Student Engagement in Adolescence:

A Scoping Review of Longitudinal Studies 2010-20

Katariina Salmela-Aro[1*], Xin Tang[1*], Jennifer Symonds[2*], Katja Upadyaya[1*]

[1] Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland

[2] School of Education, University College Dublin, Dublin, Republic of Ireland

Author Note

[*]All four authors made equal contribution to the manuscript, thus they should be considered joint first authors

(The paper is accepted by the *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. The final version of the paper may appear differently from this one)

The authors report no conflict of interests.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Katariina Salmela-Aro, Faculty of Educational Sciences, PL 9 (Siltavuorenpenger 5A), 00014, University of Helsinki, Finland; katariina.salmela-aro@helsinki.fi

Acknowledgements

Funding

Abstract

We systematically mapped and analyzed the longitudinal research on student engagement in adolescence published during 2010-20 to provide the review of how this topic has been covered conceptually, theoretically, and methodologically. A total of 104 studies, involving 104,304 adolescents, met inclusion criteria. Studies were mainly conducted in North America (43%) or Europe (34%). Over half studied engagement across one or more years. Most studies (93%) focused on antecedents of engagement, whereas fewer (also) focused on outcomes of engagement (38%). Data were commonly collected using self-report questionnaires (87%) and analyzed using path, growth, and cross-lagged models. Owing to measurement selection, studies commonly examined engagement in classroom activities followed by engagement with school or schoolwork; and focused on behavioral engagement (70%), followed by emotional (61%), then cognitive engagement (35%). No studies used a specific theory of engagement development, and instead commonly premised their analyses using self-determination, ecological systems, and stage-environment fit theories.

Keywords: student engagement; longitudinal studies; adolescents; scoping review

Student Engagement in Adolescence:

A Scoping Review of Longitudinal Studies 2010-20

Student engagement has been studied extensively during the past decade (2010-2020). There has been a six-fold increase in studies of engagement in the school context. Of the 13,528 records identified between the years 2000 and 2020[1], 11,696 were published between the years 2010 and 2020. Of these records, 8128 concerned student engagement in adolescence (see Figure 1). This presents the challenge of maintaining oversight of the scope and directions of the research on student engagement. Such an oversight is extremely valuable for helping researchers systematically advance research to provide a scientific advance whilst avoiding redundancies. Although there are several narrative reviews on engagement (Christenson et al., 2012; Sinatra et al., 2015; Upadyaya & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Wang & Degol, 2014; Wang et al., 2019), and systematic or scoping reviews on different forms of engagement (e.g., engagement in science education: Aker et al., 2019) and the relationship between engagement and other constructs (e.g., achievement: Lei et al., 2018), there is no review that examines how engagement has been studied longitudinally, i.e., across two or more timepoints. This topic is of special interest to developmental psychologists of student engagement, and to researchers interested in longitudinal methods and their potential for inferring causality and describing trends, and their enhanced robustness against age, cohort, and history effects. Because this is a scoping review of the field, we do not (meta)analyze the results of the studies. Instead, we used an iterative and systematic process to identify the key methodological components of the longitudinal studies and to extract and analyze data on these. This allows us to present a synthesis of the field of longitudinal studies

---

[1] We carried out an initial, exploratory search at the end of March 2020 using the Web of Science. The search was conducted using the terms school/student/academic engagement, and adolescence/adolescent, and was limited to the fields of education and psychology.

of adolescent student engagement published in the decade 2010 and 2020. This work serves as a starting place for informing future systematic reviews and meta-analyses of student engagement development.

Conceptualizing Student Engagement

Our focal construct in this scoping review is student engagement which has also been described as academic engagement (Furrer & Skinner, 2003), school engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004) and schoolwork engagement (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012). Researchers have been interested in how and why students focus at school, invest in their studies, behave, interact with peers and other people around them while learning, and learn in diverse educational activities and settings over time. Because engagement is a core mechanism of knowledge building in and out of educational contexts (Howard-Jones et al., 2018), it has been called the "holy grail of learning" (Sinatra et al., 2015). Engagement can be contrast to disengagement and disaffection, which are conceptualized as qualitatively different phenomena. Disengagement refers to the reduction of involvement in an activity, for example when students stop doing their schoolwork or drop out of school; and disaffection refers to a loss of motivation or enjoyment in an activity which can spiral into deeper disaffection and influence patterns of disengagement across time (Skinner, 2016). In this review we focus specifically on student engagement, to allow for a more detailed examination of this construct and its associated methodologies.

In the literature published during the past decade, student engagement has mostly been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct (Christenson et al., 2012; Schmidt et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019). The main dimensions of student engagement have included emotional engagement (feelings about school, learning, and/or a task; Fredricks et al., 2004), cognitive engagement (mental effort and strategies employed while learning; Wang et al., 2019), behavioral engagement (observable participation in activities; Wang et al., 2019),

social engagement (cooperation with others; Wang & Hofkens, 2019), and agentic

engagement (students' active contribution in shaping their academic activities; Reeve &

Tseng, 2011). In line with the work engagement literature, schoolwork engagement has also

been conceptualized as energy, dedication, and absorption in studies/school (Salmela-Aro &

Upadyaya, 2012). However, the most dominant perspective on student engagement during the

past decade has been the concept of multidimensional engagement, including aspects such as

emotions, cognitions and behaviors (Fredricks et al., 2004).

Emotional engagement encompasses the positive affective reactions and attitudes

attributed to school activities, such as flow experiences, enjoyment, liking, belonging, and

happiness (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Salmela-Aro et al., 2016; Symonds & Hargreaves, 2016).

Cognitive engagement refers to the degree to which students exert the mental effort needed to

understand complex ideas and master difficult skills, and the extent to which students show a

desire to go beyond the requirements, including willingness to do high-quality work

(Fredricks et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2019). Behavioral engagement describes students'

participation in classroom and school activities and includes attention, concentration, and on-

task behaviour, and broader patterns of participation such as attending extracurriculuar

activities and school (Li & Lerner, 2013; Skinner, 2016).

In addition to emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement, research on agentic

engagement (e.g., Reeve & Tseng, 2011) and social engagement (Wang & Hofkens, 2019) is

emerging. In agentic engagement, students are involved in shaping their experience of a task,

acting either independently or as co-agents (Salmela-Aro, 2009) with their peers and other

people involved in the learning process. For individual students, agency can influence the

internal dynamics of engagement, for example self-regulating the co-actions between

emotion, motivation and action (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2012). Social engagement refers to

students' engagement in social processes at school, including the effort and time they spend

interacting with peers. Social engagement is not a dimension of academic engagement but is rather an important sub-type of engagement in schooling (where students can be engaged both academically and socially; Tuovinen et al., 2020; Wang & Hofkens, 2019).

The engagement construct is also viewed as a multi-level phenomenon, which can be described using the concept of the 'grain size' of how engagement is conceptualized and studied (Sinatra et al., 2015). Student engagement can refer to how involved students are in academic tasks, lessons on specific subjects, being part of classroom processes, and participating in school. Each of these 'objects' of engagement are nested within the other, with tasks nested in lessons, lessons nested within classrooms, and classrooms nested within schools (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012). Clarifying the object of engagement in studies is an important task for researchers, with some researchers deliberately measuring engagement across grain sizes to holistically capture engagement in schooling (e.g., Wang et al., 2019) and others focusing on the smaller grain size of engagement in individual tasks for the purpose of investigating specific cognitive and social learning processes (e.g., Higashi & Schunn, 2020; Symonds et al., 2019).

Methods of Researching Student Engagement

Multiple internal dimensions and types of student engagement lend themselves to various approaches to capture data on how adolescents invest in, and involve themselves in, school activities. Self-report surveys aim to discover what adolescents think and feel about schooling, and ask adolescents to estimate the extent of their involvement in school activities (e.g., Olivier et al., 2019). Observations of adolescents engaging in academic work are made by teachers and researchers (e.g., Vollet et al., 2017), and sometimes by peers (e.g., Shin, 2020). Learning analytics have also been applied to examine student engagement, for example, by measuring trace data (i.e., task accuracy, interaction, and completion; Camacho et al., 2020). Also, physiological arousal representing increased attention to the object of

engagement has been studied by measuring electrodermal activity (e.g., Wu et al., 2021). The move towards multi-modal and multi-informant methods of researching engagement is currently increasing rigor in the field.

The past decade has witnessed a burgeoning of research applying an alternative approach to variable-oriented analyses, the 'person-oriented' approach, in studies of engagement. Compared to the variable-oriented approach, the person-oriented approach aims to identify diverse homogeneous groups from within the same sample of students (Bergman & Trost, 2006). In student engagement research, a person-oriented approach has been used to identify unique trajectories of engagement development (e.g., Archambault & Dupéré, 2017), internally divergent forms of engagement, e.g., high cognitive engagement but low emotional engagement (Schmidt et al., 2018; Symonds et al., 2019) and profiles of students who simultaneously show indicators of both positive and negative academic well-being, such as burnout and engagement (Tuominen-Soini & Salmela-Aro, 2014).

