From the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ, Pekrun et al., 2011), an instrument based on CVTAE, we selected four emotion scales that are most strongly related to academic performance: positive activating Enjoyment, negative activating Anxiety, and negative deactivating Boredom and Hopelessness.

### 3.5 Statistical analyses

Building on person-centred modelling approaches (Malcom-Piqueux, 2015), using cluster analysis techniques to distinguish 'unique' and common profiles of learners based on actual learners' engagement and behaviour that satisfy requirements of homogeneity (Howard & Hoffman, 2018), the analysis was carried out using k-means cluster analysis. Input variables were the five times 21 Sowiso trace variables representing attempts, mastered attempts, finished packages, solutions and hints in each of the three learning phases, preparing the tutorial sessions, the quiz sessions, and the final exam, and each of the seven weekly topics. Although disposition data could have been included in the cluster analysis step, we opted to cluster on trace data only as to isolate the role of trace data

from all other data, allowing comparison with the research reviewed in Saint et al. (2022) and research by Pardo and co-authors (Han et al., 2020; Pardo et al., 2017). The choice to group students into clusters of different learning orientations using learning behavior only has the advantage that we can distinguish and investigate the relationships of learning orientations based on learning activities and orientations based on self-reported aptitudes (Han et al., 2020). If not for the demonstration of commonalities of learning orientations derived in these two different ways, a more natural choice would have been to combine behavioral and dispositional measures as the basis for clustering, as in Zamecnic et al. (2022) and previous research by the authors (Author1, 2020b). In that case, profiles of students, the outcome of the clustering operation, represent a mixture of actual learning activities and self-perceptions of learning dispositions. A third option, focusing on the role of dispositions in learning behaviors, is to base clusters on disposition data only and investigate differences in the learning behaviors of clusters. An example is (Author1, 2021), which aims to demonstrate characteristic differences in learning behaviors of students in different mindsets profiles, a specific learning aptitude.

The number of clusters was chosen to have maximum profile variability without going into small clusters (clusters with less than 5% of the students). We opted for an eight-cluster solution containing five ‘real’ clusters (three clusters contained only one single outlier and were excluded from the further analysis; all three were students with abnormally high levels of trace data but strongly differing in the temporal patterns of their intensive use of the e-tutorial system). Solutions with higher dimensions did not strongly change the characteristics of the clusters and were more complex to interpret. As a next step in the analysis, shaping the variable-centred analysis step, differences between profiles were investigated with ANOVA. All these analyses were done using IBM SPSS statistical package. The event-based structural equation model of observed traces was estimated in MPlus. Ethics approval was obtained by the *\*\*\*Anonymized\*\*\**.

## **4. RESULTS**

### **4.1 Student engagement profiles by clustering log data**

As with most LA application based on authentic settings, trace data exhibit right-skewness, in particular with regard to the learning aid data, with standard deviation to mean ratios of two or even higher. Next, a few outlying cases are present, such as the student who called 2185 worked-out solutions in the eight-week module, about tenfold of the average of 222 worked-out solutions of all students. Rather than addressing skewed data distributions and high outliers with data transforms and case deletion, we opted to address data heterogeneity by creating more homogeneous student profiles by applying cluster analysis. The choice of number of clusters was primarily based on the presence of a simple, intuitive interpretation of the several profiles, preferring solutions that are more parsimonious. The five-cluster solution has that characteristic, with the clusters representing five different profiles of learning approaches. These profiles are best interpreted with the time-lines of four categories of traces: see Figures 3 and 4.




Figure 3. Activity trace data of five profiles of learning approaches: Attempts and Mastered Attempts

A saw tooth gradient characterizes both figures. That gradient is determined by the seven cycles of three subsequent learning phases. Most students, in all profiles, concentrate on the second learning phase, where more activity takes place than in the first and third learning phases. Therefore, the cumulative number of attempts makes a modest start in learning phase one, makes a large jump in learning phase two, and demonstrates a modest further increase in the last learning phase. In short: most students go relatively unprepared in the tutorial sessions, focus their learning on preparing the quizzes, and do not need extra preparation for the final exam. This pattern is repeated seven times for all weekly topics.

