Chapter 3
Towards an Emergent Mainstream Engagement Framework

Abstract This chapter offers 10 propositions of what teachers can do to engage their students. The propositions are synthesized from the mainstream research literature discussed in Chap. 2. The synthesis is informed by complexity theory and its by-product 'emergence' which enables clear proposals for action to be developed from diverse perspectives and practice frameworks. Each proposition is intended for both students and teachers. They are arranged under three headings: students invest in their own learning, teachers and institutions are vital enablers of engagement, and engagement is assisted by enabling external environments. Emergence is captured by a conceptual organizer for mainstream student engagement practice. An appendix (Appendix A) investigates whether there is any empirical support for the organizer.

The perspectives and practice frameworks discussed in Chap. 2 highlight both differences and similarities in student engagement research. They reveal student engagement as complex with features that have strong connections to each other while also being distinct. For example, engagement researchers working in all conceptual frameworks share the view that engagement is learner centred and constructionist but differ about whether it is primarily behavioural, cognitive, affective or all three, and if the latter in what proportions. Complexity is a feature of a system in which connection and distinction operate simultaneously. Connection offers system continuity and stability by opening possibilities for definition, a necessary condition for system maintenance; distinction enables diverse ideas to flourish, for change in the system to occur and for multiple definitions. Heylighen (1999) goes back to the original Latin word 'complexus' meaning 'entwined' to describe complex systems that are closely connected while simultaneously being distinct. Aspects of such systems are entwined in unpredictable ways leading to the similar yet diverse practice frameworks identified in Chap. 2.

However, merely labelling a system complex does not get us closer to understanding what engagement looks like in practice. It is very difficult to obtain a coherent and defensible view of how we might practice engagement when confronted by the complex array of conceptual frameworks discussed so far, as

N. Zepke, *Student Engagement in Neoliberal Times*,
DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-3200-4_3

engagement is "a system that is comprised of a large number of entities that display a high level of nonlinear interactivity" (Richardson and Cilliers 2001, p. 8). It is this nonlinear interactivity that offers the opportunity to gain a more cohesive view of engagement. Complexity researchers like Davis and Sumara (2008) observe that complex systems are able to address the question 'how should we act?' This question enables new practices and understandings to emerge. Emergence is a feature of complex systems. It often happens at the margins of a complex network, is not lineally derived from data and so is not usually predictable. This chapter identifies the emergence of possible strategies from the many nonlinear activities revealed in the mainstream conceptual engagement frameworks discussed so far.

Emergence: Ten Propositions for Enabling Student Engagement

A key emergent property of the frameworks is that the student engagement construct is made up of separate yet intertwining organizing ideas. Three such organizing ideas emerge from the perspectives and frameworks: engaged students invest in learning; institution and classroom practices support learning; and engaging features of external environments sustain learning. An important understanding about emergence is that emergent properties are not necessarily traceable to or lineally derived from any particular framework, but might be evident in a number or even all. Each property is important for engagement as it is essential to know about the generic, the connected ideas offered by the frameworks and other engagement research. But it is even more critical to understand that these properties apply to our own contexts, how they can be adapted to suit our own students, our teaching philosophies and content areas. They are both generic and unique at the same time. The aim of the chapter is to trace the emergence of generic propositions for engagement that can be applied to our unique contexts and students. These propositions will help learners to engage in learning but with the understanding that they have to be shaped to suit diverse individuals and contexts. They are like items on supermarket shelves that have yet to be prepared in our own kitchen for our own consumption.

I have abstracted 10 emergent and generic propositions from the perspectives and frameworks identified in Chap. 2. They address 'how research suggests we should act' under three headings: *students' invest in their own learning, teachers and institutions are vital enablers of engagement*, and *engagement is assisted by enabling external environments.* Each proposition is intended as a reference for both students and teachers.

Students' Invest in Their Own Learning

Students are at the heart of engagement. They invest cognitively, emotionally and actively in learning in order to succeed (Fredricks et al. 2004). As the survey of engagement frameworks suggests, investment opportunities are many, varied and complex. While students invest in their own learning, teachers, institutions and significant outsiders help facilitate and grow the investment. Emerging from the engagement frameworks are indications of how students need to invest in their learning but also what supports are needed to grow that investment.

Student Self-belief Is Vital for Success

Emerging from the frameworks is an assumption that all students can engage; that they have strengths. To engage successfully they must believe that they have enough strengths to succeed. But self-belief is not given. It is built and maintained in various relationships between learners and teachers, learners and learners, learners and institutions and learners and their communities. Within both the 'inner' and 'outer' teaching learning environments discussed by Entwistle et al. (2002), a strengths-based approach to engagement assumes that while students have weaknesses they can learn to overcome them by enhancing their self-belief, by building their strengths. Strengths-based learning is rooted in Appreciative Inquiry (AI) developed by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) to overcome and solve problems in organizational behaviour. AI provides an important insight into higher education as it attempts to replace deficiency discourses that perceive disengagement as caused by problem students with poor achievement, negative behaviours and attitudes (Bushe 2013). For example, AI attempts to convince students that they bring cultural, age-related, educational and personality-related strengths to their learning. Take cultural strengths. Some students belong to cultures that value individualism and autonomy; others belong to collectivist cultures that value connection with others. Both strengths are useful in learning as long as learners and teachers believe that collaborative as well as autonomous learning leads to success. Some students are practical problem solvers; others think deeply by reflecting on their experiences; yet others theorize from reading and some do all three. Students need to believe that all strengths they bring into the classroom are appreciated.