The Development of Student Engagement

In variable-oriented research, the general decreasing trend in engagement over the school years has been well documented (Wigfield et al., 2015). In person-oriented research on student engagement, researchers have unpacked these trends to identify heterogeneous engagement trajectories. Instead of a general decline in engagement, person-oriented studies have demonstrated that engagement remains relatively stable over time in the majority of students, but declines gradually or rapidly in smaller groups of students (Symonds et al., 2016; Wylie & Hodgen, 2012). Some studies have also found that a small proportion of students display increasing cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement (Zhen et al., 2020). These results on distinct engagement trajectories indicate the need for more research on the smaller groups of students who report low/decreasing engagement, with a focus on how to prevent further decreases and raise their level of engagement.

Although the longitudinal research on student engagement focuses on trajectories and causal predictors, there are no specific theories of how engagement develops across time. Rather, researchers apply general developmental theories and perspectives to explain observed changes in student engagement, for example self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020) which proposes that motivational outcomes (such as engagement) are impelled by the satisfaction of person's intrinsic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Given our focus on longitudinal research, it is of interest to consider which developmental theories underpin researchers' conceptualizations and rationales for studying engagement across time.

The Current Research

The aim of the current research was to conduct a scoping review of the longitudinal studies on student engagement in adolescence published in the last decade 2010-20. A scoping review is needed to bring coherence to the field and to identify targets for questions and methods that will systematically advance the science of student engagement. Using a systematic approach, the review focused on five key aspects of the evidence base: study demographics (including geographic location, sample size and gender composition, and study timescale), study focus (on antecedents or outcomes of engagement, or on engagement research methodology), study methods (of data collection and analysis), conceptualization of student engagement as a construct, and theoretical perspective on engagement development. These seven aspects were chosen to provide a broad yet comprehensive overview of how the studies were conceptualized and designed, situated against the backdrop of study demographics (e.g., sample size, gender balance, geographic location) to aid interpretation of identified trends and variations. The main question answered by the review is: how has adolescent student engagement been studied longitudinally in the past decade (2010 – 2020)?

Methods

To answer the research question as it pertained to study demographics, study focus, study methods, and conceptual and theoretical perspectives, we conducted a scoping review of the published literature on longitudinal empirical studies of student engagement in adolescence. A scoping review was determined as the most appropriate methodology based on the definition of scoping reviews outlined in Munn et al. (2018). Scoping reviews aim "to identify the types of available evidence in a given field, to clarify key concepts / definitions in the literature, [and] to examine how research is conducted on a certain topic or field" (Munn et al., 2018, p. 2), for the purpose of identifying evidence gaps. Scoping reviews differ from systematic literature reviews by not evaluating study quality, because they do not seek to answer a specific question about a studied phenomenon (e.g., the effectiveness of a treatment). Instead, scoping reviews focus on mapping the evidence base as we do here.

On October 3rd, 2020, we searched Scopus, Psych Info, and the education databases in ProQuest (ERIC, Australian Education Index, and ProQuest Education) for longitudinal studies of student engagement in adolescence. Our inclusion criteria were that studies had to research adolescent student engagement as an empirical (observable) phenomenon across two or more time points, and were published in English in peer reviewed academic journals during the past decade, 2010-2020. Table 1 displays the search string which used Boolean operators to combine sets of search terms to return a comprehensive set of records.

Record Screening

The record screening process took place using Microsoft Excel and is summarized in Figure 2. Each step was preserved on a separate Excel sheet in a single workbook. In the first step, the initial set of records from each database were combined and duplicates were removed.

In the second step, titles and abstracts were screened using the inclusion criteria to identify (1) empirical analyses of data collected on student engagement on two or more

occasions (longitudinal), (2) with samples aged between 10 and 18-years (early to late adolescence). One author screened all records, and two authors screened a unique 50% of the records each, so that each record was screened independently by two authors. Each record was evaluated against the inclusion criteria and scored as 'yes', 'unsure', or 'no' for having met the criteria. After this process, there was a percentage agreement of 78.4% for the inclusion criteria of longitudinal studies of student engagement, and of 86.9% for the inclusion criteria of adolescent samples. The four authors discussed each record where there was a disagreement and made a joint decision about whether to shortlist the record for full text screening.

In the third step, the agreed set of records scoring 'yes' or 'unsure' was transferred into a list for full text screening. PDFs of each full text were obtained from the search databases or research repositories. The full texts were randomly divided between three authors, who read the texts' methods sections to determine whether the inclusion criteria were met. Each full text was scored as a 'yes' or 'no' after reading. A fourth author was randomly assigned three texts from each of the other three authors' lists (nine duplicate texts in total) and screened these independently to check for consistency in the full text screening process. The records scoring 'yes' after full text screening were transferred to the list of included records.

Data Extraction

A coding frame (Table S1) was developed by the authors to aid extraction of data (information from the publications) on the topics of study demographics, study focus, study methods, and conceptual and theoretical perspectives. First, the authors designed a draft coding frame in line with these aspects, based on their knowledge of longitudinal studies of student engagement. Second, the authors independently coded four sample texts that were chosen to represent a diverse set of methods (a three-year study with annual student self-

report surveys; an 18-interval study of wearables conducted across several months; a seven wave one-year study of a single student; and a repeated-measures randomized controlled trial). This activity led to refinement and expansion of the draft coding frame to capture a large grained, comprehensive set of methodology indicators present across the four studies. Third, the initial included records (N = 105) were divided between the authors for data extraction. In Excel, columns were created next to each record, with a separate column used to extract data on each data type (e.g., sample N). Data were summarized by the authors as they were extracted. Finally, the three sets of data extracted by the different authors were combined into the same Microsoft Excel workbook. Of the initial 105 included records, a further four were discarded after data extraction because they did not meet inclusion criteria, resulting in 101 records with extracted data.

Data Synthesis

The main types of extracted data (study demographics, study focus, study methodology, conceptualization of engagement, and theoretical perspective on development) were synthesized in Microsoft Excel, using a standardized process. First, open ended data (e.g., names of theories) were reviewed to correct any inconsistencies in spelling and abbreviation across the authors. Second, all data types were sorted using the filter function into categories within data types (e.g., yes or no). Third, the number of records in each category were summed to create category totals that are displayed next to the data types in the Tables in the results section. Fourth, the results of the sorting and quantitative synthesis were summarized as a qualitative narrative in the results section.

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

A total of 101 articles (containing 104 separate studies conducted with separate or same samples) were identified as meeting the inclusion criteria of (1) empirical analyses of data collected on student engagement on two or more occasions (longitudinal), that were carried out

(2) with samples aged between 10 and 18-years (early to late adolescence). Of the total number of student engagement papers identified during the decade 2010-2020 (Figure 1) these papers comprised about one percent. Figure 3 also shows the incremental growth in the rate of longitudinal studies of student engagement being published across the decade reviewed. A table (Table S2) detailing the main characteristics of all studies can be found in the supplementary material. We present summary tables in the results section.

Study Demographics

Together, the samples of the 104 studies comprised a total of 104, 304 adolescents. Out of the 104 studies most (53%) included over 500 participants, and only eight had fewer than 100 participants (Table 2). The average amount of participants across studies was 1002 (Table 2). Eight studies did not report students' gender. Based on the available data the gender distribution was 50% male and 50% female. A few studies had demographic information partially missing, or the information lacked in clarity. However, all available information on the study demographics was extracted and analyzed in this review.

Some longitudinal studies were of participants who had first entered the study in childhood but still met inclusion criteria because they reported on a separate analysis of engagement when the participants were adolescents. Thus, at the beginning of the studies, the participants were between 6 and 17 years old, whereas at the end of the studies they were typically between 11 and 19 years old. Similarly, the beginning and end grades varied between 1-11 and 5-12.

Most studies examined data from one country, and two studies had data from both USA and China. The number of studies conducted in different continents and countries showed that the largest number of studies (43%) were conducted in North America, followed by Europe (32%), Asia (13%), Oceania (9%), and the Middle East (3%) (Table 3, Figure 3). After the US (41% of the studies), a relatively large number of studies were conducted in

Belgium (9%), China (8%), and Australia (8%). See Figure S1 for the cumulated trend of studies per countries during the past decade.

The time scale of most of the studies were mid-term (e.g., a duration of months to one year, 23% of the studies) or long-term (e.g., longer than one year, 54%) (Table 4). Seven studies measured engagement using interval data, and only five studies measured engagement at momentary timescales. The number of waves in the examined studies varied from 1 to 17.

Study Focus

The focus of the studies on antecedents or outcomes of engagement, or on methods of researching engagement (e.g., measure development papers) were mapped and analyzed across the 104 studies (see Table 5). Most studies (N = 97; 93%) focused on the antecedents of engagement, whereas 38% of the studies examined the outcomes of engagement (often at the same time as examining antecedents, e.g., in cross-lagged or path models). In comparison, very few studies (N = 2; 1.92%) focused on methods of researching engagement.