The exception to this course of action are the students in Profile 1, the smallest profile counting 146 students. They are both the most active students and study earliest, with more balance between learning activities in the first two phases (except the very first cycle, where the module starts with a tutorial meeting, leaving students little time to prepare). Aggregated over all weeks, Profile 1 students made 120 Attempts in the first phase, 367 in the second phase and 57 in the last phase. Differences between weekly topics are caused by differences in the number of topic exercises.

Comparing the two panels of Figure 3 clarifies that Profile 1 students are not the most efficient learners: *Profile 2* (387 students) and *Profile 3* (320 students) learners take much less attempts to reach about the same level of mastered attempts. These two profiles differ in that Profile 3 learners are early learners, distributing learning activities over the first two learning phases, whereas *Profile 2* learners concentrate fully on the second phase of quiz preparation. The last two profiles, *Profile 4* (largest profile with 824 students) and *Profile 5* (648 students),

mimic the learning approach of *Profile 2* learners, putting most effort in the second learning phase, but at lower activity levels. Basically, *Profile 5* learners opt-out of using the e-tutorial after experiencing it in the first week.

Figure 4 provides insight into the use of learning aids over the several weekly topics and the three learning phases: *Solutions*, or worked-out examples, and *Hints*. Students use the solution functionality more frequent than the hints functionality: on average, 222 *Solutions* against 19 *Hints* per student, mostly taking place in the second learning phase.




Figure 4. Mathematics and Statistics engagement of students in five profiles

Figure 4 clarifies a large gap between *Attempts* and *Mastered attempts* in Figure 3 for *Profile 1* students: they champion in calling worked *Solutions*, but because calling a solution renders the attempt into one of un-mastered type, this gives rise to a gap between *Attempts* and *Mastered Attempts*. From the right panel of Figure 4 describing *Hints* we observe that *Profile 3* students are the most frequent users of this functionality, although their general activity level is below that of the *Profile 1* students. Forward-looking to the next sub-section: these students appear to be the better performing students, who in general, do not need the full exposé of a worked example but suffice with a partial, directed hint.

## 4.2 Relevance of clustering based profiles for module performance and learning dispositions

The fundamental question in any LA application is to what extent the profiling of students using trace-based engagement data is predictive for module performance. Figure 5 provides a straightforward answer to this question. There were apparent average performance differences between the five profiles in terms of their final module grade (*Grade*; eta squared effect size equal to 14.0%) and the component scores of final grade, exam scores for mathematics (*ExamMath*; eta squared effect size equal to 7.4%), and quiz scores for mathematics (*QuizMath*; eta squared effect size equal to 7.0%). As Figure 3 describes, the highest scores were achieved by *Profile 3* students, the lowest scores by *Profile 5* students, with basically equal scores for the other three profiles. Cluster differences are substantive from a consequential point of view: the grade benchmark to pass the module is 5.5, so with an average grade of 5.4, a large part of *Profile 5* students will not pass, in contrast to the other profiles.



Figure 5. Average module performance of students in different profiles

Profiting from the availability of disposition data of student aptitudes, we were finally interested in how the five profiles related to our “static” measurements of students’ motivation and engagement scales, their approaches to learning, expressed as cognitive processing strategies and metacognitive regulation strategies, their attitudes towards learning and their tendency to postpone, all measured at the start of the module, and their learning activity emotions, measured the module halfway. ANOVA tests pointed toward all of the profile differences being

statistically significant beyond the .01 level, with one exception: students in different profiles do not differ on their assessment of the difficulty of the module (*NoDifficulty*). Given the large sample sizes, the practical significance of profile differences is, however, more important than statistical significance.

In the adaptive motivations and engagement scales, we find small differences in the cognitive, motivational constructs, but larger differences for the behavioral, engagement constructs, with highest effect size for *Planning*: eta squared equals 6.6%. The first five scales of Figure 6 exhibits these adaptive scales. We see a similar pattern for the maladaptive scales, depicted in the second panel: no practically significant profile differences for the cognitive, motivational factors, but larger differences for the behavioral, engagement constructs *Disengagement* and *Self-Sabotage*, up to effect sizes of 4.3%. Profile differences follow the pattern that *Profile 1* students demonstrate the better scores (higher adaptive scores, lower maladaptive scores), *Profile 5* students demonstrate adverse scores, and other profiles take intermediate positions.