Bushe (2013) suggests that five principles underpin AI. Together they have the capacity to help students build self-belief to engage. A constructionist principle proposes that what we believe to be true determines what we do. When applied to learning in higher education students co-construct new ideas, stories and images with significant others such as teachers, peers and outside influences to generate new possibilities for self-belief and success. A simultaneity principle proposes that as soon as we inquire into our own learning we change our understanding of how we learn and this plants seeds for change in our confidence and willingness to engage. A poetic principle proposes that self-belief and engagement is expressed in

the stories people tell each other every day, and the story of our learning is constantly co-authored by significant others such as teachers, friends and colleagues. The stories we tell about ourselves and others have an impact far beyond just the words themselves. An anticipatory principle suggests that what we do today is guided by our image of the future. We project ahead of ourselves a horizon of expectation that brings the future powerfully into the present as a mobilizing agent. AI uses positive imagery on a collective basis to anticipate changes in self-belief. A positive principle emphasizes that change in self-esteem requires positive affect and feelings of belonging with others in our teaching-learning environment. These principles suggest the following actions by students, teachers and significant others: recognize and demonstrate, in word and deed that we appreciate our own and others strengths; engage with a variety of learning experiences that enable us to use and develop our particular strengths; and provide and accept feedback that enables us to build our and others' strengths.

Students' Motivation Grows from Self-belief

Motivation and self-belief go hand in hand in the engagement research literature. A number of researchers found that learners' self-belief to be a key motivator. Yorke and Knight (2004) for example found that the self-theories learners bring to their learning impact motivation, agency and engagement. Those with fixed self-theories tend to have fixed views about their own abilities. They adopt performance goals for their learning and lose motivation when these are not achieved. Those with malleable self-theories tend to adopt learning goals, seeing challenges as opportunities for learning. Such learners tend to stay engaged independently of their performance. They suggest that somewhere between 25 and 30% of learners have fixed self-theories that could impact negatively on their engagement. Related to this work is what Llorens et al. (2007) label a personal resources–efficacy–engagement spiral. They found that where learners believe they have the personal resources to complete a task, their self-efficacy grows and consequently so does their engagement. Fazey and Fazey (2001) reported that self-perceived competence is a key motivator for engagement. Students' confidence in their own competence within their context was a strong motivator for ongoing active learning. Such learners stayed motivated and engaged even in the face of short-term failure.

The work of Ryan and Deci (2000) on self-determination theory (SDT) has been influential in the way motivation and self-belief has been constructed in the engagement literature. From SDT, a synthesis emerges about how motivation and learner agency lead to engagement. SDT focuses on agentic individuals who have set themselves clear performance and learning goals, have positive self-theories and actively interact with their social environments. To be motivated means to be moved to do something. Ryan and Deci (2000) identify a trinity of intrinsic motivational factors that are vital for student engagement. They found that engaged students work autonomously, enjoy learning relationships with others and feel they are competent to achieve their own objectives. Of the three, feeling competent is the

most important for motivation (Ryan and Deci 2000). This enhances students' self-belief, and Appreciative Inquiry offers examples of this. Set tasks that are challenging when within students' capabilities and offer feedback, help them to build feelings of competence. Autonomy does not just mean working independently; it can mean working interdependently. Belonging to and working within a group does not detract from autonomy or self-belief. A sense of belonging, or being in learning relationships with the teacher and other students, also enhances engagement. While perhaps less important than competence and autonomy, belonging is still important to student engagement and is enhanced through working in groups (Ryan and Deci 2000).

Social and Cultural Capital Enhance Engagement

Although engagement research, including that reported in this book, often looks at engagement in a generic way, it also acknowledges diversity. Whether due to social class, culture, ethnicity, age, gender, geographic location or sexual orientation diversity is likely to influence whether and how students engage. Two sociological theories alert us to this. The first is the notion of social capital. According to Putnam (2000) the shared values and understandings that enable us and others to trust each other and to work together create social capital. Having social capital enables us to connect to people with a common identity such as family and a shared ethnicity and culture; to relate to peers, colleagues and associates who do not share the same identity but nevertheless have similar characteristics; and under certain circumstances forge links to people who 'are not like us'. Cultural capital, according to Bourdieu, refers to symbolic elements such as skills, tastes, posture, clothing, mannerisms, material belongings, credentials that we acquires as members of a particular social class. Sharing similar forms of cultural capital with others—understanding and using academic language, for example—creates a sense of collective identity and group position. Not having cultural capital is a major source of social inequality (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). Certain forms of cultural capital are valued over others, and can help or hinder a person's acceptance and respect just as much as income or wealth. In higher education holding social and cultural capital recognized and valued by the dominant majority in education, provides acceptance and respect that people from diverse minority groups may not have.