To further understand the focuses of the studies, we categorized the antecedents and outcomes into 14 categories (see Table 6; for detailed descriptions, see Table S1 in the online supplementary material). The categories were informed by the bioecological model of human development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). At the individual level, we included personal characteristics (e.g., age, gender), behavior (e.g., violence, delinquency), psychology (e.g., self-esteem, depression), physiology (e.g., physical activity, sleep quality), and achievement (e.g., GPA, academic performance) categories. At the level of proximal social influences, we included peers (e.g., popularity; peer supports), families (e.g., SES, parent support, parent-children relationship), and teachers (e.g., teacher support, teacher-student relationship). We then included indicators of proximal to distal social systems which were classrooms (e.g., class activities, class size), schools (e.g., school curriculum, school climate), communities (e.g., violence in community), and societies (e.g., state poverty). Finally, we included two

activity-oriented indicators of digital (e.g., video game), and intervention. When coding into this framework, we coded for (1) antecedents, (2) outcomes, and (3) covariates which were the authors' use of control variables in linear models.

The most frequently studied antecedents of engagement were psychological factors (N = 47; 45%), followed by peers (32%), teachers (30%), personal characteristics (25%), and family-related factors (21%). In comparison, very few studies focused on classroom (8%), community (5%), society (5%), digital (3%), and physiological (2%) antecedents.

For studies that examined engagement outcomes of engagement (see Table 6), psychological factors (N = 21; 20%) were also the most often studied. Achievement (10%), peers (10%), and teacher-related factors (9%) were next three popular outcomes. In contrast, the outcomes of family (2%), physiology (1%), classroom (1%), school (1%), community (1%), and digital (1%), were rarely examined. Society and interventions were not studied as outcomes.

Studies that included covariates as control variables most often focused on personal factors (49%) of mostly gender and age, family factors (29%) mainly family socioeconomic status, and individual student achievement (12%).

Study Methods

Across the 104 studies, survey was the dominant method used to measure student engagement (N = 96; 92.31%). Other methods, such as observations of engagement (N = 7; 6.73%), semi-structured interviews (N = 3; 2.88%), physiological measures (N = 1; 0.96%), and behavioral tracking (N = 1; 0.96%) were seldom used. Within survey studies, self-reporting (N = 90; 93.75%) was the most often used, whereas teacher report (N = 5; 5.21%), peer nomination (N = 3; 3.13%), and parent report (N = 2; 2.08%) were less often used. In, terms of study designs, ten studies (9.62%) were identified as intervention studies.

Throughout the studies (Table 7), Skinner's Engagement and Disaffection Scale (latest version and earlier version; Skinner et al., 1998, 2008) was the single most popular scale used (N = 23; 22.12%), followed by the Fredrick's School Engagement Scale (N = 7; 6.73%; Fredricks et al., 2005), the Schoolwork Engagement Inventory (N = 4; 3.85%; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012), the Student Engagement Instrument (N = 4; 3.85%; Appleton et al., 2006), and the Behavioral-Emotional-Cognitive School Engagement Scale (N = 4; 3.85%; BEC-SES; Li & Lerner, 2013). Close to one-third of studies (N = 30; 28.85%) used a self-designed scale (e.g., see Shin, 2020) or a scale that was used only once across the studies. More importantly, nearly one-third of studies (N = 27; 25.96%) used items from scales that were not designed specifically for capturing indicators of engagement (e.g., Goal Orientation and Learning Strategies Survey; see Qu & Pomerantz, 2015). See Table 7 for a full list of the scales that had been used across the studies.

Regarding the analytical models, three types of modeling were the major choices. Path models (e.g., hierarchical linear model, SEM mediation model) were the most frequent models used (N = 38; 36.54%). Growth models (e.g., growth curve model, latent change model) were the second most frequent models (N = 32; 30.77%). Cross-lagged models occupied another third of studies (N = 28; 26.92%). Innovative analytical methods such as random intercept cross-lagged modeling, and time series analysis, were used once across studies. Most of the studies were variable-oriented, and only 6.73% (N=7) were person-oriented studies. Across the studies, two (1.92%) were identified as qualitative studies in which interview and content analyses were conducted.

Conceptualization of Student Engagement

To extract data on how student engagement was conceptualized in the 104 studies, the authors used a predetermined framework with two components: the engagement object (i.e., the activity that the person is engaging in, e.g., an algebra equation, or engaging in math

classrooms), and the engagement dimension (e.g., cognitive, behavioral, or emotional). Our analytic framework was based on the concept of engagement grain sizes (e.g., Sinatra et al., 2015), the model of student engagement occurring within nested types of tasks (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012), and on the conceptualization of engagement as a multidimensional construct (Fredericks et al., 2004). The engagement dimensions used in the studies were identified based on the terms used by the authors, or if these terms were missing, we examined the content of items used in the measurements (which often involved researching and retrieving the original measurements) to determine if the measures regarded to emotional, cognitive, or behavioral aspects of engagement. Open-ended codes for 'other' ensured that data not fitting this framework were also analyzable. See Table 8 for the summary of the findings.

Classrooms were the most commonly studied object of adolescents' engagement (53.85 % of studies). For studies to receive this code, there needed to be explicit reference to 'class' or 'classrooms' in the measured items. The high prevalence of classroom engagement occurred because of the frequent use of (1) scales specifically designed to measure classroom engagement (e.g., Skinner et al.'s 2008 *Engagement Versus Disaffection with Learning Student-Report*), and (2) multilevel scales of school, classroom, and schoolwork engagement (e.g., Fredricks et al.'s (2005) *School Engagement Scale*). The next most prevalent objects of engagement were school (45.19%) (e.g*., When I do well in school it's because I work hard;* Appleton et al., 2006)*,* and schoolwork (42.31 %) (e.g., *My schoolwork inspires me*, Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012) again owing to the frequent use of multilevel engagement scales.

A smaller proportion of studies focused on engagement in specific school subjects (10.58 %). Of these 11 studies, math was the most common subject researched (n = 8). Science and French engagement were researched by two studies each, and English, German, and physical education engagement were researched by one study each. Finally, six studies (5.77%) researched task engagement. Four of these studies used the experience sampling

method (ESM) to capture students' experiences of momentarily doing academic tasks in classrooms, one study used interval assessments of students' task engagement before, during and after the task, and one study used systematic observation to assess students' on/off-task behavior during an academic task.

Behavioral engagement was the most prevalent engagement dimension coded (in 70.19% of studies). This was closely followed by emotional engagement (60.58%). Cognitive engagement was only captured by around a third of studies (34.62%). Eight studies researched other engagement dimensions. Three of these concerned engagement in general academic activities, two captured agentic engagement, two studied social aspects of engagement (nominations of peer engagement, and engagement in teacher-student relationships), and one researched motivational engagement.

Theoretical Perspective on Engagement Development

The introductions of the studies were read to establish which theories of psychological development were used to frame the longitudinal analyses. All developmental theories cited in the introduction sections were coded (see Table 9). To clarify our position on theory, we distinguish between psychological constructs (e.g., self-efficacy; Bandura, 2000) and theories of psychological development (e.g., social-cognitive theory; Bandura, 2012). In this review, we use one citation for each theory to simplify the reporting, although each theory was supported by a variety of citations across the included studies.

A total of 28 theories were cited by the studies. The full list of theories can be found in the supplemental table (Table S2). Fourteen theories were cited by one study each, whereas the other 14 theories were cited by multiple studies. The three most prevalent theories were self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020) (cited in 15.38% of studies), ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) (14.42%) and stage-environment fit theory (Eccles & Roeser, 2009) (13.46%). Next most prevalent were expectancy-value theory

(Eccles & Wigfield, 2020) (7.69%), self-system theory (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Skinner & Pitzer, 2012) (5.77%) and broaden and build theory (4.81%) (Fredrickson, 2001). Developmental contextualism (Lerner, 1995), the participation-identification model (Finn, 1989), and references to feedback loops (e.g., Fredrickson's 2013 upward spiral hypothesis) were cited in three studies each. Then, life course theory (Elder & Shanahan, 2006), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2012), positive youth development (Lerner et al., 2015) and motivational resilience (Skinner et al., 2020) were cited in two studies each. Around a third of studies did not cite any developmental theories (28.85%).

Discussion

The current scoping review mapped the longitudinal research on adolescent student engagement published between 2010 and 2020. Using systematic methods, the authors identified 104 studies that met inclusion criteria. These studies involved 104,304 adolescents, were balanced in gender, and examined all stages of adolescence. To perform the mapping, data were extracted on study demographics, study focus, study methods, the conceptualization of student engagement, and theoretical perspectives used to explain engagement development. By analyzing these data, we identified several trends that we overview and discuss below.

First, the longitudinal research on student engagement research is rapidly expanding internationally, with the most growth occurring in Europe in the past decade, following a predominance of research generated within the US. The greater number of studies in North America and Europe signals that the longitudinal evidence base on adolescent student engagement is Western-centric, with more research needed in non-Western contexts to both test and expand our knowledge. Of the 104 studies, those conducted in China, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Turkey, and Israel, warrant further examination to investigate the

suitability of the engagement measures and cross-cultural comparison of the pattern of results to Western studies.