Figure 6. Average regulation and processing levels of students in different profiles

Concerning learning processing and learning regulation scales, we observe that *Profile 1* students champion all scales: deep processing and stepwise processing, self-regulation and external regulation, with again *Profile 5* students in the mirror position. Effects are modest in size, up to 4.0% for stepwise processing and 3.7% for external regulation.

This pattern of profile differences continues in the learning attitudes, with the far largest effect size noted for planned learning *Effort*: 6.3%. Largest overall effect is in the tendency to *Postpone*, 6.8%, where *Profile 5* students score considerably higher than students in other profiles.



Amongst the learning activity emotions, less a disposition but more an outcome of performing learning activities, the score for learning Boredom is remarkable: again a high score for *Profile 5* students (effect size 6.4%).

### 4.3 An event-based model of trace data

The database of event data contains 1,360,756 individual learning events by 2360 students. Since data are collected in an authentic learning context, these events demonstrate timing differences between students, necessitating an aggregation step. From the instructional design perspective, individual timing differences within learning phases are non-essential and may be subject to aggregation, whereas individual differences in timing between learning phases are essential and should not be aggregated. The same logic refers to the seven learning cycles: aggregation can take place for events belonging to the same learning cycle but not for events based on different learning cycles.

Aggregating all event data along this logic gives rise to a complex event model consisting of seven sub-models: one for each learning cycle. Figure 7 provides the theoretical event model for one sub-model, with arrows on the left and right sides indicating the hypothesized behavioral relationships between the levels of events in subsequent learning cycles.




Figure 7. Event sub-model for one learning cycle distinguishing three learning phases

Within each submodel, the three phases of learning are demarcated: *TG* for preparing tutorial group session, *Qz* for preparing the quiz session, and *Ex* for preparing exam writing. In addition, within each learning phase, the following types of events are distinguished: an *Attempt*, a *Mastered Attempt*, the finishing of a complete *Package*, the call of a *Solution* and the call of a *Hint*.

Arrows represent predictive relationships, where dashed arrows represent relationships of behavioural type, and straight arrows represent relationships that contain both a behavioural component and the outcome of an instructional design choice. Thus, *Mastered Attempts*, finished *Packages*, *Solutions* and *Hints* are predicted as a proportion of *Attempts* in any learning phase and learning cycle, *Mastery* achieved by a student is predicted by *Mastered Attempts* and finished *Packages*, *Quiz score* is predicted by *Mastery* achieved in the second learning phase, and all seven *Quiz scores* predict *Exam score*.

Structural equation methods can be applied to estimate this path model. However, although the fit of this model is reasonable, there is a conceptual issue with the model that prevents the use of it. We can illustrate that issue by looking at the very first relationship of this model, the relationship between attempts in the first learning phase (*Attempts TG*) and attempts in the second learning phase (*Attempts Qz*) for all weekly topics and both for all students together, as for the individual profiles. Those relationships are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Prediction equations of *Attempts Qz* by *Attempts TG* (represented as  $x$ ), per profile and per topic