Students from minority groups, often labelled 'non-traditional', must still develop the social and cultural capital needed to succeed in mainstream education. They do not command the group memberships, relationships, networks of influence and support, the forms of knowledge, skills and education that will give them the capital to engage and succeed in higher education. They must learn the language of the subject they study, the attitudes and practices that are valued within the academy, gain a sense of belonging and understand how things work around here (Case 2007; Gavala and Flett 2005). To engage, all students including non-traditional ones need to feel that they can negotiate ways to succeed. Such negotiation means they need to engage with subject, institution and pedagogical cultures. Most

importantly they must believe that such engagement is meaningful, reciprocated by peers, teachers and institution. Social and cultural capital grows when students feel they can negotiate, be accepted, enjoy constructive relationships with others, feel they have strengths they can contribute to the mainstream; in short when they feel like a 'fish in water' Thomas (2002). Johnson et al. (2007) found that, rather than merely placing the burden on students to adapt to an unalterable context, institutions wanting to engage learners respect the importance of students' perceptions of their educational environments and experiences and include such perspectives in developing institutional climates and curricula. Laird et al. (2007) did not find uniformly that 'minority' students feel alienated from their institutions; they did note that a greater effort was needed by teachers and institutions for them to ask deep questions about their cultures.

Engaged Learners Are Deep Learners

That engaged learners are deep learners has been widely accepted by researchers. For example, Coates et al. (2008) found that while students' attitudes to learning varied greatly, those who engaged in higher forms of learning such as analysing, synthesizing and evaluating tended to be most engaged. This finding was supported by Hockings et al. (2008) who suggested that students who reflect, question, conjecture, evaluate and make connections between ideas whilst drawing on the ideas, experiences and knowledge of others are most deeply engaged. The Higher Education Academy in the United Kingdom (n.d.) brought together a number of characteristics of deep learning gleaned from the research literature. These include: examining new facts and ideas critically, and tying them into existing cognitive structures; making numerous links between ideas; looking for meaning; focussing on the central argument or concepts needed to solve a problem; distinguishing between argument and evidence; having an intrinsic curiosity in the subject; and showing personal interest in the subject. These findings substantiate and refine the work of the originators of the 'approaches to learning' perspective like Marton and Säljö (1976) and Entwistle (2005) among others. The latter identified five aspects of deep learning: seeking meaning and understanding from learning; connecting ideas to enable independent thinking; weighing evidence by drawing conclusions, questioning author intent and finding reasons for it; and forward goal setting planning and evaluation. Underpinning and stimulating these aspects is intrinsic motivation that is driven by an interest in ideas originating inside and outside the classroom.

An important feature of deep learning is to confront an enduring myth about learners and learning in higher education. This is that students do not engage if they are challenged, if learning becomes difficult. On the contrary, the evidence is compelling that enriching experiences and academic challenge are engaging. Students respond to rigour, to experiences that take them out of their comfort zones, and to tasks that make them feel that they have grown intellectually and as people (Kuh et al. 2005). However, helping learners to meet such challenges requires

support from teachers, institutions and the 'outer' environment. Among engaging support practices are convincing students that they are expected to meet high standards. Problem solving will only work when students are supported by suitable learning resources. Group work is not of itself disengaging but requires the opportunity for participants to get to know each other. Challenging academic tasks have to be clearly set out, and must allow students sufficient time to complete them. Challenging assessment activities are not disengaging if they are accompanied by timely and strengthening feedback. Indeed, challenge and extension work best in an environment in which students feel comfortable and safe in a strengths-based atmosphere (Báez 2011). The following ideas for challenging, enriching and extending students are offered in the research literature: convincing students that significant others have high expectations; expecting students to put sufficient time into tasks to complete them satisfactorily; supporting students when they get into academic trouble or when they want help to extend themselves; and encouraging students to share the results of their learning (Bryson and Hand 2007).

Teachers and Institutions Are Vital Enablers of Engagement

A number of the frameworks put the teacher and/or the institution at the centre of student engagement (Kuh et al. 2005; Nelson et al. 2012; Tinto 2010). According to Trowler (2010) this view dominates student engagement research. It is chiefly concerned with the 'how' of teaching and learning for engagement. While a generic view of teaching for engagement is necessary for learning and is unpacked in this section, it is not sufficient as will become clearer in Chaps. 7–11. This section canvasses some popular practical ideas that emerge from the frameworks about teaching but also proposes three teaching and institutional roles not so often surfaced in engagement discourses.

Quality Teaching and Institutional Support Enhance Engagement

Quality teaching is critical for quality learning. This is a key finding in much engagement research. Numerous meta-analyses attempt to quantify this finding. In their meta-analysis of how College affects student learning, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) claim that literally hundreds of such studies show that teacher behaviour and student learning are positively correlated. They suggest that meta-analyses and narrative syntheses show that student perceptions of teacher behaviours and attributes are multi-dimensional, have reasonable reliability and have moderate positive correlations with successful learning. They found that under appropriate conditions more than 45% of the variation in student learning can be explained by student perceptions of teacher effectiveness. Feldman (1997) synthesis of meta-analyses showed moderately positive correlations for teacher behaviours such as clarity and

understandability of explanations, avoidance of vague terms and use of concrete examples; teacher availability and helpfulness to discuss matters of concern; quality and frequency of feedback by teacher to student; and teacher effort to establish rapport with students. Experimental studies have shown that teacher expressiveness such as enthusiasm, humour, making eye contact and physical movement significantly enhance student content learning. Such studies have also shown that some teacher behaviours improve critical thinking. Edison et al. (1998), for example, reported that their experimental study revealed that how teachers organized teaching sessions could have a positive effect on critical thinking.