Second, most of the research measured engagement across two or more waves spread across months or years, with very limited research studying engagement across momentary timescales. Among the longitudinal studies, more than half were long-term (e.g., longer than one year), whereas about one fourth of the studies were mid-term (e.g., measuring engagement across months up to one year). A momentary approach (measuring engagement across seconds and minutes; D'Mello et al., 2017) was used only in five studies. Data captured by momentary approaches has often been analyzed in cross-sectional designs, and more studies are needed to examine the short-term longitudinal development (e.g., across lessons or school week) of engagement as well as interaction between momentary engagement and other momentary variables.

Third, most studies focused on antecedents of engagement, whereas fewer studies examined outcomes of engagement. The outcomes and antecedents primarily regarded the interaction of engagement with individual psychological functioning or the socializing impact of peers, teachers, and families. Very few studies examined the interaction of more complex and distal social structures (e.g., classrooms, schools, communities, societies) with engagement. Accordingly, the decade evidence base is limited to explaining student engagement in relation to microlevel individual processes and face to face interactions, with less consideration of the macrolevel processes which shape and are shaped by student engagement, including cultures and social structures (Pettigrew, 2018).

Fourth, there was a predominance of student self-report surveys and very few observational, physiological, trace (engagement product) or multi-informant studies. Among the 104 studies, most (~87%) used student self-report surveys. Other methods such as observations, interviews, or behavior tracking were seldom used. Although students' views

on schooling are suitably captured through self-report, their engagement behaviors (including attention, on/off-task behavior, activity participation, and school attendance) could be more rigorously examined using observation and trace methods that do not allow for students' subjective biases about their own behavior to influence the results.

Fifth, the analysis methods were limited to three main methods (path/HLM, cross-lagged panel, growth) and were typically variable-oriented. Each analysis method was used in about one third of the papers. Innovative analytical methods, such as random intercept cross-lagged models and time series analysis were both used only once. Nearly all studies used variables centered methods and very few were person-oriented. Therefore, we know more about how engagement develops on average than we do about individual diversity in engagement development. This is problematic, on account of several recent person-oriented analyses of student engagement showing diverse trajectories and profiles of engagement occurring within different samples and timescales (e.g., Archembault & Dupéré, 2017; Schmidt et al., 2018; Symonds et al., 2020).

Sixth, engagement was measured primarily using the Engagement and Disaffection Scale (Skinner et al., 1998, 2008) and the School Engagement Scale (Fredricks et al., 2005). Nearly one-third of studies attempted to examine engagement by using scales that were not named as engagement or were not originally meant for engagement. The review found that most studies used one of two scales to measure engagement: Skinner's (1998, 2008) Engagement and Disaffection Scale and Fredricks and colleagues' (2005) School Engagement Scale. The first scale measures behavioral and emotional engagement in classroom activities, whilst the second measures cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement across the levels of schoolwork, classrooms, and school. Researchers' choices of what scales to use are ideally guided by their research questions. Therefore, the commonplace of these scales suggests that researchers are not focusing their studies on

individual engagement dimensions (e.g., how does cognitive engagement develop across time, within the different levels of task, schoolwork, classroom, and school) and are not systematically exploring and explaining student engagement as it develops across time in relation to individual tasks, schoolwork, subjects, and schooling.

Interestingly, around a third of studies used a self-designed scale (e.g., see Shin 2020) or scales that were not designed to measure engagement. These results indicate that the longitudinal research on student engagement suffers from a "jingle-jangle" problem in that the terms and concepts are used in a confusing way; the same terms referring to different constructs or different terms referring to same constructs (Reschly & Christenson, 2012; Schmidt et al., 2018).

Seventh, most research was generated on classroom engagement and behavioral engagement, owing to the wide use of Skinner's (1998, 2008) Engagement versus Disaffection scale which does not capture cognitive engagement. Cognitive engagement was only researched by a third of the studies. It is also possible that behavioral engagement was studied more often because it is a construct that is easier to define (e.g., participation, involvement) and capture (using previously established or researcher designed scales) than cognitive engagement which often reflects factors which can be more challenging to define, such as mental effort and willingness to invest in schoolwork. Moreover, it is possible that cognitive engagement is a factor which partially predicts behavioral engagement, as to be involved in schoolwork and participating in the classroom (behavioral engagement) students also need to put in some mental effort or need to be willing to get more involved. In the future, it would be important to develop new measures which would consider different types of engagement simultaneously, capturing also dimensions which have had less attention (e.g., cognitive engagement) in the past.

Eighth, the most common developmental theories underpinning the longitudinal research were self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020), ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and stage-environment fit theory (Eccles & Roeser, 2009). Self-determination theory provides a useful framework for engagement research because it explains engagement in relation to students' individual needs and conditions of the environment (Mitchell et al., 2015). Similarly, ecological systems theory considers proximal development (microsystem) and relationship between students, peers, and teachers, who are also important sources of emotional support in the school context (Bakadorova & Raufelder, 2017). Stage-environment fit theory is often used to examine students adjusting to new environments during school transitions and gives deeper insights on changes that occur in students' engagement, sense of belonging, and relationships with peers, teachers, and academic environment (see also Ulmanen et al., 2016).

Other developmental theories used were expectancy-value theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2020), self-system theory (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Skinner & Pitzer, 2012) and broaden and build theory (Fredrickson, 2001). Expectancy-value theory highlights the role of competence beliefs, which are often affected by teachers' feedback and peer comparisons, as a source of student engagement (Lemos et al., 2020; McKellar et al., 2020). Similarly, self-system theory emphasizes the role of motivation in engagement which occurs in the social learning context (see also Engels et al., 2020). Broaden and build theory, in turn, describes the accumulation of positive academic experiences (e.g., teacher-student interaction) and students' skills, personal resources, and engagement (see also Martin & Collie, 2019). These theories describe multiple factors deriving to student engagement, and consider the role of social interaction, academic context, and changes in environment. The decision to use these developmental theories as a conceptual framework of student engagement reflects the longitudinal nature of the studies included in this scoping review.

Finally, nearly a third of studies had no specific developmental theory underpinning them. This presents a gap for theoretical development concerning student engagement. In addition, even though the developmental theories were often used to premise engagement studies; they were rarely tested. These results indicate that the engagement literature is not currently contributing a vast amount to theoretical development. Although a recent theoretical synthesis has resulted in a model of engagement development in sociocultural context (Wang et al., 2019), theory refinement and generation needs to continue and should consider the different levels of engagement (e.g., engagement in tasks, subjects, classrooms etc.) to refine more our models of individual levels or to attempt to bridge the levels in a holistic conceptualization of student engagement development.

Limitations

The current review was a scoping review of longitudinal studies on student engagement during the last decade 2010-20. Thus, many studies using a cross-sectional design were not included in the review and including these studies in the review might have given a different picture on how engagement has been studied across the past decade. For example, several studies focusing on momentary engagement using cross-sectional designs have been published during the past ten years and were not included in this review due to their cross-sectional design. However, the present review addressed the need to review the longitudinal research on adolescent student engagement which presents a first appraisal of the evidence base that can be further developed.

<center>**Conclusions**</center>

Through conducting a scoping review of the longitudinal research on adolescent student engagement, we found many consistencies in the literature regarding how the topic is conceptualized and studied across time. In summary, the main message from these results is that more diversity is needed to extend the evidence base to generate new and potentially

important findings that are currently outside of the scope of the traditional study methods. The following recommendations are given to address this point. First, student engagement constructs should be tested in indigenous and non-Western samples to avoid an overly Western bias in how engagement is conceptualized and measured. Second, studies should use multiple informants and multiple methods in both longer-term and momentary designs, to increase methodological rigor and the reliability of results. Third, more person-oriented and individual variance analyses are needed to expand knowledge on engagement development. Fourth, the development of new measures and use of less commonly known measures can expand the field to consider different levels (e.g., task, schoolwork) and dimensions (e.g., cognitive) of engagement. Fifth, further theory development is needed to consider different levels and dimensions of engagement and how these develop and interact across time. Also, existing developmental theories should be tested rather than simply used as a worldview in study introductions. A key finding of this review is that there is a need to construct a specific theory of how engagement develops. Sixth, further systematic work is needed to map and strengthen the field of longitudinal research on adolescent student engagement. For example, this scoping review has provided part of the foundational work necessary for informing future meta-analyses of student engagement development. Finally, we encourage researchers to think carefully about how to systematically advance knowledge on adolescent student engagement using longitudinal designs, which may require moving away from what is commonly tried and tested. We hope that this scoping review will give them a starting place for identifying what needs to be done.

References

Aker, L. B., & Ellis, A. K. (2019). A Meta-Analysis of Middle School Students' Science

Engagement. *International Dialogues on Education: Past and Present, 6*(1), 9-24.

https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1245320

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive

and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument.

Journal of School Psychology, 44(5), 427-445. doi:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.002

Archambault, I. & Dupéré, V. (2017). Joint trajectories of behavioral, affective, and cognitive

engagement in elementary school. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(2), 188-

198. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1060931

Archambault, I., & Vandenbossche-Makombo, J. (2014). Validation de l'échelle des

dimensions de l'engagement scolaire (ÉDES) chez les élèves du primaire [Validation of

the scale of the dimensions of school engagement among primary school students].

*Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du

comportement, 46*(2), 275–288. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031951

Bakadorova, O., & Raufelder, D. (2017). The interplay of students' school engagement,

school self-concept and motivational relations during adolescence. *Frontiers in

Psychology, 8*(DEC). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02171

Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy: The foundation of agency. In W. J. Perrig & A. Grob

(Eds.), *Control of human behavior, mental processes, and consciousness: Essays in

honor of the 60th birthday of August Flammer* (pp. 17-33). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates.

Bandura, A. (2012). Social cognitive theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E.
 T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol.1, pp. 349-373).
 London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Bergman, L., & Trost, K. (2006). The person-oriented versus the variable-oriented approach:
 Are they complementary, opposites, or exploring different worlds? *Merrill-Palmer*
 Quarterly, 52(3), 601-632. Retrieved December 2, 2020, from
 http://www.jstor.org/stable/23096208

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human
 development. *Handbook of Child Psychology: Theoretical models of human*
 development (6th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 793– 828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Camacho, V., Elena, D. L. G., Olivares, T., Flores Gallego, J., & Orozco Barbosa, L. (2020).
 Data capture and learning analytics focused on engagement with a new wearable IoT
 approach. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*.
 https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2020.2999787

Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of research on*
 student engagement. Heidelberg, DE: Springer Science & Business Media.

Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A
 motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. R. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.),
 Self processes and development (pp. 43-77). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
 Associates.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). The domain of creativity. In M. A. Runco & R. S. Albert
 (Eds.), *Theories of creativity* (p. 190–212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

D'Mello, S. Dieterle, E., & Duckworth, A. (2017). Advanced, analytic, automated (AAA)
 measurement of engagement during learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *52*(2), 104-123.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1281747

Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2009). Schools, academic motivation, and stage-environment fit. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology: Individual bases of adolescent development* (3rd ed., pp. 404-434). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479193.adlpsy001013

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61*, Advance online publication. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859

Elder, G. H., Jr., & Shanahan, M. J. (2006). The life course and human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 665-715). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Engels, M. C., Phalet, K., Gremmen, M. C., Dijkstra, J. K., & Verschueren, K. (2020). Adolescents' engagement trajectories in multicultural classrooms: The role of the classroom context. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 69*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101156

Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(2), 117–142. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543059002117

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., Friedel, J., & Paris, A. (2005). School engagement. In K.A. Moore & L.H. Lippman (Eds.), *What do children need to flourish?* (pp. 305-321). Boston, MA: Springer.

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. doi: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3516061

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Positive emotions broaden and build. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 1-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-407236-7.00001-2

Furrer, C., & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 148–162. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.148

Higashi, R., & Schunn, C. D. (2020). Perceived relevance of digital badges predicts longitudinal change in program engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(5), 1020–1041. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000401

Howard-Jones, P., Ioannou, K., Bailey, R., Prior, J., Yau, S. H., & Jay, T. (2018). Applying the science of learning in the classroom. *Profession*, *18*, 19.

Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Zhou, W. (2018). Relationships between student engagement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 46(3), 517-528. http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7054

Lemos, M. S., Gonçalves, T., & Cadima, J. (2020). Examining differential trajectories of engagement over the transition to secondary school: The role of perceived control. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 44*(4), 313-324. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025419881743

Lerner, R. M. (1995). Developing individuals within changing contexts: Implications of developmental contextualism for human development research, policy, and programs. In T. A. Kindermann & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Development of person–context relations* (pp. 13-37). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Bowers, E. P., & Geldhof, G. J. (2015). Positive youth

    development and relational-developmental-systems. In W. F. Overton, P. C. M.

    Molenaar & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental*

    science (7th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 607-651). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Li, Y., Lerner, R.M. (2013). Interrelations of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive school

    engagement in high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*, 20–32.

    https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9857-5

Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2019). Teacher-student relationships and students' engagement

    in high school: Does the number of negative and positive relationships with teachers

    matter? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(5), 861-876.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000317

McKellar, S. E., Cortina, K. S., & Ryan, A. M. (2020). Teaching practices and student

    engagement in early adolescence: A longitudinal study using the Classroom Assessment

    Scoring System. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 89*.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102936

Mitchell, F., Gray, S., & Inchley, J. (2015). 'This choice thing really works … ' Changes in

    experiences and engagement of adolescent girls in physical education classes, during a

    school-based physical activity programme. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy,*

    20(6), 593-611. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2013.837433

Munn, Z., Peters, M.D., Stern, C. Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A. & Aromatis, E. (2018).

    Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a

    systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *18*(1),

    143. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x

Olivier, E., Archambault, I., De Clercq, M., & Galand, B. (2019). Student self-efficacy,

    classroom engagement, and academic achievement: Comparing three theoretical

frameworks. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*(2), 326-340.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0952-0

Overton, W. F. (2015). Processes, relations, and relational developmental systems. In R. M.

Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (7th ed., Vol. 1,

pp. 9-62). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Pettigrew, T. F. (2018). The emergence of contextual social psychology. Personality and

Social Psychology Bulletin, 44(7), 963-971. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218756033

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Allen, J. P. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and

engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom

interactions. In S.L. Christenson, A.L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of*

research on student engagement (pp. 365-386). Boston, MA: Springer.

Qu, Y., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2015). Divergent school trajectories in early adolescence in the

United States and China: An examination of underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Youth*

and Adolescence, 44(11), 2095-2109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-014-0201-0

Reeve, J. & Tseng, C-M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during

learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*(4), 257-267. doi:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002.

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness:

Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S.L. Christenson, A.L.

Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.). *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 3-19).

Heidelberg, DE: Springer, Boston, MA.

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(11). Advance online publication.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Salmela-Aro, K. (2009). Personal goals and well-being during critical life transitions: The four C's — Channelling, choice, co-agency and compensation. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *14*(1-2), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2009.03.003

Salmela-Aro, K., Moeller, J., Schneider, B., Spicer, J. & Lavonen, J. (2016). Integrating the light and dark sides of student engagement using person-oriented and situation-specific approaches. *Learning and Instruction, 43*, 61-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.01.001

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2012). The schoolwork engagement inventory: Energy, dedication, and absorption (EDA). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 28*(1), 60-67. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000091

Schmidt, J.A., Rosenberg, J.M., & Beymer, P.N. (2018). A person-in-context approach to student engagement in science: Examining learning activities and choice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *55*(1), 19-43. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21409

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (Eds.). (2012). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. London, UK: Routledge.

Seligman, M. (2018). PERMA and the building blocks of well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 13*(4), 333-335. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1437466

Shin, H. (2020). Who are popular, liked, and admired? Longitudinal associations between three social status and academic-social behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 49*(9), 1783-1792. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01222-0

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.1002924

Skinner, E. A. (2016). Engagement and disaffection as central to processes of motivational resilience development. In K. Wentzel & D. Miele (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school*, (2nd ed., pp. 145-168). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Skinner, E. A., Graham, J. P., Brule, H., Rickert, N., & Kindermann, T. A. (2020). I get knocked down but I get up again": Integrative frameworks for studying the development of motivational resilience in school. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *44*(4), 290–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025420924122

Skinner, E. A., Marchand, G., Furrer, C., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(4), 765-781. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012840

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping and everyday resilience. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school engagement* (pp. 21-44). New York, NY: Springer.

Skinner, E. A., Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Connell, J. P., Eccles, J. S., & Wellborn, J. G. (1998). Individual differences and the development of perceived control. *Monographs of the society for Research in Child Development*, i-231.

Symonds J, Hargreaves L. (2016). Emotional and motivational engagement at school transition: A qualitative stage-environment fit study. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *36*(1), 54-85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431614556348

Symonds, J., Schoon, I., Eccles, J., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2019).The development of motivation and amotivation to study and work across age-graded transitions in adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *48*(6), 1131-1145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01003-4

Symonds, J., Schoon, I., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2016). Developmental trajectories of emotional disengagement from schoolwork and their longitudinal associations in England. *British Educational Research Journal, 42*(6), 993–1022. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3243

Symonds, J. E., Schreiber, J. B., & Torsney, B. M. (2020). Silver linings and storm clouds: Four profiles of student momentary engagement emerge in response to the same task. *Journal of Educational Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000605

Tuominen-Soini, H., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2014). Schoolwork engagement and burnout among Finnish high school students and young adults: Profiles, progressions and educational outcomes. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(3)*,* 649–662. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033898

Tuovinen, S., Tang, X. & Salmela-Aro, K. (2020). Introversion and Social Engagement: Scale Validation, Their Interaction, and Positive Association with Self-Esteem. *Frontiers in Psychology.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.590748

Ulmanen, S., Soini, T., Pietarinen, J., & Pyhältö, K. (2016). Students' experiences of the development of emotional engagement. *International Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 86-96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2016.06.003

Upadyaya, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). Development of school engagement in association with academic success and well-being in varying social contexts: A review of empirical research. *European Psychologist, 18*(2), 136–147. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000143

Vollet, J. W., Kindermann, T. A., & Skinner, E. A. (2017). In peer matters, teachers matter: Peer group influences on students' engagement depend on teacher involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*(5), 635-652. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000172

Wang, M.-T. & Degol, J. (2014), Staying engaged: Knowledge and research needs in student

engagement. *Child Development Perspectives*, *8*, 137-143.

https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12073

Wang, M-T., Degol, J.L., & Henry, D.A. (2019). An integrative development-in-

sociocultural-context model for children's engagement in learning. *American*

Psychologist, *74*(9), 1086-1102. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000522

Wang, M.-T., Fredricks, J., Ye, F., Hofkens, T., & Linn, J. S. (2019). Conceptualization and

assessment of adolescents' engagement and disengagement in school: A

Multidimensional School Engagement Scale. *European Journal of Psychological*

Assessment, 35(4), 592–606. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000431

Wang, M. T., & Hofkens, T. L. (2019). Beyond classroom academics: A school-wide and

multi-contextual perspective on student engagement in school. *Adolescent Research*

Review, *5*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-019-00115-z

Wellborn, J. G. (1991). *Engaged and disaffected action: The conceptualization and*

measurement of motivation in the academic domain. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,

University of Rochester.

