THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL PEDAGOGICAL TECHNOLOGIES ON STUDENT ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT: A MODERATED MEDIATION ANALYSIS OF LEARNING MOTIVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT

Guanxiong Zhang [1*]
Ziyue Wang [2]
Weiwei Luo [3]
Yong Wu [4]
Fangli Ying [5]

[1-5] Innovation College, North-Chiang Mai University
[1] Law School (Discipline Inspection and Supervision), Chengdu University of Technology
[*] **Corresponding Author, E-mail:** guanxiong.zhang@northcm.ac.th

Abstract: The rapid integration of digital pedagogical technologies in higher education has fundamentally transformed teaching and learning practices, yet the mechanisms through which these technologies influence student academic engagement remain insufficiently understood. This study explores how digital technologies impact engagement through a moderated mediation model, focusing on learning motivation as a mediator and teacher technology support as a moderator. Based on a cross-sectional survey of 417 students from blended and online learning environments, data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and Hayes' PROCESS macro. The model showed excellent fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.34$, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .057), accounting for 23% of the variance in learning motivation and 54% in student engagement. Results indicated that digital tool usage significantly predicted student engagement ($\beta = .21$, $p < .001$), learning motivation significantly mediated this relationship (indirect effect $\beta = .25$, 95% CI [.18, .33]), and teacher technology support moderated the mediation pathway, with conditional indirect effects ranging from $\beta = .17$ (low support) to $\beta = .33$ (high support). These findings suggest that technology alone does not guarantee engagement; instead, student engagement emerges through motivational processes that are shaped by effective and supportive instructional practices. This research contributes to theoretical development by integrating Self-Determination Theory, the Technology Acceptance Model, and Student Engagement Theory, while offering practical implications for educators and policymakers seeking to enhance digital learning environments.

Keywords: Digital Pedagogical Technologies, Student Engagement, Learning Motivation, Technology Acceptance, Self-Determination Theory, Higher Education

Introduction

The digital transformation of higher education has accelerated significantly over the past decade, driven by substantial institutional investments in educational technologies (Guri-Rosenblit, 2018). This transformation was further intensified by the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced a rapid transition to remote and blended learning formats (Hodges et al., 2020). As a result, digital pedagogical technologies—including Learning Management Systems (LMS), interactive applications, virtual collaboration platforms, and adaptive learning tools—have become foundational to contemporary educational environments. However, despite widespread adoption, empirical findings on the effectiveness of such technologies in enhancing student outcomes remain inconclusive (Means et al., 2013; Tamm, 2019). While some research highlights positive correlations between technology use and academic performance, others report negligible or even adverse effects (Clark, 2012; Sung, Chang, & Liu, 2016). This inconsistency points to a more intricate relationship between digital technologies and learning outcomes, suggesting the involvement of underlying pedagogical, motivational, and contextual factors. At the core of this complexity lies the construct of student engagement, widely acknowledged as a pivotal determinant of academic success across educational levels and modalities (Kuh, 2009; Trowler, 2010). Engagement encompasses behavioral, emotional, and cognitive aspects of student involvement and is often used as a proximal measure of instructional effectiveness (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). In digital learning settings, fostering engagement becomes particularly challenging due to issues such as digital distractions, diminished social presence, and the increased need for self-directed learning (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). Although scholarship on digital learning environments has expanded, three notable gaps persist in our understanding of how digital pedagogical technologies influence engagement.

First, many existing studies rely on direct-effect models that oversimplify the relationship between technology use and engagement by omitting the mediating processes that may underlie observed effects (Bond & Bedenlier, 2019). Second, the role of motivation—widely recognized as a fundamental antecedent of engagement—has not been sufficiently examined as a mediating mechanism within this context (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Without integrating motivational constructs, explanations for how technology translates into engagement remain incomplete. Third, contextual moderators, particularly instructor support in using technology, are underexplored despite substantial evidence that teacher-related factors critically influence the success of educational innovations (Hattie, 2012). These gaps in the literature not only constrain theoretical advancement but also hinder the development of practical strategies for optimizing digital learning environments.

To address these shortcomings, the present study proposes and empirically tests a moderated mediation model informed by three theoretical perspectives. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) serves as the motivational foundation, asserting that learners achieve optimal engagement when their basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—are fulfilled (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In digital learning contexts, these needs can be addressed through thoughtful technological design and supportive instructional practices. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) offers a complementary perspective, positing that individuals' acceptance and use of technology are shaped by their perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use (Davis, 1989). Extensions of TAM incorporate motivational variables, thereby connecting technology adoption with engagement outcomes. Finally, Student Engagement Theory frames engagement as a multidimensional construct and provides conceptual clarity for measuring its behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components (Fredricks et al., 2004). By synthesizing these three perspectives, this study seeks to advance a more comprehensive understanding of the processes and conditions under which digital pedagogical technologies impact student academic engagement.