	<i>All</i>	<i>Profile 1</i>	<i>Profile 2</i>	<i>Profile 3</i>	<i>Profile 4</i>	<i>Profile 5</i>
Topic1	85.8+0.857*** $x$	192.0+0.118 $x$	125.6+0.267** $x$	109.5+0.183*** $x$	86.0+0.346*** $x$	40.3+0.993*** $x$
Topic2	64.8+0.882*** $x$	159.8+0.265** $x$	114.0+0.415*** $x$	105.6+0.253*** $x$	65.2+0.495*** $x$	14.3+1.340*** $x$
Topic3	52.8+0.698*** $x$	134.2+0.228** $x$	92.7+0.328*** $x$	89.5+0.384*** $x$	59.8+0.187*** $x$	10.7+1.028*** $x$
Topic4	49.7+0.644*** $x$	115.7+0.229*** $x$	92.8+0.154* $x$	79.7+0.157*** $x$	58.8+0.291*** $x$	8.3+1.121*** $x$
Topic5	60.3+0.725*** $x$	190.8+0.115 $x$	131.7+0.091 $x$	75.2+0.475*** $x$	69.2+0.231*** $x$	8.3+1.213*** $x$
Topic6	44.0+0.675*** $x$	116.1+0.135* $x$	93.1+0.110** $x$	62.7+0.372*** $x$	54.3+0.306*** $x$	10.4+1.039*** $x$
Topic7	40.0+0.881*** $x$	134.6+0.301*** $x$	87.8+0.382** $x$	65.0+0.470*** $x$	35.6+0.600*** $x$	5.8+1.115*** $x$
AllTopics	349+1.143*** $x$	1074+0.131* $x$	728+0.329*** $x$	584+0.346*** $x$	438+0.185*** $x$	93+1.670*** $x$

Note: \*=p-value<.05; \*\*=p-value<.01; \*\*\*=p-value<.001

Prediction equations exhibit strong variability, both over the several topics as well as over the profiles. In specific, this profile variability is large. A second observation from Table 1 is that prediction equations for the full population of students tend to have higher path coefficient estimates than the prediction equations in the individual profiles, except the last profile. Explained variation, not reported here, is also much higher in the prediction equations for the full population than for any individual profile (for example,  $R^2=42.5\%$  for all students for all topics aggregated, but ranging between  $R^2=1.8\%$  and  $R^2=17.8\%$  for the profiles).

The cause of profile-specific relationships being different from all students' relationship is again best illustrated with graphical means. Figure 8 provides the prediction equations per profile, as well as the prediction equation based on the full sample of all students. Next, it contains the line that best fits the means of the six profiles: the inter-profile relationship, whereas the profile-specific prediction equation represent the intra-profile relationships. The full sample prediction equation takes both these two sources of variation into account, and thus

the path coefficient of that relationship is expected to be in between the coefficient of the full sample estimate, and the five profile-specific estimates.




Figure 8. Prediction equation of AttemptQz on AttemptTG, for full sample, profiles and means of profiles

## 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Empirical research into the temporal aspect of SRL is predominantly based on laboratory research taking short learning episodes as subject; the example presented in Reimann et al. (2014) of an 1.5 hour taking learning session in hypermedia learning is representative. At the same time, there is the wish to go beyond laboratory settings and investigate *'perceptually and experientially richer problem-solving environments'* that *'provide for more authentic learning experiences'* (Reimann et al., 2014, p. 537). Without doubt, our case that stretches out over a period of eight weeks of SRL is such an environment par excellence. In many ways, this complicates the analysis because of the 'open systems' characteristic of any authentic learning setting (Reimann et al., 2014).

A main complication of investigating learning in an authentic context rather than in experimental research taking place in a laboratory (see Molenaar et al., 2023 for examples) is the heterogeneity of the learners. In a lab session, learning is typically focused on a topic none of the participants is familiar with, guaranteeing that all learners are novices. In an authentic setting, some learners will be novices, but other learners have substantial prior knowledge. This diversity will create heterogeneity in the data describing the learning by students. Consequently, we cannot assume that patterns derived from trace data represent the typical learning behavior of all students, and in the presence of heterogeneity, variable-based models as well as event-based models, both assuming homogeneity, are dysfunctional.

When learners follow individual learning paths that crucially differ from each other, creating heterogeneity, we preferably need an intra-individual analysis of trace data rather than an inter-individual one (Howard & Hoffman, 2018). However, again the authentic setting prevents collecting repeated measures required for the intra-

individual type of analyses. In this context, it is a person-centered analysis offering the ultimate solution by splitting the heterogeneous sample into homogeneous, or at least more homogeneous, subsamples and designing models of whatever type for these subsamples. We can observe in Figure 6 how far off LA based predictions can be if they are based on a sample composed of multiple types of learners with diverging learning behaviors. The demonstration of prediction errors in Figure 6 makes use person-centered types of prediction models; if prediction models based on intra-individual data would have been available, even larger prediction errors were to be expected.