Teachers' work is vital to engagement but is most effective when backed by a strong philosophy and by institutional support. While a unitary philosophy for student engagement is hard to find, there are clear philosophical assumptions about quality teaching. One is that teaching for engagement is learner-centred, the other is that education is about students constructing their own knowledge (Krause and Coates 2008). This meets the requirements of Barr and Tagg (1995) notion of a learning paradigm where teaching is not about instruction but about producing learning with every student by whatever means work. This learner-centred view is made even clearer by the UK's Trowler (2010): student engagement encompasses ways in which students become active partners in shaping their learning experience. A particular feature of this learner-focused conception is learner participation in learning communities which Pike et al. (2011) claim is positively and significantly related to student engagement. Institutional support for learning is another important foundation for engaging teaching. Kuh et al. (2005) provide valuable research information about the nature and quality of institutional support for learning. An overview of what engaging institutions do is provided by this team of researchers. In researching the practices of 20 successful higher education institutions in the USA, they found cultures that focused on student success, fore-grounded learning, established high expectations, aimed for continuous improvement, invested money in support services, asserted the importance of diversity and difference and prepared students for learning in higher education.

Disciplinary Knowledge Engages Students

Solomonides et al. (2012) developed a relational model of engagement in which discipline knowledge plays a major role. They suggest that the inclusion of discipline knowledge as a key component of student engagement is evident in only a few frameworks. Yet, students enrol in higher education to gain subject or discipline knowledge and skills to achieve life goals. To help them achieve these requires "a teaching approach which begins to satisfy simultaneously a tacit demand for content, for understanding of content, for relevance and applicability of that content…" (Walker cited in Entwistle 2010). It is important then to include an explicit consideration of content in an engagement pedagogy that enhances quality learning. Entwistle (2003) does so when reporting on the *Enhancing teaching-learning*

environments in undergraduate courses project (ETL) in the United Kingdom. This investigated quality learning in teaching-learning environments. He reports that stimulating interest in students about ways of thinking and practising in a subject is one of five factors leading to interest and engagement in learning. Engagement is developed on the back of growing conceptual understandings in a subject. Such understandings involve key terms, concepts and principles of a subject; higher order understandings such as possibilities for application in the 'real world'; fundamental skills such as designing programmes and communication skills; and higher order skills like evaluating and interpreting knowledge. But quality learning and teaching also requires a suitable pedagogy, ways to facilitate the understanding of content. He suggests that engagement in quality learning is achieved when teachers and learners together deal with content in pedagogically suitable ways.

Teaching disciplinary knowledge in a pedagogically engaging way, then, seems to be a vital element for quality learning and success. The ETL project investigated the potential of threshold concepts to explore the close link between content and learning-teaching. They are "akin to a portal, opening up a new and previously inaccessible way of thinking about something" (Meyer and Land 2003, p. 1). This seems to be a suitable construct to help develop disciplinary knowledge while stimulating student engagement. A threshold concept is discipline specific, focuses on understanding of the subject and, indeed, has the ability to transform learners' views of the content by providing a conceptual gateway to gain such understanding. Once through the gateway, a new way of understanding, interpreting or viewing a subject may emerge. Walker (2013) suggests that threshold concepts can be viewed as a product of learning, something developed in the minds of learners, or as a learning process, a transformative journey with distinct stages. As a product threshold concepts have a cognitive, deep learning focus that seeks understanding and seeing things in new ways. As a process it is transformative, integrative, bounded, troublesome and eventually tacit. Whether seen as product or process threshold concepts require students' cognitive investment in, active participation in and emotional commitment to their learning (Fredricks et al. 2004) and therefore require engagement in disciplinary learning.

Adapt to Changing Student Expectations

Engaging institutions and teachers, no matter how successful, are never satisfied with their performance. They change practices in response to evidence. There is evidence that political and social conditions are changing and that institutions and teachers must adapt to. McInnis (2003) observed a new reality in higher education with students increasingly studying part-time. In Australia, for example, James et al. (2010) found that more than half the students surveyed thought that paid work interfered with their academic performance. Such students expected study to fit their lives; not fit their lives around study. McInnis (2003) suggests that engagement can no longer be assumed; it must be negotiated with students. James et al. (2010) found that half of the students in part-time employment offered family

reasons for seeking employment. Some wanted to gain greater financial independence from their family; others, and this was particularly so for aboriginal students, were supporting their families. Together, these studies suggest that factors created by changing conditions in wider society are important influences on engagement. Teachers and institutions must keep abreast of, adapt to and negotiate around ever-changing student expectations. While we will dance a fine line between maintaining standards and accommodating expectations, there are methods we can use that would not lower standards. Some flexibility is often permissible around content, assessment deadlines, and attendance requirements. In negotiating such items we must be very clear about our expectations.