Research Objectives and Hypotheses

The primary objective of this study is to examine how digital pedagogical technologies influence student academic engagement through the mediating role of learning motivation and the moderating role of teacher technology support. Specifically, we address three research questions:

RQ1: To what extent do digital teaching tools predict student academic engagement? RQ2: Does learning motivation mediate the relationship between digital teaching tools and student engagement? RQ3: Does teacher technology support moderate the mediation effect of learning motivation?

Based on the theoretical framework and literature review, we propose the following hypotheses:

H1: Digital teaching tools usage positively predicts student academic engagement. H2: Learning motivation mediates the relationship between digital tools usage and student engagement. H3: Teacher technology support moderates the mediation pathway, such that higher support enhances the positive effect of learning motivation on engagement.

Literature Review

Digital Pedagogical Technologies in Higher Education

Digital pedagogical technologies encompass a wide spectrum of tools, platforms, and applications intentionally designed to support and enhance teaching and learning processes (Kirkwood & Price, 2014). Unlike generic information technologies, these tools are developed or adapted specifically for educational purposes, emphasizing their pedagogical affordances. Functionally, digital technologies in education range from Learning Management Systems (LMS) and content repositories to interactive platforms such as virtual classrooms and simulation tools, as well as collaborative tools like wikis and discussion forums. Pedagogically, these technologies align with different learning theories: behaviorist tools facilitate repetitive practice and immediate feedback, cognitivist tools focus on structured information processing, while constructivist tools promote collaborative knowledge construction and authentic learning (Ertmer & Newby, 2013). From an interactivity standpoint, technologies vary from passive information-delivery systems to immersive, highly interactive environments, with higher levels of interactivity often correlating with deeper student engagement and improved learning outcomes (Clark & Mayer, 2016).

Adoption patterns of digital pedagogical technologies in higher education exhibit substantial variation. Institutions implement these technologies through models ranging from supplemental, where digital tools enhance traditional teaching without altering pedagogy, to replacement models that substitute digital components for certain instructional activities. Most innovatively, transformation models fundamentally redesign the learning experience through digital means, enabling approaches that are not feasible in traditional settings (Hughes et al., 2013). Evidence suggests that transformation models yield the greatest gains in engagement and achievement, yet they demand significant changes in teaching practices and institutional infrastructure (Means et al., 2013). Consequently, meaningful integration of technology must move beyond superficial adoption and focus on pedagogical coherence and instructional intent.

The effectiveness of digital pedagogical technologies remains a topic of scholarly debate. While meta-analyses report improvements in learning outcomes and satisfaction (Bernard et al., 2014), other studies highlight inconsistent or limited benefits (Clark, 2012). These discrepancies can be traced to several factors. High-quality instructional design grounded in sound pedagogical principles tends to yield more positive outcomes than ad hoc implementation (Merrill, 2013). Faculty readiness, including their confidence and competence in using technology, plays a critical role in shaping student experiences (Ertmer et al., 2012). Learner characteristics, such as digital literacy and self-regulation skills, further influence the effectiveness of technological tools (Broadbent & Poon, 2015). Finally, institutional support—spanning technical infrastructure, professional development, and administrative leadership—can either facilitate or hinder the success of digital initiatives (Guri-Rosenblit, 2018).

Student Engagement in Digital Learning Environments

The concept of student engagement has undergone considerable theoretical development, expanding from a simple behavioral framework to a multidimensional construct that includes behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and agentic dimensions (Fredricks et al., 2004; Reeve & Tseng, 2011). Behavioral engagement encompasses observable participation such as attending class, submitting assignments, and contributing to discussions. In digital contexts, it can be monitored through platform usage metrics, login frequencies, and task completion rates. Emotional engagement involves affective experiences such as enjoyment, interest, and a sense of belonging, yet digital environments often struggle to support this dimension due to diminished social presence. Cognitive engagement reflects the extent of intellectual investment and the use of self-regulated learning strategies, which can be enhanced through digital tools that promote reflection, planning, and metacognition. Agentic engagement, a more recent addition, captures students' proactive efforts to influence their own learning experiences, including providing feedback, initiating discussion, and customizing learning paths—behaviors that digital platforms can facilitate through personalization and learner autonomy features.

Measuring engagement in digital environments is complex. Traditional self-report surveys remain widely used due to their ease of implementation, yet they are vulnerable to social desirability bias and fail to capture fluctuations in engagement over time (Sinatra et al., 2015). In contrast, learning analytics provide objective behavioral data, such as clickstream activity and time-on-task metrics, but are limited in capturing emotional and cognitive engagement (Gašević et al., 2015). Consequently, mixed-methods approaches are increasingly advocated. These combine quantitative tracking data with qualitative insights from interviews, open-ended surveys, and observational techniques to yield a richer understanding of how and why students engage with digital learning environments (Henrie et al., 2015).