Heterogeneity can have different sources: students can be the cause of diversity, but also learning events that strongly differ in characteristics. To solve student diversity, statistical methods as cluster analysis or latent class analysis, both person-centered methods, serve the function to identify student profiles; see the example of this contribution. Investigating event heterogeneity will take a different approach. However, the main aim of any LA application is to provide learning feedback to students, or to enrich instruction by providing student learning related information. Therefore, a variable-centered approach to address heterogeneity is prescribed.

The investigation of authentic learning settings is not complicating every dimension of a LA application; it may simplify things because of natural choices for time segmentation, the time windows, and for granularity of time, the size of time units within the time window (Molenaar et al., 2022). The time window is in our case determined by the instructional choice of having weekly learning cycles. Granularity is induced by the timing of important events: tutorial session, quiz session and final exam, that divide each learning cycle into three subsequent learning phases. These characteristics of the design of the authentic learning process enable us to express both the passage of time and the order of time in terms of measured variables rather than events only: the amount of student engagement in each phase for each cycle and the allocation of engagement over subsequent phases. This finding answers the first research question: the educational design, rather than the outcome of a discovery method, provides the relevant time window. In line with previous work, (Author4, 2017, 2018) we conjecture that most authentic learning settings are characterized by instructional choices that allow for a natural identification of segmentation and granularity of time. In a context where student learning behavior are primarily steered by instructional design choices, and these instructional design choices are well expressed in terms of time window and granularity, the differences of event-based modeling and variable-based modeling to include dimensions of temporality tend to disappear. Or even favor design-based choices: discovery methods would have had a hard time recognizing our first learning phase, given that so few students respect proper preparation of tutorial sessions, where from an educational point of view, this outcome represents crucial information.

Turning to the confirmation of the second research question: being able to describe learning events in terms of variables opens the way for integrating trace data with disposition data measuring student aptitudes. The person-oriented modelling step that was introduced as the first step of our analysis not only serves the function of homogenizing the sample but also allows the integration of learning aptitudes and observations of learning episodes into one model: Reimann's solution of a balanced approach. As indicated above, variable-centered modeling appears to be, for now, the only approach in which aptitudes can be unified in a single model with trace data of learning events. Studies based on event-centered modeling that apply aptitude data, for instance, Han et al. (2020), perform cluster analyses on event data only and restrict the role of the aptitude data to describe qualitative differences between the clusters.

Integrating aptitude variables into the model describing the learning process is also instrumental in designing educational intervention: our third research question. If the provision of LA-based individual learning feedback

to students is a necessary but not always a sufficient step in addressing learning barriers, an ideal setup would be the introduction of educational interventions for groups of students that face similar learning issues. A natural choice for such grouping is provided by the profiling step: profiles represent students with similar learning behaviors in the e-tutorials, having similar learning challenges (see also Zamecnik et al., 2022, for an overview of the role of learner profiling in shaping personalized learning). The availability of disposition data that measure learning aptitudes is the second step to interventions. In our analysis, we find important differences in the levels of motivation and engagement, learning attitudes and more general personality characteristics as the tendency to postpone, in the five profiles of learning approaches. These dispositions represent aptitudes that can be addressed in a well-designed learning skills training. Adding these dispositions to the analysis reduces the risk to fight the symptoms, rather than the causes, of lacking academic performance. Furthermore, it might prevent sending reminders to inactive students when the presence of learning boredom would suggest a different type of intervention.

In comparison to other studies that create profiles on the basis of observed learning behavior, our 5-profiles solution tends being richer than the findings of other research. Uzir et al. (2019) finds a 3-profiles solution, labeled as Active, Passive and Selective. Our first and fifth profiles resemble the Active and Passive profiles, but we find three intermediate clusters. Two different causes may explain this difference: the share of students falling in the two extreme categories of very high or very low activity is much smaller in our context than the 70% found by Uzir et al., and differences in time window and granularity. In our learning context, the time window differentiates three moments important for learning, leading to three subsequent learning phases, with the consequence that more distinct patterns can be discerned of time-management, than when the time window is characterized by one single point of reference. In Uzir et al. (2020), the combination of time-management tactics and learning tactics as the basis of clustering generated four profiles that differ in both the timing of learning and the use of learning resources. The Han et al. (2020) found four profiles of learning behavior, differing primarily in learning intensity, rather than time-management. The advantage of profiles that are based on a single dimension, as time management, is obviously that implications in terms of educational interventions will be less complex.