Ever-changing student expectations are also apparent around the use of technology. In research of university students' attitude and use of media in the United States, Mihailidis (2014) found that students have different attitudes to media in their private and educational lives. In private life, they engaged avidly with social media such as Facebook, MySpace Twitter, WordPress, YouTube and Flickr. Most participants integrated all facets of daily communication into such social networks. They felt that they won strong relationships and a sense of belonging from that engagement. Mihailidis' research also revealed an ambivalent view of technology. Many students saw the use of technology in a negative light, feeling that their engagement with media tethered and controlled them. This ambivalence can extend into the classroom leading to reluctance to participate in formal online classroom activities while at the same time wanting to use social media for their own purposes in that setting. Deuze (2006) explains this ambivalence as a tension between technologies learners choose to use in their daily lives and technologies they are told to use in class. He suggests that bricolage, a third mode of engagement with technology, leads to constantly rethinking and questioning the use of teaching media in the classroom. Bricolage attempts to address learner ambivalence about using classroom-learning technologies by introducing diverse, perhaps less educationally orthodox technologies. For example, Cull et al. (2010) suggest including both social media and more formal technology teaching platforms into planning for engagement. They suggest that teachers who stay in touch, respond quickly, deliver material and engage in conversations in both social and formal media have a good chance to engage their students.

Engagement Requires Enabling External Environments

In general, engagement researchers focus on what teachers and institutions can do to enhance learning inside the classroom. While occasionally mentioned, influences that happen or originate outside the walls of the academy are neglected in some frameworks. The framework offered by Yorke and Longden (2008) is an exception. They found that seven factors explained disengagement and early departure. While five of these factors related mainly to institutional issues such as poor-quality

teaching, and to personal considerations such as choosing the wrong course, two factors originated outside the institution: problems with finance and employment; and problems with social integration into aspects of institutional life due to their background. This suggests that influences on engagement from outside the institution can be important. Here I consider three motivations for engagement that occur outside the institution.

Engagement Occurs Across the Life-Span

Lawson and Lawson (2013) view of student engagement as a sociocultural ecological construct suggests that it involves more than behavioural, psychological, social and cultural understandings. They recognize that engagement involves the whole being and is nourished by experiences in classroom, the home, the community and their own virtual worlds. Engagement in this holistic view transcends formal education and can occur in several contexts sequentially, simultaneously or iteratively. This view draws on sociocultural theory (Vygotsky 1978), the ecological systems framework developed by Bronfenbrenner (1979) and experiential learning (Dewey 1938/1997). It also mirrors the idea of lifewide education and learning that sees learning and engagement as happening in several places simultaneously (Barnett 2010). This notion of lifewide learning adds an extra dimension to our understanding of student engagement. It suggests that we inhabit simultaneously multiple learning spaces and can draw inspiration for engagement in the classroom from all or some. Barnett highlights a number of potentially engaging spaces to make this point. He suggests that our engagement with classroom learning can be traced to multiple sites; formal learning in credit bearing courses may only be one of numerous spaces that engage us; and the most engaging stimulation for learning may be unaccredited, personally stretching, highly demanding yet transfer to the classroom. Of course, experiences in the sociocultural ecological spaces can have disengaging consequences in the classroom as well. Engagement and disengagement are not attributable only to the classroom.

A key strength of the lifewide view of student engagement is that it explains how emotions contribute to engagement in multiple spaces. As Kahu et al. (2014) observe, different emotions contribute to engagement and influence all stages of the learning process. But they are not contained in one site like a classroom. Rather, emotions in one space affect engagement and learning in other spaces in the lifeworld and so engagement can transfer between lifewide spaces. This is not to say that classroom experiences cannot stimulate engagement on their own, merely that it is not possible to say that emotional engagement is always contained within the classroom. Emotions that act on engagement for learning can be positive and negative. Positive learning emotions can be traced to students' private lives at home, at work and at leisure as well as to the classroom. Positive effects of emotion on engagement are enabled by background, skills, self-efficacy and success (Kahu et al. 2014) and stimulated by warm relationships, respect and success in what students want to achieve (Bryson and Hand 2007) whether inside or outside the

classroom. The absence of such positive emotions experienced anywhere in the lifeworld can lead to disengagement or as Case (2007) puts it to alienation from learning. She attributes reasons for alienation to an undesirable separation from the self, disturbances in relationships with self, others and society.

Engagement Is Linked to Subjective Well-being

Subjective well-being is an area of research that has increasingly been connected with student engagement. This connection is two sided. On one side, well-being research sees engagement as an important indicator of subjective well-being. The New Economics Foundation (NEF) (2009) has created an international well-being accounting process using the European Social Survey to measure people's subjective well-being. The account is based on personal and social well-being as two headline measures. Personal well-being measures people's experiences of their positive and negative emotions, satisfaction, vitality, resilience self-esteem and sense of positive engagement in the world. Social well-being measures people's experiences of supportive relationships and sense of trust and engagement with others. The NEF developed a well-being manifesto based on these results. One of their manifesto findings claimed that "being actively engaged with communities has been shown … to give us a personal sense of well-being but also to have a positive knock-on effect for others" (Shah and Marks 2004, p. 3). Alternative approaches to this European set of indicators have been developed elsewhere. Indeed, in the United States, Forgeard, Jayawickreme, Kern and Seligman et al. (2011) suggested a new science of well-being containing five domains: positive emotion, engagement, relationship, meaning and accomplishment. Also in the United States, Ryan et al. (2008) identified four motivational well-being indicators based on Self-Determination Theory. They argued that by feeling competent, autonomous and belonging, people engaged with their community to the benefit of their community. On the back of such studies, I suggest that personal well-being requires autonomy, competence, engagement and self-esteem; social well-being involves social engagement, sound interpersonal relationships and social competence.