Various antecedents influence engagement in digital learning. Instructional design is paramount, with clearly articulated objectives, timely feedback, and interactive elements consistently linked to higher engagement (Dumford & Miller, 2018). Technological usability and alignment with pedagogical goals also affect student interaction with digital tools (Mtebe & Raisamo, 2014). Social elements such as peer collaboration and instructor presence foster community and reduce the sense of isolation in virtual settings (Richardson et al., 2017). Individual student attributes, including prior knowledge, self-discipline, and motivation, further mediate engagement (Broadbent & Poon, 2015). In turn, engagement serves as a strong predictor of academic achievement, satisfaction, and persistence, making it a critical focus for educational research and practice (Kuh, 2009).

Learning Motivation as Mediating Mechanism

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a foundational lens through which student motivation in education can be understood (Deci & Ryan, 2000). SDT distinguishes between autonomous motivation, where students engage in learning because it is inherently interesting or personally valuable, and controlled motivation, where behavior is driven by external demands or internal pressure. Research consistently shows that autonomous motivation is more closely associated with deeper engagement, conceptual understanding, and overall well-being, whereas controlled motivation may elicit short-term compliance but often leads to surface learning and diminished creativity (Ryan & Deci, 2020). SDT identifies three essential psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—that, when fulfilled, promote internalized motivation and engagement.

In digital learning environments, these psychological needs are supported and challenged in distinctive ways. Digital tools can enhance autonomy by allowing flexible pacing and multiple learning pathways. They can foster competence through adaptive systems, gamified feedback, and mastery-based progression. Relatedness, however, is often more difficult to maintain due to the reduced physical and social interaction typical of online environments. Still, when digital platforms incorporate collaborative tools, peer-to-peer interaction, and social presence features, they can partially restore the sense of connectedness vital to motivation (Chen & Jang, 2010). Nonetheless, these benefits are not guaranteed. Poorly designed systems or overwhelming cognitive loads can undermine motivation by creating confusion, frustration, or disengagement (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 2017). Thus, the motivational potential of digital learning depends on how intentionally the environment supports students' psychological needs.

Recent studies support the role of motivation as a mediating mechanism between digital technology use and engagement outcomes. When educational technologies are implemented in ways that satisfy students' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, they are more likely to enhance intrinsic motivation, which in turn fosters sustained and meaningful engagement (Martí-Parreño, Méndez-Ibáñez, & Alonso-Arroyo, 2016). This mediating pathway explains why identical technologies can yield divergent results across contexts: it is not the presence of technology itself that drives engagement, but rather how it is leveraged to support the learner's motivational profile (Baeten, Kyndt, Struyven, & Dochy, 2013).

Teacher Technology Support as Moderating Factor

Teacher technology support refers to the diverse forms of assistance instructors provide to help students navigate and benefit from digital learning tools. This support can take multiple forms. Technical support involves guiding students through platform functionalities, resolving access issues, and helping them adapt to new technologies. Pedagogical support refers to integrating digital tools into instructional strategies in meaningful ways, including demonstrating their relevance and modeling their effective use. Motivational support includes fostering student confidence in using technology, encouraging experimentation, and promoting a growth mindset. Social support comprises cultivating an online learning community, maintaining instructor presence, and demonstrating empathy in digital communication (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2001).

The presence and quality of such support significantly affect students' acceptance and sustained use of technology. When students perceive instructors as competent, responsive, and supportive, they are more likely to develop positive attitudes toward digital tools, persevere through technical challenges, and explore new functionalities in ways that enrich their learning (Teo, 2011). In contrast, the absence of adequate support may lead to frustration, disengagement, and underutilization of available technologies (Ertmer et al., 2012). Therefore, faculty capacity and pedagogical readiness are critical determinants of successful digital integration.

Furthermore, teacher support appears to moderate the relationship between student motivation and engagement. In supportive environments, students who are already motivated are more likely to convert their motivation into active engagement because barriers are minimized and encouragement is readily available. In contrast, in low-support contexts, even highly motivated students may struggle to stay engaged due to confusion, lack of direction, or technical constraints (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012). This moderating effect aligns with person-environment fit theory, which posits that optimal educational outcomes occur when students' personal resources—such as intrinsic motivation—are matched with appropriate environmental conditions and supports (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). In sum, teacher technology support not only enhances students' ability to use digital tools effectively but also serves as a critical contextual factor that shapes the strength and direction of motivation-engagement linkages.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey design to investigate the proposed moderated mediation model examining the relationship between digital pedagogical technologies and student academic engagement. Although longitudinal designs are generally more powerful for establishing causal inference, the cross-sectional approach is widely accepted for theory-testing in the early stages of model development. It enables the exploration of variable relationships at a specific point in time, offering valuable insights into the underlying mechanisms and interactions between key constructs (Rindfleisch, Malter, Ganesan, & Moorman, 2008).