A first obvious limitation of our research design is the unbalanced observation of the learning process. We observe in detail how students are learning in the two e-tutorials. However, all learning that takes place outside these e-tutorials remains either unobserved or not recorded (e.g., interactions with students during tutorials). In a student-centered program applying blended learning as in our module, students design their individual learning paths, and may opt out for learning in the e-tutorials preferring alternative learning modes. These students end up in *Profile 5* because of our focus on engagement in the trace data, together with the students that truly deserve the label of low activity. This limitation is inextricably linked to the authentic learning setting, where the learning measurement is necessarily no more than partial.

A second limitation is found in the ‘closed nature’ of the two e-tutorials, limiting the perspectives of event-based methods. The pattern of events observed in our students is largely an artefact of instructional design choices, rather than preferred learning behavior by students. If instructional design is leading, one cannot expect event-based models to reveal ‘secrets’ that cannot be found in variable-based models that stem from optimal specification of time-window and granularity. Extending this type of research to more ‘open’ authentic learning contexts where the impact of contextual factors on the order and timing of events is much larger, would be an attractive next step.

Implications of this study depend on the context of the learning and the type of learning analytics-based feedback. In our authentic learning setting, the educational design specified time window and granularity in full, enabling the expression of temporality in terms of well-chosen variables. Next, learning feedback was framed in terms of learning dispositions essential for our problem-based learning process. Both of these premises favor a variable-based approach. We conjecture that these premises are more often than not valid in authentic settings. Event-based discovery methods certainly contribute in situations where little is known about the design, or where the design is so flexible that it does not strongly restrain time window or granularity. In that case, profiling students based on the outcomes of event-based models can be a fruitful start to the learning analytics application. However, also in that situation, the specification of learning feedback or learning interventions in terms of learning dispositions crucial for the learning process will usher in the stage where variables enter.

## REFERENCES

- Chen, B., Knight, S., & Wise, A. F. (2018). Critical issues in designing and implementing temporal analytics. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 5(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2018.53.1>
- Elliot, A.J., Murayama, K., Kobeisy, A., & Lichtendfeld, S. (2015). Potential-based achievement goals, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 192-206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12051>
- Elliot, A.J., Murayama, K., & Pekrun R. (2011). A 3 × 2 achievement goal model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103, 632-648. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023952>
- Han F, Pardo A, & Ellis RA. (2020). Students' self-report and observed learning orientations in blended university course design: How are they related to each other and to academic performance? *Journal Computer Assisted Learning*; 36(6), 969–980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12453>
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-Based Learning: What and How Do Students Learn? *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(3): 235–266. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3>
- Howard, M. C. & Hoffman, M. E. (2018). Variable-Centered, Person-Centered, and Person-Specific Approaches: Where Theory Meets the Method. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21(4) 846-876. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117744021>
- Knight, S., Wise, A. F., & Chen, B. (2017). Time for change: Why learning analytics needs temporal analysis. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 4(3), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2017.43.2>
- Loyens, S. M. M., Gijbels, D. Coertjens, L., & Coté, D. J.. (2013). Students' Approaches to Learning in Problem-Based Learning: Taking into account Professional Behavior in the Tutorial Groups, Self-Study Time, and Different Assessment Aspects. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 39(1): 23–32. <https://doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.10.004>
- Malcom-Piqueux, L. (2015). Application of Person-Centered Approaches to Critical Quantitative Research: Exploring Inequities in College Financing Strategies. *New directions for institutional research*, 2014(163), 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20086>
- Martin, A. J. (2007). Examining a multidimensional model of student motivation and engagement using a construct validation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(2), 413-440. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X118036>
- Molenaar, I. (2014). Advances in temporal analysis in learning and instruction. *Frontline Learning Research*, 2(4), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v2i4.118>
- Molenaar, I., de Mooij, S., Azevedo, R., Bannert, M., Järvelä, S. & Gašević, D. (2023) Measuring self-regulated learning and the role of AI: Five years of research using multimodal multichannel data. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 139, 107540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107540>