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J.S., Fredricks, J.A., Simpkins, S., Roeser, R.W. and Schiefele, U.

(2015). Development of achievement motivation and engagement. In R.M. Lerner (Ed.),

Handbook of child psychology and developmental science, (Vol 3, pp. 657-700).

https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy316

Wu, S.-F., Lu, Y.-L., & Lien, C.-J. (2021). Detecting students' flow states and their construct

through electroencephalogram: Reflective flow experiences, balance of challenge and

skill, and sense of control. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *58(8)*, 1515-

1540. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633120944084

Wylie, C., & Hodgen, E. (2012). Trajectories and patterns of student engagement: Evidence from a longitudinal study. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 585-599). Boston, MA: Springer.

Zhen, R., Ru-De, L., Ming-Te, W., Ding, Y., Jiang, R., Fu, X., & Sun, Y. (2020). Trajectory patterns of academic engagement among elementary school students: The implicit theory of intelligence and academic self-efficacy matters. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(3), 618-634. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12320

Tables

Table 1

Search Terms and Strings

	Search terms	Boolean
Student engagement	("school engagement" OR "engagement in school*" OR "student engagement" OR "pupil engagement" OR "learner engagement" OR "emotional engagement" OR "cognitive engagement" OR "behavioral engagement" OR "behavioural engagement" OR "agentic engagement" OR "academic engagement")	AND
Longitudinal study	(longitudinal OR developmental OR cohort OR life-span OR "life course" OR transition OR long-term OR "longer term" OR trajector* OR growth OR maturation)	AND
Adolescent sample	(child* OR adolescen* OR student* OR youth OR "young person" OR "young people" OR pupil*)	NOT
	(pre-school OR kindergarten OR playschool OR "nursery school" OR daycare OR "further education" OR college OR university OR "third level" OR polytechnic OR "young adult" OR "higher education")	

Table 2

Number of Participants and Demographics Across Studies

Participants N	Study N	%		Mean	SD	Min value	Max value	Total	%
5-100	8	8	Study N	1002.92	1758.20	5	12302	104304	100.00
101-500	40	39	N of males	452.62	874.10	0	6217	43904	42.09
501-1000	26	25	N of females	459.24	830.68	5	6274	44087	42.27
>1001	29	28	Min age	12.29	2.03	6	17		
total N	103	100	Max age	15.39	2.16	11	19		
			Mean age	13.20	1.53	9.4	15.98		
			Start grade	6.83	1.90	1	11		
			End grade	9.11	2.00	5	12		
			N of waves	3.10	2.21	1	17		

Table 3

Description of the Countries and Continents

Continent / Country	N	%
North America		
Canada	2	1.92
USA	43	41.35
total		43.27
Europe		
Belgium	9	8.65
Finland	6	5.77
German	2	1.92
Greece	1	0.96
Iceland	2	1.92
Ireland	1	0.96
Italy	1	0.96
Lithuania	1	0.96
Netherlands	2	1.90
Portugal	3	2.88
Romania	1	0.96
Spain	1	0.96
Switzerland	1	0.96
UK	3	2.88
Turkey	1	0.96
total		33.65
Middle East		
Israel	2	1.92
total		1.92
Asia		
China	7	6.73
Japan	1	0.96
Philippines	2	1.92
South Korea	3	2.88
total		12.50
Oceania		
Australia	8	7.69
Fiji	1	0.96
total		8.65
Total N=24 countries	104	100.00

Table 4

Study Timescales

Type of study	N	Percentage
Interval	7	6.7%
2 intervals	2	1.9%
3 intervals	1	1.0%
4 intervals	1	1.0%
7 intervals	2	1.9%
10 intervals	1	1.0%
Continuous	1	1.0%
Momentary	5	4.8%
Short term	8	7.7%
Mid term	29	27.9%
Long term	68	65.4%

Note. continuous = constant measurement across time; momentary = measured across seconds or minutes; short term = measured across days or weeks; mid-term = measured across months to one year; long term = measured across more than one year.

Table 5

Study Focus Summary

Study Focus	N	%
Antecedents (including moderators) of Engagement	97	93.27
Outcomes of Engagement	40	38.46
Method paper of Engagement	2	1.92

Note. Numbers calculated from 104 studies.

Table 6

Study Focus Themes

	Antecedents (including Moderators)		Outcomes		Covariates	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Personal	26	25.00	1	0.96	51	49.04
Behavioral	17	16.35	5	4.81	3	2.88
Psychological	47	45.19	21	20.19	6	5.77
Physiological	2	1.92	1	0.96	2	1.92
Achievement	19	18.27	10	9.62	13	12.50
Peers	33	31.73	10	9.62	1	0.96
Family	22	21.15	2	1.92	30	28.85
Teacher	31	29.81	9	8.65	3	2.88
Classroom	8	7.69	1	0.96	3	2.88
School	11	10.58	1	0.96	2	1.92
Community	5	4.81	1	0.96	0	0.00
Society	5	4.81	0	0.00	2	1.92
Digital	3	2.88	1	0.96	0	0.00
Intervention	10	9.62	0	0.00	0	0.00

Note. Numbers calculated from 104 studies.

Table 7

Measurement Scales

	N	%
Self-designed items/scale	30	28.85
Related items from other measures	27	25.96
Engagement and Disaffection Scale (Skinner et al., 2008) and earlier versions (Skinner et al, 1998)	23	22.12
Wellborn's (1991) Behavioral Engagement and Disaffection scales	3	2.88
School Engagement Scale (Fredricks et al., 2005)	7	6.73
Schoolwork Engagement Inventory (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012)	4	3.85
Student Engagement Instrument (Appleton et al., 2006)	4	3.85
Behavioral-Emotional-Cognitive School Engagement Scale (BEC-SES; Li & Lerner, 2013)	4	3.85
Classroom Assessment Scoring System (Pianta et al., 2012)	3	2.88
Dimensions of School Engagement Scale (Archambault & Vandenbossche-Makombo, 2014)	2	1.92
Agentic Engagement Scale (Reeve & Tseng, 2011)	2	1.92

Note. Numbers calculated from 104 studies.

Table 8

Approach to Studying the Engagement Construct

Engagement construct	N	%
Engagement object		
School	47	45.19
Classroom	56	53.85
Schoolwork	44	42.31
Subject	11	10.58
Task	6	5.77
Engagement dimension		
Behavioral	73	70.19
Emotional	63	60.58
Cognitive	36	34.62
Other	8	7.69

Note. Numbers calculated from 104 studies.

Table 9

Developmental Theories

Developmental theory	N	%
No developmental theory	30	28.85
Self-determination theory	16	15.38
Ecological systems theory	15	14.42
Stage-environment fit	14	13.46
Individual theories	14	13.46
Expectancy value theory	8	7.69
Self-system theory	6	5.77
Broaden and build theory	5	4.81
Developmental contextualism	3	2.88
Participation-identification model	3	2.88
Feedback loops	2	1.92
Life course theory	2	1.92
Social cognitive theory	3	2.88
PERMA	1	1.92
Positive youth development	2	1.92
Motivational resilience	3	2.88

Note. Numbers calculated from 104 studies.

Figures

Figure 1. Numbers of Publications Per Year on Academic Engagement/School Engagement/Student Engagement AND Adolescence/Adolescent(s).

```
┌─────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐
│ Records identified  │   │ Records identified  │   │ Records identified  │
│      in Scopus      │   │    in Psych Info    │   │   in education      │
│                     │   │                     │   │     databases       │
│     (n = 776)       │   │     (n = 333)       │   │     (n = 620)       │
└─────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘

              ┌─────────────────────────────────┐
              │ Records after duplicates        │
              │ removed                         │
              │                                 │
              │ (n = 963)                       │
              └─────────────────────────────────┘

              ┌─────────────────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐
              │ Titles and abstracts            │   │ Records excluded    │
              │ screened                        │──▶│                     │
              │                                 │   │ (n = 799)           │
              │ (n = 963)                       │   │                     │
              └─────────────────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘

              ┌─────────────────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐
              │ Full text articles screened     │   │ Full text articles  │
              │                                 │──▶│ excluded            │
              │ (n = 164)                       │   │ (n = 63)            │
              └─────────────────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘

              ┌─────────────────────────────────┐
              │ Articles included in            │
              │ qualitative synthesis           │
              │                                 │
              │ (n = 101)                       │
              └─────────────────────────────────┘
```

Figure 2. Prisma Diagram of Search Process.