Participants and Sampling

Participants were drawn from a range of higher education institutions that offer courses in blended and online formats. The inclusion criteria required students to have completed at least one semester of study within a technology-enhanced learning environment, ensuring familiarity with digital pedagogical tools. The final sample consisted of 417 students, with a demographic distribution of 62% female and 38% male, and an age range between 18 and 45 years (M = 23.4, SD = 4.7). Students represented diverse academic disciplines, including business (28%), education (22%), sciences (20%), humanities (18%), and other fields (12%). Approximately 60% of respondents were enrolled in blended learning courses, while the remaining 40% were engaged in fully online programs. A convenience sampling strategy was used to recruit participants, utilizing digital recruitment channels such as course announcements, email invitations, and social media outreach. While this approach may limit the generalizability of findings, it is frequently employed in educational technology research to provide initial empirical validation of theoretical models (Brewer & Crano, 2000). A priori power analysis using G*Power confirmed that a minimum sample of 400 participants would yield adequate statistical power (.80) to detect medium effect sizes ($f^2 = .15$) in regression-based models with up to ten predictors.

Measures

All variables were measured using validated instruments, adapted for relevance to digital learning environments. Responses were captured using 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), allowing for fine-grained differentiation in attitudes and experiences.

Digital tools usage was assessed through a 12-item scale adapted from the Technology Integration Assessment Instrument (TIAI; Rohatgi, Scherer, & Hatlevik, 2016). The items measured the frequency and depth of engagement with various types of digital educational tools, including learning management systems, discussion forums, and other digital resources. The internal consistency of the scale was strong, with Cronbach's alpha reported at .89.

Learning motivation was measured using the intrinsic motivation subscale of the Academic Motivation Scale–College Version (AMS-C; Vallerand et al., 1992), modified for application in digital contexts. This scale captures the degree to which students are intrinsically driven to learn for interest, enjoyment, or personal relevance, aligning closely with the constructs defined in Self-Determination Theory. The scale demonstrated excellent internal consistency (α = .93).

Student engagement was measured using the University Student Engagement Inventory (USEI; Maroco, Maroco, Campos, & Fredricks, 2016), which operationalizes engagement across behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. Items were adapted to capture the nuances of digital learning environments, and the overall scale showed high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .91.

Teacher technology support was measured with a 15-item instrument developed specifically for this study, drawing from prior research on digital instructor support (Martin & Bolliger, 2018). This measure encompassed support across technical, pedagogical, motivational, and social dimensions, reflecting the multifaceted nature of instructional guidance in online settings. Sample items included references to clarity of tool usage instructions and encouragement of digital experimentation. The scale demonstrated high internal consistency (α = .94).

Control variables were included to account for potential confounding influences. These variables encompassed demographic factors such as age and gender, prior experience with digital technologies, course delivery mode (blended versus online), and academic discipline.

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected through an online survey hosted on a secure web-based platform. Participants were provided with comprehensive information regarding the research objectives, participation terms, confidentiality safeguards, and contact information for inquiries. The survey required approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. To reduce potential response biases, items from different scales were randomly intermixed, and reverse-coded items were incorporated where appropriate. Additional measures to ensure data quality included the use of attention check questions and monitoring of response times to detect inattentive or rushed completions.

Data Analysis Strategy

The data analysis process followed a structured multi-phase approach. Initial analyses involved data screening for missing responses, detection of outliers, and testing of assumptions related to normality, linearity, and multicollinearity. Descriptive statistics were computed to profile the sample and examine the distribution of key variables. Measurement validity was evaluated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), which assessed the dimensionality, reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity of the constructs. Each latent variable's factor loadings, composite reliability, and average variance extracted (AVE) were examined to confirm the psychometric soundness of the measurement model.

The hypothesized structural relationships among constructs were tested using structural equation modeling (SEM) with maximum likelihood estimation. Model fit was evaluated using multiple indices, including the chi-square statistic, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis's index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). To examine the proposed moderated mediation model, Hayes' PROCESS macro (Model 7) was employed. This analytic approach enabled the assessment of the conditional indirect effect of digital tools usage on student engagement via learning motivation, with teacher technology support as the moderator. Confidence intervals for indirect effects were estimated using 5,000 bootstrap samples.