- Molenaar, I. and Wise, A. F. (2022). Temporal Aspects of Learning Analytics - Grounding Analyses in Concepts of Time. In: C. Lang, G. Siemens, A. F. Wise, D. Gašević, A. Merceron (Eds.), *The Handbook of Learning Analytics, Second edition*, Ch. 7, pp. 66-76. Vancouver, Canada: SOLAR. <https://doi.org/10.18608/hla22>
- Molenaar, P. C. M. (2004). A manifesto on psychology as idiographic science: Bringing the person back into scientific psychology, this time forever. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 2, 201–218.
- Molenaar, P.C.M. & Campbell, C.G. (2009). The new person-specific paradigm in psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 112–116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01619.x>
- Author4 (2018)
- Author4 (2017)
- Author4 (2016)
- Pardo, A., Han, F., & Ellis, R. A. (2017). Combining University Student Self-Regulated Learning Indicators and Engagement with Online Learning Events to Predict Academic Performance. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 10(1), 82-92. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2016.2639508>
- Pekrun, R. (2006). The Control-Value Theory of Achievement Emotions: Assumptions, Corollaries, and Implications for Educational Research and Practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18(4), 315–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Barchfeld, P., & Perry, R. P. (2011). Measuring emotions in students' learning and performance: The Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ). *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(1), 36–48. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.10.002>
- Reimann, P. (2009). Time is precious: Variable- and event-centred approaches to process analysis in CSCL research. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4, 239–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-009-9070-z>
- Reimann, P., Markauskaite, L., & Bannert, M. (2014). e-Research and learning theory: What do sequence and process mining methods contribute? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45, 528–540. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/bjet.12146>
- Author2 (2019)
- Rizvi, S., Rienties, B., Rogaten, J., & Kizilcec, R. (2022). Beyond one-size-fits-all in MOOCs: Variation in learning design and persistence of learners in different cultural and socioeconomic contexts. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 126, 106973. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106973>
- Saint, J., Gašević, D., Matcha, W., Uzir, N., & Pardo, A. (2020a). Combining analytic methods to unlock sequential and temporal patterns of self-regulated learning. In *Proceedings of the tenth international conference on learning analytics & knowledge* (pp. 402–411). Frankfurt, Germany: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3375462.3375487>.
- Saint, J., Fan, Y., Gašević, D., & Pardo, A. (2022). Temporally-focused analytics of self-regulated learning: A systematic review of literature. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 100060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100060>
- Author1 (2007)
- Author1 (2015)
- Author1 (2017)
- Author1 (2020a)
- Author1 (2020b)
- Author1 (2021) Uzir, N. A. A., Gašević, D., Jovanović, J., Matcha, W., Lim, L. A., & Fudge, A. (2020, March). Analytics of time management and learning strategies for effective online learning in blended environments. In: *Proceedings of the tenth international conference on learning analytics & knowledge* (pp. 392-401). Frankfurt, Germany: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3375462.3375493>
- Uzir, A., Gašević, D., Matcha, W., Jovanović, J., Pardo, A., Lim, L. A., & Gentili, S. (2019). Discovering time management strategies in learning processes using process mining techniques. In: *European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning* (pp. 555-569). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29736-7\\_41](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29736-7_41)

- Vermunt, J. D. (1996). Metacognitive, cognitive and affective aspects of learning styles and strategies: A phenomenographic analysis. *Higher Education*, 31(25–50). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00129106>
- Voelkle, M. C., Brose, A., Schmiedek, F., & Lindenberger, U. (2014). Toward a Unified Framework for the Study of Between-Person and Within-Person Structures: Building a Bridge Between Two Research Paradigms. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 49(3), 193-213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2014.889593>
- Zamecnik, A., Kovanovi'c, V., Joksimovi'c, S., and Liu, L. (2022). Exploring non-traditional learner motivations and characteristics in online learning: a learner profile study. *Computers & Education, Artificial Intelligence*, 3(100051). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100051>