The other side of the connection between engagement and subjective well-being research considers well-being from an engagement perspective. In general, engagement research addresses well-being as a consequence of engagement (Bryson and Hardy 2012) and of how personal attributes like connection, autonomy and intrapersonal competence facilitate feelings of well-being and engagement (Wimpenny and Savin-Baden 2013). Bryson and Hardy's student learning pathways offer rich examples of how disengagement, particularly in the absence of social connection, can lead to alienation and ill health. Wimpenny and Savin Baden's literature synthesis identified four critical factors in engagement: inter-relational factors due to connection with others; personal shifts from self-consciousness to self-sufficiency in learning; intra-personal factors enabling resilience and persistence; and emotional factors leading either to connection with or disjunction from study. Indirectly both these studies support general insights

about both engagement and subjective well-being—self-esteem, resilience and positive emotions; autonomy, competence and engagement; and positive relationships with students, teachers and significant others. These findings from engagement studies are supported by Field (2009), an education researcher who examined the relationship between learning and well-being. He argued that successful learning requires learners to be and feel well physically, socially and emotionally. He observed that successful learning impacts positively on feelings of well-being. "(T)here is, then, a growing body of evidence on the relationship between learning and well-being, as well as on the impact of learning on factors that help promote well-being" Field (2009 p.11).

Active Citizenship Is Important for Student Engagement

Powerful in helping students engage is for them to believe they are active citizens with a say in learning processes. Students want to feel they have a voice in what and how they learn and 'student voice' has become a powerful metaphor for active citizenship and engagement, particularly in Europe. But according to Toshalis and Nakkula (2012) research in the United States too has shown that where educators give students choice and opportunities for collaboration, their engagement will rise. Klemenčič (2011) suggests that student voice, and collaboration enhances active citizenship and serves as an indicator of democracy and a culture of dialogue. She argues that student voice is "of particular relevance for students' civic learning, as one of the purposes or social roles of higher education" (p. 76). But there is not just one form of student voice or participation for engagement. According to Toshalis and Nakkula (2012), participation lies on a continuum ranging from minimal participation to taking a full part in a learning democracy. Their examples range from students expressing opinions; to being consulted in feedback; to participating in decision-making meetings; to being involved in framing issues and planning actions; to acting in partnership with others on standard operations; to identifying problems and generating solutions in and outside the institutional context; and at the other end of the continuum to taking on a leadership role in co-planning, and accepting significant responsibility in group processes and conducting activities.

There are many examples of student voice leading to active citizenship in engagement research. Trowler (2010) offers a classification for student voice for engagement. Students as active citizens are co-producers of learning in the classroom, active co-workers in various institutional structures and identity builders in the wider community. A good example of this model is in a book co-edited by Nygaard et al. (2013) which reports on a collaboration between 18 academic staff and 15 students in writing a book of 16 chapters. This offers examples of student voice in an applied, evidence based approach to engagement. A number of chapters offer insights into students as partners. These show how students' identity has changed from being receptacles for knowledge transfer to participants in active learning relationships. A second selection of chapters presents ways collaborative authorship can contribute to engagement in the structures of an institution. A third

group of chapters presents ways in which collaboration creates learning communities, the value of which has also been emphasized by American writers such as Tinto (2010) and Pike et al. (2011) who stress that learning community participation is positively and significantly related to student engagement. Collaborative research is also a feature of this approach to active citizenship. Taylor et al. (2012), for example, offer a case study of collaborative research in which the notion of student as consumer is critiqued and changed to student as producer.

Emergence: A Conceptual Organizer for Mainstream Student Engagement

These 10 propositions offer a coherent conceptual organizer for engagement synthesized from research. Solomonides et al. (2012) observed that engagement can be arranged in a number of such organizers (they refer to frameworks). While their frameworks differ from those discussed in Chap. 2 of this book and will not be discussed further, one of their frameworks seems suitable for summarizing the conceptual organizer developed in this chapter. They suggest that there is a multidimensional type of framework that can incorporate all the others. Given the complexity of engagement and its ability to assist the emergence of new ideas at the margins of a system, a multidimensional conceptual organizer seems appropriate and Table 3.1 presents one.

This organizer focuses on how students engage, how teachers and institutions promote student engagement and how enabling environments for students and teachers support it. The 10 propositions for practice synthesize engagement research from the multiple frameworks discussed in Chap. 2. The 'key concepts' column identifies concepts drawn from other research on student learning that illuminates particular propositions. They offer detail needed to make the general propositions generated by engagement research more meaningful.

The organizer is presented as a table. This gives clarity to the organizer but also hides some important considerations. The different contributions to the organizer are recognized by the discrete boxes within which each contribution is placed. The three organizing ideas focus on the roles of learners, teachers, institutions and ecological factors in engagement. Each organizing idea consists of three or four propositions drawn from the conceptual frameworks in Chap. 2. In the 'key concepts' column, I have connected each proposition to other educational research that further illuminates and supports the proposition. The placement of the different aspects of the organizer next to each other and the frame around the whole diagram suggests that the perspectives are both connected and distinct.