Robustness checks were conducted to test the stability and validity of the findings. This included examination of potential alternative models, tests for common method variance, and subgroup analyses based on key demographic and contextual variables. The thorough and systematic approach to data analysis ensured the rigor and reliability of the empirical findings.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

In the initial data screening process, missing data analysis indicated that 3.7% of the total data points were missing, with no single variable exceeding 5% missingness. Little's MCAR test yielded a non-significant result ($\chi^2 = 47.23$, df = 52, p = .64), confirming that the data were missing completely at random. Accordingly, missing values were addressed using full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimation. Multivariate outlier detection was conducted via Mahalanobis distance, which identified 8 cases exceeding critical values. Each of these cases was reviewed individually and retained, as all reflected valid responses consistent with the study's target population.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for the focal variables are presented in Table 1. All variables exhibited acceptable levels of skewness (below 2.0) and kurtosis (below 7.0), meeting the assumptions necessary for maximum likelihood estimation. The correlation matrix indicated moderate to strong positive associations between digital tools usage, learning motivation, teacher support, and student engagement. These findings supported the theoretical model's plausibility while also showing that multicollinearity was not a concern, as no correlation exceeded r = .80.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Digital Tools Usage	5.34	1.12	—			
2. Learning Motivation	5.67	1.08	.52**	—		
3. Teacher Support	5.23	1.31	.43**	.61**	—	
4. Student Engagement	5.45	1.19	.58**	.73**	.66**	—

* Note: N = 417. *$p < .01$

Measurement Model Assessment

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess the measurement properties of the four latent constructs. The model exhibited satisfactory fit statistics: $\chi^2(146) = 341.56$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 2.34$; CFI = .96; TLI = .95; RMSEA = .057 (90% CI [.049, .065]); SRMR = .048. All factor loadings were statistically significant and exceeded .70, indicating strong convergence between observed items and their latent variables. Composite reliability values ranged from .89 to .94, and average variance extracted (AVE) values ranged from .67 to .81. Furthermore, the square root of each AVE exceeded the inter-construct correlations, confirming discriminant validity among all constructs.

Structural Model Testing

Direct Effects Model

The initial structural model tested the direct relationship between digital tools usage and student engagement. Model fit was strong, with $\chi^2(87) = 203.47$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 2.34$; CFI = .97; TLI = .96; RMSEA = .057; SRMR = .045. The path coefficient from digital tools usage to engagement was statistically significant ($\beta = .58$, SE = .043, $p < .001$), supporting the hypothesized direct effect (H1). This model explained 34% of the variance in student engagement.

Mediation Model

In the mediation model, learning motivation was introduced as an intervening variable between digital tools usage and engagement. Model fit remained excellent: $\chi^2(129) = 289.23$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2/df = 2.24$; CFI = .96; TLI = .95; RMSEA = .055; SRMR = .047. The mediation hypothesis (H2) was supported, as digital tools usage significantly predicted learning motivation ($\beta = .48$, SE = .045, $p < .001$), which in turn significantly predicted student engagement ($\beta = .52$, SE = .047, $p < .001$). The direct effect from digital tools usage to engagement remained significant but was reduced ($\beta = .21$, SE = .046, $p < .001$), indicating partial mediation. Bootstrap analysis using 5,000 resamples revealed a significant indirect effect ($\beta = .25$, 95% CI [.18, .33]). The mediation model explained 23% of the variance in learning motivation and 54% in student engagement.

Moderated Mediation Analysis

To test the moderated mediation hypothesis (H3), Hayes' PROCESS macro (Model 7) was used. Table 2 presents the results of this analysis.

The interaction between learning motivation and teacher support was significant ($\beta = .13$, $p = .002$), confirming the moderation effect. Simple slope analysis indicated that the relationship between learning motivation and engagement was stronger under high levels of teacher support (+1 SD: $\beta = .74$, $p < .001$) compared to low levels (–1 SD: $\beta = .48$, $p < .001$).

Conditional Indirect Effects

Conditional indirect effects further confirmed the moderated mediation model. As shown in the table below, the indirect effect of digital tools usage on engagement through learning motivation varied across levels of teacher support.

The index of moderated mediation was statistically significant (Index = .056, 95% CI [.021, .095]), providing strong evidence that teacher support moderates the indirect effect of digital tools usage on student engagement via learning motivation.

Table 2: Moderated Mediation Analysis Results

Path	Coefficient	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
DT → LM	0.43	0.049	8.78	< .001	0.334	0.526
LM → SE	0.61	0.052	11.73	< .001	0.508	0.712
TS → SE	0.28	0.045	6.22	< .001	0.192	0.368
LM × TS → SE	0.13	0.041	3.17	0.002	0.05	0.21
DT → SE	0.18	0.047	3.83	< .001	0.088	0.272

Note: DT = Digital Tools Usage; LM = Learning Motivation; TS = Teacher Support; SE = Student

Table 3: Conditional Indirect Effects of Digital Tools Usage on Student Engagement at Varying Levels of Teacher Support

Teacher Support Level	Indirect Effect	SE	Boot LLCI	Boot ULCI
Low (–1 SD)	0.17	0.034	0.109	0.241
Mean	0.26	0.032	0.202	0.327
High (+1 SD)	0.33	0.039	0.258	0.412

Robustness Checks

Alternative Models

Several alternative model specifications were evaluated to test the robustness of the findings. A reverse mediation model, which tested student engagement as a mediator between digital tools usage and learning motivation, exhibited poorer model fit ($\Delta AIC = 47.3$) and lacked theoretical justification. A full mediation model that constrained the direct path from digital tools usage to engagement to zero also resulted in significantly worse model fit ($\Delta\chi^2 = 14.73$, df = 1, $p < .001$), thus confirming partial rather than full mediation. When both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were entered as parallel mediators, intrinsic motivation emerged as the primary explanatory variable ($\beta = .23$), while extrinsic motivation had a negligible effect ($\beta = .04$), reinforcing the SDT-based focus.