Figure 3. Timeline of Study Publication Date by Geographic Area.

Student Engagement in Adolescence:

A Scoping Review of Longitudinal Studies 2010-20

Online Supplementary Materials

Table of Contents

Table S1. *Data Extraction Coding Frame*

| Data Type (Excel Column Headings)	Data Codes to Use within Column Cells
Study Characteristics	
Sample N	Write in total number
Males N	Write in number of males
Females N	Write in number of females
Age at the start of data collection	
Age at the end of data collection	
Mean Age	
School grade at the start of data collection	
School grade at the end of data collection	
Country	List study country
Study Focus	
Antecedents	Yes or No
Outcomes	Yes or No
Method paper	Yes or No
Antecedents	
Personal (e.g., age, gender)	Yes or No
Behavioral (e.g., violence, delinquency)	Yes or No
Psychological (e.g., self-esteem, depression)	Yes or No
Physiological (e.g., physical activity, sleep quality)	Yes or No
Achievement (e.g., GPA, academic performance)	Yes or No
Peers (e.g., popularity; peer supports)	Yes or No
Family (e.g., SES, parent support, parent-children relationship)	Yes or No
Teacher (e.g., teacher support, teacher-student relationship)	Yes or No
Classroom (e.g., class activities, class size)	Yes or No
School (e.g., school curriculum, school climate)	Yes or No
Community (e.g., violence in community)	Yes or No
Society (e.g., state poverty)	Yes or No
Digital (e.g., video game)	Yes or No
Intervention	Yes or No
Outcomes	
see list under Antecedents	
Covariates	
see list under Antecedents	
Study Timescale	
Number of Waves	Write in number
Numbers of Intervals (For momentary intensive study)	-(numbers) -Random -Structured
Continuous (e.g., physiological)	Yes or No
Timescale- Momentary: a task/lesson	Yes or No
Timescale- Short-term: days-weeks	Yes or No
Timescale- Mid-term: months-one year	Yes or No
Timescale- Long-term: more than a year	Yes or No
Timescale- else	

Data Collection Methods

Questionnaire data	Yes or No
Interview data	Yes or No
Observation data	Yes or No
Trace data (includes task completion data)	Yes or No
Physiological data	Yes or No
Other data	List any other data type not covered by the above categories
Intervention	Yes or No
Name of engagement measure	-(name) -other

Data Analysis Methods

Statistical model	Type in name(s)
Person-oriented study	Yes or No

Engagement Construct

Task engagement (e.g., engagement in a specific academic task such as solving a math problem or writing an essay)	Yes or No
Schoolwork engagement -engagement in academic tasks/assignments/ -dedication, absorption, energy	Yes or No
Subject engagement (engagement in an academic subject, e.g., I like attending math lesson)	Yes or No
Name of the subject	Type in name(s)
Classroom engagement (e.g., engagement at the level of the classroom as a social system, e.g., classroom belongingness, I pay attention in the classroom)	Yes or No
School engagement (engagement at the level of the school as a social system, e.g., I like school)	Yes or No
Cognitive engagement (e.g., information processing, learning strategies, cognitive effort, learner beliefs)	Yes or No
Emotional engagement (e.g., emotional response (e.g., joy, liking), emotional attitude (e.g., school is exciting, school is boring), motivational attitude (e.g., school is important, school is meaningless)	Yes or No
Behavioral engagement (e.g., time on task, attention, concentration, attendance, truancy, drop-out)	Yes or No
Extra-curricular activity engagement	Yes or No
Other engagement	List other type of engagement construct studied

Theoretical perspective

Theory name	List precise names of theories that are used to explain engagement development (e.g., cascade model, stage-environment fit)

Table S2. *Summary of the Studies Included in the Scoping Review*

Authors[a]	Country	N	Gender[b]	Age/ School Grade[c]	Number of waves/ intervals[d]	Theoretical Approach[e]	Object & Dimension of Engagement	Methodological Approach	Data Collection Method & Measure[e]	Analysis Method
Bakadorova et al. (2020)	Germany	1 088	502 (M) 586 (F)	13.7- 14.9 (A) 8-9 (G)	2 (W)	Expectancy Value Theory (EVT; Wang & Eccles, 2012) Bioecological Theory (BT; Bronfenbrenner, 1979) Developmental Contextualism (DC; Lerner, 1998) Stage-Environment Fit (SEF; Eccles et al., 1993) Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Connell & Wellborn, 1991)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Engagement and Disaffection Scale (EDS; Skinner, Marchand et al., 2008)	LCSM (Latent Change Score Model)
Bakadorova & Raufelder (2017	Germany	1 088	490 (M) 598 (F)	8-9 (G)	2 (W)	BT (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) DC (Lerner, 1998) Self-System Model of Motivational Development (SSMMD; Connell, 1990)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 2009)	CLPM (Cross-Lagged Panel Model)
Benner et al. (2017)	USA	252	126 (M) 126 (F)	14-16 (A) 8-9 (G)	2 (W)	Life-Course Theory (LCT; Elder, 1998)	Classroom	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Perceived Social Norms for	Path Analysis

									Schoolwork and Achievement during Adolescence (PSNSA; Witkow 2006)	
Blondal & Adalbjarnardott ir (2012)	Iceland	832	384 (M) 448 (F)	14-15 (A) 9-10 (G)	2 (W)	Frustration-Self-Esteem Model (Finn, 1989) Participation-Identification Model (Finn, 1989)	School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	Path Analysis
Borofsky et al. (2012)	USA	118	59 (M) 59 (F)	12.7-15.3 (A)	2 (W)		School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	CLPM
Brody et al. (2012)	USA	538	252 (M) 286 (F)	11.0-18.5 (A)	6 (W)		School	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Scale developed for the Family and Community Health Study (Brody et al., 2006)	CLPM SEM (Structural Equation Modeling)
Burns et al. (2018)	Australia	1 481	696 (M) 785 (F)	8-11 (G)	2 (W)	Social Cognitive Theory (SCT; Bandura, 1986) Life-Span Development Theory (Baltes, 1987)	School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	SEM
Burns et al. (2019)	Australia	368	66 (M) 302 (F)	7-11 (G)	3 (W)		Schoolwork	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Motivation and Engagement Scale–	LGA

									High School (MES-HS; Martin, 2009)	(Latent Growth Analysis)
Caldarella et al. (2020)	USA	311	255 (M) 86 (F)		3 (W)	Operant Conditioning (Skinner, 1938)	School	Variable-oriented	Observation Self-designated items/scale	Path Analysis
Camacho et al. (2020)	Spain	18	12 (M) 6 (F)	7-8 (G)			Subject Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Trace	Descriptive; Visualization
Chang et al. (2016)	USA	107	46 (M) 50 (F)	5-5 (G)	2 (W) Intervention		Subject Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	Two-way ANCOVA
Chase et al. (2014)	USA	710	504 (M) 206 (F)	10-12 (G)	3 (W)	Positive Youth Development (PYD; Lerner et al., 2005)	Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral-Emotional-Cognitive School Engagement Scale (BEC-SES; Li 2010)	SEM
Chen et al. (2020)	USA	245	120 (M) 125 (F)	14.4 (A; start) 8-9 (G)	2 (W)	Bioecological Model of Human Development (BMHD; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006)	School	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire PSNSA (Witkow 2006)	Path Analysis
Cheung (2019)	USA	383	176 (M) 207 (F)	12.3-13.8 (A)	3 (W)	Social Development Model (SDM; Pomerantz et al., 2012)	Schoolwork Cognitive	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Goal Orientation and Learning Strategies Survey	CLPM

									(GOLS-S; Dowson & McInerney, 2004)	
Cipriano et al. (2019)	USA	318	189 (M) 129 (F)	5-7 (G)	3 (W) Intervention	BMHD (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006)	Emotional Classroom	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Furrer & Skinner, 2003)	Multigroup Path Analysis
Cook et al. (2018)	USA	203	101 (M) 102 (F)	6 (G; start)	2 (W) Intervention		Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Observation Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools (BOSS; Shapiro, 2004)	Pre/Post-test Analysis
Damian et al. (2017)	Romania	486	224 (M) 262 (F)	12.00 (A; start) 6 (G; start)	3 (W)		Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire School Engagement Measure– MacArthur (SEM– MacArthur; Fredricks et al., 2005)	CLPM
Datu & King (2018)	Phillipines	389	172 (M) 217 (F)	13-15 (A) 7-10 (G)	2 (W)	Broaden and Build Theory (BBT; Fredrickson, 2001) Upward Spiral Hypothesis (Fredrickson, 2013)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 2009)	CLPM
Datu et al. (2017) - study 2 only	Philippines	400	178 (M) 222 (F)		3 (W)	BBT (Fredrickson, 2001)	Classroom Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 2009)	CLPM