But the organizer also hides important information. It pictures student engagement as a bounded entity that is made up of separate parts that exist in an uncertain relationship with each other. While what differentiates the different aspects of the organizer is clear, how they are connected in a complex meta-construct is less so.

Table 3.1 Emergence: a conceptual organizer of propositions and key concepts of engagement

Organizing Idea	Proposition for practice	Key concepts
Students' investment in learning	1. Student self-belief is vital for success 2. Student motivation grows self-confidence 3. Social and cultural capital enhance engagement 4. Engaged learners are deep learners	Appreciative inquiry Self determination theory Social/cultural capital Deep learning
Teacher and institutional support	5. Quality teaching and institutional support enhance engagement 6. Disciplinary knowledge engages students 7. Quality teaching adapts to changing student expectations	Learner centred teaching Threshold concepts Social change
Enabling environments	8. Engagement occurs across the life-span 9. Engagement is supported by subjective well-being 10. Active citizenship is important for engagement	Lifewide education Subjective well-being Student voice

Neither is whether the boundaries between perspectives are permeable and, if they are, in what way. The organizer as presented in Table 3.1 does not show the dynamic processes and relationships that are distinguishing features of student engagement and are not seen in Table 3.1.

A synthesis of literature is a construction from what has been read and what the author thinks is important. Hence, it is limited as it cannot include all research on student engagement. While not overcoming this weakness, empirical evidence can help to validate such research. Appendix A offers some evidence that higher education student in New Zealand, in any case, do find the 10 propositions acceptable.

References

Báez, C. (2011). *Crafting programs to stimulate student engagement and persistence in higher education*. Paper presented at the 15th Biennial of the International Study Association on Teachers and Teaching (ISATT), University of Minho, Braga, Portugal.

Barnett, R. (2010). Life-wide education: A new and transformative concept for higher education? *Enabling a More Complete Education e-Proceedings On-line.* Retrieved from http://lifewidelearningconference.pbworks.com/w/page/24285296/E%20proceedings

Barr, R., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 26*(6), 13–25.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryson, C., & Hand, L. (2007). The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(4), 349–362.

Bryson, C., & Hardy, C. (2012). The nature of academic engagement: What the students tell us. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid & P. Petocz (Eds.), *Engaging with learning in higher education*. Faringdon, UK: Libri Publishing.

Bushe, G. (2013). The appreciative inquiry model. In E. Kessler (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of management theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Case, J. (2007). Alienation and engagement: Exploring students' experiences of studying engineering. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(1), 119–133. doi:10.1080/1356251060110235

Coates, H., Hillman, K., Jackson, D., Tan, L., Daws, A., Rainsford, D., & Murphy, M. (2008). *Attracting, engaging and retaining: New conversations about learning. Australasian student engagement (AUSSE) report* Retrieved from Camberwell, Australia: https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/bitstream/handle/11343/28878/264257_2008_coates_attracting_report.pdf?sequence=1

Cooperrider, D., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In R. Woodman & W. Pasmore (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development. Volume 1* (pp. 129–169). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Cull, S., Reed, D., & Kirk, K. (2010). *Student motivation and engagement in online courses*. Retrieved from http://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online/motivation.html

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2008). *Complexity and education: Inquiries into learning, teaching and research*. London, UK: Routledge.

Deuze, M. (2006). Participation, remediation, bricolage: Considering principal components of a digital culture. *The Information Society, 22*(2), 63–75.

Dewey, J. (1938/1997). *Experience and education*. New York NY: Macmillan.

Edison, M., Doyle, S., & Pascarella, E. (1998). *Dimensions of teaching effectiveness and their impact on student cognitive development*. Paper presented at the Association of the Study of Higher Education, Miami, FL.

Entwistle, N. (2003). *Concepts and conceptual frameworks underpinning the ETL project. Occasional Report 3*. Retrieved from Edinburgh, UK: http://www.etl.tla.ed.ac.uk/docs/ETLreport3.pdf

Entwistle, N. (2005). Contrasting perspectives on learning. In F. Marton, D. Hounsell & N. Entwistle (Eds.), *The experience of learning: Implications for teaching and studying in higher education* (3rd (Internet) ed., pp. 3–22). Edinburgh, UK: Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment, University of Edinburgh.

Entwistle, N. (2010). Taking stock: An overview of key research findings. In J. Hughes & J. Mighty (Eds.), *Taking stock: Research on teaching and learning in higher education*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Entwistle, N., McCune, V., & Hounsell, J. (2002). *Approaches to studying and perceptions of university teaching-learning environments: Concepts, measures and preliminary findings. Occasional Report 1*. Enhancing Teaching-Learning Environments (ETL) Project.

Fazey, D., & Fazey, J. (2001). The potential for autonomy in learning: Perceptions of competence, motivation and locus of control in first-year undergraduate students. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*(3), 345–361.

Feldman, K. (1997). Identifying exemplary teachers and teaching: Evidence from student ratings. In R. Perry & J. Smart (Eds.), *Effective teaching in higher education: Research and practice*. New York, NY: Agathon.

Field, J. (2009). *Well-being and happiness: Inquiry into the future for lifelong learning. Thematic Article 4*. Retrieved from Leicester, UK.