Common Method Bias Assessment

To assess potential common method variance, Harman's single-factor test was conducted, and the first unrotated factor accounted for only 31% of the total variance, well below the 50% threshold. An unmeasured latent method construct (ULMC) analysis further showed that method variance accounted for less than 20% of the explained variance, suggesting that common method bias was not a significant threat to the validity of the results.

Subgroup Analyses

Subgroup analyses were conducted to test the generalizability of the model across different student populations. The structural relationships held consistently across both blended (n = 251) and fully online (n = 166) learning environments, with no significant differences in path coefficients. The model also showed consistency across academic levels, applying equally to undergraduate (n = 289) and graduate (n = 128) students. Multi-group analysis by gender revealed no significant differences in structural paths, indicating that the model is robust across male and female students.

Discussion

Summary of Key Findings

This study investigated the mechanisms through which digital pedagogical technologies influence student academic engagement by testing a moderated mediation model that incorporates learning motivation as a mediator and teacher technology support as a moderator. The findings offer strong empirical support for the hypothesized relationships and contribute meaningful insights to both theoretical understanding and instructional practice. The first major finding confirmed that the use of digital tools significantly predicts student engagement, consistent with prior literature indicating that when appropriately integrated, educational technologies can enrich the learning experience (Means et al., 2013). However, the moderate effect size ($\beta = .21$) indicates that technology in isolation may not be sufficient to ensure high engagement levels. The second key finding demonstrated that learning motivation plays a mediating role in the relationship between technology usage and engagement. In line with Self-Determination Theory, this suggests that digital technologies primarily influence engagement through their effects on students' intrinsic motivation, and the mediation effect was substantial ($\beta = .25$). Third, teacher technology support significantly moderated the relationship between learning motivation and engagement, indicating that instructional support enhances students' ability to convert motivation into meaningful engagement behaviors. Lastly, the moderated mediation analysis showed that the strength of the indirect effect of digital tools on engagement via motivation was contingent upon the level of teacher support, with the indirect effect nearly doubling when teacher support was high, highlighting the critical importance of instructor facilitation in technology-rich learning environments.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study offer several important theoretical contributions by bridging and extending three major frameworks: Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), and Student Engagement Theory. The integration of these perspectives into a single explanatory model demonstrates how technology-related behaviors are not isolated from broader psychological and pedagogical processes. In particular, the mediation analysis strengthens SDT by showing that intrinsic motivation remains a key driver of engagement even in digitally mediated environments, underscoring the continuing relevance of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in shaping student outcomes. Engagement, often treated as a behavioral or attitudinal endpoint, is shown here to be a product of motivational dynamics that are themselves shaped by environmental conditions. The moderating role of teacher support also adds depth to engagement theory by emphasizing that the translation of motivation into engagement is not automatic but conditional, depending on the presence of instructional scaffolding and support. Furthermore, this study broadens the scope of TAM by linking technology acceptance not only to usage behaviors but also to deeper learning outcomes, suggesting that future TAM-based research should more fully incorporate motivational constructs and situational supports. Altogether, this theoretical synthesis encourages future researchers to adopt more comprehensive, integrative frameworks that reflect the multifaceted realities of technology-enhanced learning.

Practical Implications

From a practical standpoint, the results underscore that effective digital learning requires more than simply introducing new tools—it demands thoughtful design, intentional support, and a focus on the learner's psychological experience. Instructional designers should prioritize motivational design principles by creating digital learning environments that foster autonomy through choice, enhance competence through appropriately challenging activities and feedback, and build relatedness through meaningful peer and instructor interaction. Teacher support is not an optional enhancement but a central determinant of whether students can engage meaningfully with technology; thus, institutions must invest in comprehensive faculty development programs that emphasize both technical and pedagogical strategies. Faculty should be equipped not only to use digital tools but to create environments that support student agency and emotional investment in learning. Administrators and policymakers must recognize that institutional support structures—including technical helpdesks, instructional design units, and student services—are vital to ensuring equitable access to the benefits of educational technology. Additionally, developers of educational technology should design tools with built-in affordances that promote motivational support and seamless pedagogical integration, such as real-time feedback, collaborative features, and teacher dashboards that aid in monitoring and guiding student progress. Ultimately, the success of digital learning initiatives depends on the alignment of technological, pedagogical, and institutional elements that collectively support student engagement.

Limitations and Boundary Conditions

While the study offers important insights, it is necessary to acknowledge its methodological and contextual limitations. The cross-sectional research design constrains causal inference, and although the theoretical model is robustly supported, longitudinal studies are needed to capture the temporal dynamics of motivation and engagement in digital environments. The use of self-report instruments, while common in educational research, introduces potential biases such as social desirability and common method variance, though analytic checks suggested these biases were limited.

The sample, drawn from a specific set of higher education institutions, may not fully represent other educational contexts such as K–12, vocational training, or adult education settings. Cultural and institutional factors unique to the study's context may also influence the generalizability of results. Furthermore, the study focused primarily on intrinsic motivation, potentially oversimplifying the complex array of motivational constructs that influence learning. Engagement was conceptualized as relatively stable, yet it is increasingly recognized as dynamic and context-dependent. Finally, while teacher support was identified as a significant moderator, other important contextual moderators—such as peer interaction, technological infrastructure, and institutional culture—were not examined and should be explored in future work.

Future Research Directions

Building on the current findings, future research should pursue several directions to deepen understanding and inform more effective educational practice. Longitudinal studies are needed to track how the relationships among digital tool use, motivation, and engagement evolve over time and to establish stronger causal inferences. Multi-method research designs that integrate self-reports with behavioral data, observational methods, and learning analytics can provide a richer and more accurate account of the engagement process. Future theoretical work should also expand the motivational framework beyond intrinsic motivation to include more differentiated models of autonomy, control, and goal orientation. Engagement should be conceptualized as a dynamic phenomenon, and future studies should examine how it fluctuates within learning sessions and across different digital contexts. Moreover, researchers should investigate the specific mechanisms through which different types of digital tools—such as gamified platforms, AI-driven personalization, or immersive virtual environments—affect motivation and engagement. Intervention-based studies that test instructional strategies and support models grounded in the findings of this study could yield actionable recommendations for practitioners. Finally, as educational technologies continue to evolve, future research must keep pace with emerging innovations such as adaptive learning systems, artificial intelligence, and immersive media to understand how these developments reshape the motivational and engagement landscape.

Conclusion

This study offers significant insights into how digital pedagogical technologies influence student academic engagement, not through simplistic or direct mechanisms, but via intricate motivational processes and instructional support structures. The results highlight that technology's impact is mediated by students' internal motivational states and further conditioned by the presence and quality of teacher support. These findings not only validate the complexity of technology-enhanced learning but also affirm that digital tools, when embedded within psychologically supportive environments, can meaningfully contribute to student engagement and success.

Key Contributions

Theoretically, this research provides a novel integration of Self-Determination Theory, the Technology Acceptance Model, and Student Engagement Theory into a cohesive framework that advances our understanding of digital learning environments. By demonstrating that motivation serves as a critical mediator between technology usage and engagement, and that teacher support moderates this mediational pathway, the study contributes to a more dynamic and contextualized view of educational engagement. Methodologically, the use of a moderated mediation model represents an advancement in the analytical strategies applied to educational technology research. This approach captures the complexity of indirect and conditional effects more effectively than traditional linear models, offering a powerful tool for future empirical studies. Practically, the study delivers actionable insights for multiple stakeholders in higher education. Instructional designers are encouraged to embed motivational affordances into digital tools, faculty developers are reminded of the central role instructors play in activating student motivation, and institutional leaders are guided toward creating systemic support structures that foster both faculty capacity and student engagement. Together, these contributions reflect a comprehensive approach to optimizing technology integration in higher education settings.

Implications for Digital Transformation

The findings of this study have profound implications for the ongoing digital transformation in higher education. Successful digital learning initiatives cannot be measured solely by the availability or sophistication of technological infrastructure. Rather, success depends on the degree to which digital learning environments are designed and supported in ways that satisfy students' psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Faculty development must therefore extend beyond training in digital tools to include pedagogical strategies that foster intrinsic motivation. Institutional support systems must be strategically aligned to assist both students and instructors in navigating technology-rich environments, and quality assurance efforts must be reoriented to assess not only technical functionality, but also student engagement, satisfaction, and motivational outcomes. As digital technologies continue to evolve, institutions must remain attentive to the human dimensions of learning, ensuring that technological advancement enhances—rather than displaces—core educational values.

The transition toward digital education represents both an unprecedented opportunity and a complex pedagogical challenge. This study affirms that the transformative potential of digital pedagogical technologies will only be realized when they are thoughtfully integrated with sound instructional design and robust support systems. Technology, in and of itself, does not engage students; rather, it is the meaningful alignment of technology with motivationally supportive teaching practices that cultivates deep and lasting engagement. As educators, researchers, and policymakers confront the accelerating pace of digital innovation, there is a growing imperative to resist the reductive view of technology as a one-size-fits-all solution. Instead, a more sophisticated, holistic perspective is required—one that recognizes the multifaceted nature of student engagement and the contextual conditions under which it flourishes.