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

Gavala, J., & Flett, R. (2005). Influential factors moderating academic enjoyment/motivation and psychological well-being for Maori university students at Massey University. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 34*(1), 52–57.

Heylighen, F. (1999). *The evolution of complexity*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Higher Education Academy. (n.d.). *Deep learning*. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/enhancement/definitions/deep-learning

Hockings, C., Cooke, S., Yamashita, H., McGinty, S., & Bowl, M. (2008). Switched off? A study of disengagement among computing students at two universities. *Research Papers in Education, 23*(2), 191–201.

James, R., Krause, K.-L., & Jennings, C. (2010). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from 1994 to 2009*. Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, Australia.

Johnson, D., Soldner, M., Leonard, J., Brown, J., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K., & Longerbeam, S. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 525–542.

Kahu, E., Stephens, C., Leach, L., & Zepke, N. (2014). Linking academic emotions and student engagement: Mature-aged distance students' transition to university. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 39*(4), 481–497. doi:10.1080/0309877X.2014.895305

Klemenčič, M. (2011). The public role of higher education and student participation in higher education governance. In J. Brennan & T. Shah (Eds.), *Higher education and society in changing times: Looking back and looking forward* (pp. 74–83). London, UK: Centre for Higher Education Research and Information (CHERI).

Krause, K.-L., & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 493–505. doi:10.1080/02602930701698892

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J., Whitt, E., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Laird, T., Bridges, B., Morelon-Quainoo, C., Williams, J., & Salinas Homes, M. (2007). African American and Hispanic student engagement at minority serving and predominantly white institutions. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(1), 39–56.

Lawson, M., & Lawson, H. (2013). New conceptual frameworks for student engagement research, policy and practice. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(3), 432–479.

Llorens, S., Schaufell, W., Bakker, A., & Salanova, M. (2007). Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*(1), 825–841.

Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning: Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46*(1), 4–11.

McInnis, C. (2003). *New realities of the student experience: How should universities respond?* Paper presented at the European Association for Institutional Research, Limerick, Ireland.

Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2003). *Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within disciplines. Occasional Report 4*. Retrieved from http://www.etl.tla.ed.ac.uk/docs/ETLreport4.pdf

Mihailidis, P. (2014). The civic-social media disconnect: Exploring perceptions of social media for engagement in the daily life of college students. *Information, Communication & Society, 17*(9), 1059–1071. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2013.877054

Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Clarke, J. (2012). A transition pedagogy for student engagement and first-year learning, success and retention. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid, & P. Petocz (Eds.), *Engaging with learning in higher education* (pp. 117–144). Faringdon, UK: Libri Publishing.

New Economics Foundation. (2009). *National accounts of well-being: Bringing real wealth onto the balance sheet*. Retrieved from http://cdn.media70.com/national-accounts-of-well-being-report.pdf

Nygaard, N., Brand, S., Bartholomew, P., & Millard, L. (2013). *Student engagement: Identity, motivation and community*. Faringdon, UK: Libri Publishing.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Pike, G., Kuh, G., & McCormick, A. (2011). An investigation of the contingent relationships between learning community participation and student engagement. *Research in Higher Education, 52*(3), 300–322.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revivial of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Richardson, K., & Cilliers, P. (2001). Special editors' introduction: What is complexity science? A view from different directions. *Emergence, 3*(1), 5–23.

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78.

Ryan, R., Huta, V., & Deci, E. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9*(2), 139–170.

Seligman, M. (2011). *Flourish*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Shah, H., & Marks, N. (2004). *A well-being manifesto for a flourishing society*. Retrieved from London, UK: http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/entry/a-well-being-manifesto-for-a-flourishing-society

Solomonides, I., Reid, A., & Petocz, P. (2012). A relational model of student engagement. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid & P. Petocz (Eds.), *Engaging with learning in higher education* (pp. 11–24). Faringdon, UK: Libri Publishing.

Taylor, P., Wilding, D., Mockridge, A., & Lambert, C. (2012). Reinventing engagement. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid & P. Petocz (Eds.), *Engaging with learning in higher education* (pp. 259–278). Faringdon, UK: Libri Publishing.

Thomas, L. (2002). Student retention in higher education: The role of institutional habitus. *Journal of Education Policy, 17*(4), 423–442.

Tinto, V. (2010). From theory to action: Exploring the institutional conditions for student retention. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 51–89). New York, NY: Springer.

Toshalis, E., & Nakkula, M. (2012). Motivation, engagement and student voice. Retrieved from http://www.studentsatthecenter.org/topics/motivation-engagement-and-student-voice

Trowler, V. (2010). Student engagement literature review. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/studentengagement/StudentEngagementLiteratureReview.pdf

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, G. (2013). A cognitive approach to threshold concepts. *Higher Education, 65*(2), 247–263.

Wimpenny, K., & Savin-Baden, M. (2013). Alienation, agency and authenticity: A synthesis of the literature on student engagement. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(3), 311–326. doi:10.1080/13562517.2012.725223

Yorke, M., & Knight, P. (2004). Self-theories: Some implications for teaching and learning in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(1), 25–37.

Yorke, M., & Longden, B. (2008). *The first year experience of higher education in the UK: Final report*. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/fyefinalreport_1.pdf