This study lays an important foundation for that perspective by offering an empirically supported framework and a set of practical recommendations for building effective, student-centered digital learning environments. Future research that builds on these insights will be essential to further refine our understanding of digital pedagogy, particularly in light of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, immersive learning platforms, and personalized learning systems. Ultimately, the pursuit of effective digital education must be guided by a commitment not only to technological innovation, but to the enduring human aims of learning, growth, and meaningful engagement.

References

Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in a computer conferencing context. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 5*(2), 1–17.

Baeten, M., Dochy, F., & Struyven, K. (2013). The effects of different learning environments on students' motivation for learning and their achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(4), 484–501.

Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 26*(1), 87–122.

Bond, M., & Bedenlier, S. (2019). Facilitating student engagement through educational technology: Towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 2019*(1), 1–14.

Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2015). Self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in online higher education learning environments: A systematic review. *The Internet and Higher Education, 27*, 1–13.

Brewer, M. B., & Crano, W. D. (2000). Research design and issues of validity. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 3–16). Cambridge University Press.

Chen, K. C., & Jang, S. J. (2010). Motivation in online learning: Testing a model of self-determination theory. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(4), 741–752.

Chiu, T. K. F. (2021). Digital support for student engagement in blended learning based on self-determination theory. *Computers in Human Behavior, 124*, 106909.

Clark, R. C. (2012). *Evidence-based training methods*. ATD Press.

Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *E-learning and the science of instruction* (4th ed.). Wiley.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340.

Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*, 19–43.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268.

Dumford, A. D., & Miller, A. L. (2018). Online learning in higher education: Exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 30*(3), 452–465.

Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(1), 225–241.

Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (2013). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 26*(2), 43–71.

Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. *Computers & Education, 59*(2), 423–435.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109.

Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education*. Jossey-Bass.

Gašević, D., Dawson, S., & Siemens, G. (2015). Let's not forget: Learning analytics are about learning. *TechTrends, 59*(1), 64–71.

Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2018). E-teaching in higher education: An essential prerequisite for e-learning. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research, 7*(2), 93–97.

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers*. Routledge.

Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Henrie, C. R., Halverson, L. R., & Graham, C. R. (2015). Measuring student engagement in technology-mediated learning: A review. *Computers & Education, 90*, 36–53.

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *EDUCAUSE Review, 55*(3), 1–12.

Hughes, J., Thomas, R., & Scharber, C. (2013). Assessing technology integration: The RAT—Replacement, amplification, and transformation framework. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1616–1620).

Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2014). Technology-enhanced learning and teaching in higher education: What is "enhanced" and how do we know? *Learning and Teaching, 7*(1), 1–24.

Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations.

New Directions for Institutional Research, 2009(141), 5–20.

Maroco, J., Maroco, A. L., Campos, J. A. D. B., & Fredricks, J. A. (2016). University student engagement: Development of the University Student Engagement Inventory (USEI). *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica, 29*, 1–12.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online Learning, 22*(1), 205–222.

Martí-Parreño, J., Méndez-Ibáñez, E., & Alonso-Arroyo, A. (2016). The use of gamification in education: A bibliometric and text mining analysis. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 32*(6), 663–676.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record, 115*(3), 1–47.

Merrill, M. D. (2013). *First principles of instruction*. Pfeiffer.

Mtebe, J. S., & Raisamo, R. (2014). Investigating students' behavioural intention to adopt and use mobile learning in higher education in East Africa. *International Journal of Education and Development Using ICT, 10*(3), 4–20.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903.

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*(4), 257–267.

Richardson, J. C., Maeda, Y., Lv, J., & Caskurlu, S. (2017). Social presence in relation to students' satisfaction and learning in the online environment: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior, 71*, 402–417.

Rindfleisch, A., Malter, A. J., Ganesan, S., & Moorman, C. (2008). Cross-sectional versus longitudinal survey research: Concepts, findings, and guidelines. *Journal of Marketing Research, 45*(3), 261–279.

Rohatgi, A., Scherer, R., & Hatlevik, O. E. (2016). The role of ICT self-efficacy for students' ICT use and their achievement in a computer and information literacy test. *Computers & Education, 102*, 103–116.

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*, 101860.

Sinatra, G. M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational Psychologist, 50*(1), 1–13.

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 21–44). Springer.

Sung, Y. T., Chang, K. E., & Liu, T. C. (2016). The effects of integrating mobile devices with teaching and learning on students' learning performance: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Computers & Education, 94*, 252–275.

Tamm, S. (2019). Does educational technology improve academic performance? *Educational Technology Research and Development, 67*(5), 1105–1126.

Teo, T. (2011). Factors influencing teachers' intention to use technology: Model development and test. *Computers & Education, 57*(4), 2432–2440.

Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. Higher Education Academy.

Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Sénécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1992). The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*(4), 1003–1017.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science, 46*(2), 186–204.