Study	Country	N	Gender	Age/Grade	Waves	Theory	Dimensions	Orientation	Measure	Analysis
De Laet et al. (2016)	Belgium	1 111	567 (M) 544 (F)	7 (G; start)	3 (W)	BMHD (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006)	School Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Parent Report of School Liking and Avoidance Questionnaire (P-SLAQ; Ladd et al. 2000)	CLPM
De Laet et al. (2015)	Belgium	586	270 (M) 316 (F)	9.3 (A; start) 4-6 (G)	3 (W)	BMHD (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006)	Schoolwork Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Dutch School Questionnaire (SchoolVragenLijst; Smits & Vorst, 1990)	LGCM (Latent Growth Curve Model)
Dockx et al. (2020)	Belgium	5 417		10 (G; start)	5 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993) SDT (Reeve, 2012).	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 2009)	Marginal Structural Mean Model
Dunbar et al. (2017)	USA	310	112 (M) 188 (F)	9 (G; start)	3 (W) 7 (I)	Biopsychosocial Approach (Engel, 1977)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Other EDS (Furrer & Skinner, 2003)	LGCM
Elmore & Huebner (2020)	USA	565	224 (M) 341 (F)	3 (G; start)	2 (W)	Attachment Theory (Ainsworth et al., 1978)	Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire The Assessment of Behavioral Disaffection Scale (ABDS; Roeser et al., 1998)	Path Analysis
Elsaesser et al. (2020)	USA	273	273 (M) 0 (F)	5 (G; start)	3 (W)	SDM (Bond et al., 2007)	School Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Other	SEM

									Self-designated items/scale (parent rated)	
Engels et al. (2017)	Belgium	1 116	569 (M)	13-18 (A)	3 (W)		Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire	LGCM
			547 (F)	7-11 (G)					Student Report on Engagement Versus Disaffection with Learning (SR-EVDS; Skinner, Kinderman et al., 2008)	
Engels et al. (2016)	Belgium	1 116	569 (M)	7-11 (G)	3 (W)		Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire	CLPM
			547 (F)						SR-EVDS (Skinner, Kinderman et al., 2008)	
Engels et al. (2019)	Belgium	794	382 (M)	13.8 (A; start)	3 (W)	SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985)	Schoolwork Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire	LGCM
			412 (F)	7-11 (G)		SCT (Bandura, 1977)			SR-EVDS (Skinner, Kinderman et al., 2008)	
Engels et al. (2019)	Finland	356	201 (M)	12-15 (A)	3 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Classroom School	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire	CLPM
			155 (F)	6-9 (G)			Cognitive Behavioral		Research Assessment Packages for Schools (IRRE, Lerkkanen et al., 2017; Lindeman, 1998)	
									Student Engagement Instrument (SEI;	

Appleton et al., 2006)

Engels et al. (2020)	Belgium	730	313 (M) 417 (F)	15.6-18.6 (A) 7-11 (G)	3 (W)	Dynamic (S)SMMD – DSMMD (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire SR-EVDS (Skinner, Kinderman et al., 2008)	Multilevel Latent Growth Curve Model
Erentaite et al. (2018)	Lithuania	915	444 (M) 471 (F)	14 (A; start) 9-10 (G)	3 (W)	Social-Cognitive Perspective on Identity Formation (Berzonsky, 1989)	Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Engagement vs. Disaffection in School (EvDS; Ryzin et al. 2007)	CLPM
Geng et al. (2020)	China	628	352 (M) 276 (F)	7-9 (G)	3 (W)	Transactional Model of Person-Environment Interaction (Sameroff & Mackenzie, 2003) SDT (Deci, 2009)	Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire School Engagement Scale (SES-B; Fredricks et al., 2005) SEI (Appleton et al. 2006) Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli et al. 2006)	CLPM
Glaman & Chen (2018)	USA	523	288 (M) 235 (F)	7-9 (G)	3 (W)		Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 1998)	Longitudinal Factorial Invariance Analysis

Gutman & Schoon (2018)	England	12 302	6028 (M) 6274 (F)	14-16 (A) 9-11 (G)	3 (W)	Socio-Ecological Framework of Human Agency (Schoon & Lyons-Amos, 2017)	School Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	GCA (Growth Curve Analysis)
Hafen et al. (2012)	USA	578	323 (M) 255 (F)	9-12 (G)	2 (W) Intervention		Classroom Schoolwork	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Observation Classroom Assessment Scoring System-Secondary (CLASS-S; Pianta & Hamre, 2009) Student-reported engagement: Patterns of Adapted Learning Scale (Midgley et al. 2000)	CLPM
Harris et al. (2020)	Turkey	378	175 (M) 203 (F)	6-8 (G)	3 (W)		Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire BEC-SES (Li and Lerner, 2013)	CLPM
Hietajärvi et al. (2020)	Finland	1 705	955 (M) 710 (F)	14-16 (A) 7-9 (G)	3 (W)	Demands-Resources Model (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2014)	Schoolwork	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Schoolwork Engagement Inventory (EDA; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012)	Latent Longitudinal Panel Model

Study	Country	N	Sample	Age/Grade	Waves	Theory	Engagement	Orientation	Measure	Analysis
Higashi & Schunn (2020)	USA	2 410	1542 (M) 868 (F)		2 (I; structured)	EVT (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) Positive Feedback Loops (no key reference)	Cognitive Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Three Likert-type scale items selected from the Activation Lab Engagement Scale (Science Learning Activation Lab, 2016)	Path Analysis with Moderator
Hughes & Cao (2018)	USA	550	297 (M) 253 (F)	6-15 (A) 1 (G; start)	10 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Classroom School Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Other EDS (Skinner et al., 1998)	PLGCM (Piecewise Latent Growth Curve Model) SEM
Hughes et al. (2015)	USA	204	108 (M) 96 (F)	4-8 (G)	2 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993) LCT (Elder, 1998)	School Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Scale adapted from EDS (Skinner et al., 1998)	PLGCM
Hwang et al. (2020)	South Korea	218	113 (M) 105 (F)	10-12 (A) 5-6 (G)	2 (W)		Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire SES-B (Fredricks et al., 2005)	CLPM
Kariippanon et al. (2019)	Australia	60	33 (M) 27 (F)	13-13 (A)	10 (I; structured)		Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Observation Classroom Observation System, (COS-5 Pianta; Sammons et al., (2006)	MLR (Multiple Linear Regression)

Kwak et al. (2018)	USA	790	323 (M) 467 (F)	12-19 (A)	3 (W)		Schoolwork School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire School Engagement subscale of the Drug Free Schools Outcome Study Questions (Dowd et al., 2004)	MLR
Lamote et al. (2013)	Belgium	4 604		7 (G; start)	4 (W)		School Emotional Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire Scales adopted from the School Questionnaire of Secondary Education (Schoolvragenlijst Voortgezet Onderwijs; Smits & Vorst, 1982)	Mixture Analysis
Lemos et al. (2020)	Portugal	391	195 (M) 196 (F)	13 (A; start) 9-10 (G)	3 (W)	EVT (Eccles, 2004)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 1998)	LGCM
Lewis et al. (2011)	USA	779	366 (M) 413 (F)	7-8 (G)	2 (W)	BBT (Fredrickson, 2001)	Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral Engagement Subscale – SES-B (Fredricks et al., 2005) Future Aspirations and Goals subscale – SEI (Appleton et al., 2006) School Satisfaction Subscale - Multidimensional	CLPM

									Students' Life Satisfaction Scale (MSLSS; Huebner, 1994)	
Li & Lerner (2011)	USA	1 977	1135 (M) 842 (F)	11 (A; start) 5-8 (G)	4 (W)		School Emotional Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire Profiles of Student Life: Attitudes and Behaviors (PSL-AB; Leffert et al., 1998)	Semiparametric Mixture Model
Li & Lerner (2013)	USA	1 029	329 (M) 700 (F)	9-11 (G)	3 (W)	PYD (Lerner et al., 2005)	Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire	Latent Autoregressive and CLPM
Li et al. (2011)	USA	1 676	699 (M) 977 (F)	12 (A; start) 6-8 (G)	3 (W)	DC (Lerner, 2006)	Schoolwork School Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire PSL-AB (Leffert et al., 1998)	Multilevel Linear Growth Curve Model
Lyons et al. (2013)	USA	809	380 (M) 429 (F)	12.7-13.2 (A) 7 (G; start)	2 (W)		Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral Engagement Subscale – SES-B (Fredricks et al. 2005) Future Goals and Aspirations Subscale – SEI (Appleton et al. 2006)	Repeated Measures ANOVA

									MSLSS (Huebner 1994)	
Madjar & Chohat (2017)	Israel	128	59 (M) 69 (F)	11 (A; start) 6-7 (G)	3 (W)	Social Cognitive Theory (SCT; Bandura, 1986)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 2009)	Path Analysis
Markowitz (2018)	USA	11 512	6217 (M) 5295 (F)		12 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993) SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1994)	Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Items from National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLYS; National Longitudinal Surveys, 2017)	Comparative Interrupted Time Series Analysis
Marques (2016)	Portugal	367	178 (M) 189 (F)	12-17 (A)	2 (W)		Schoolwork School Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Engagement Subscale – Gallup Student Poll (GSPE; Gallup, 2009)	MLR
Martin & Collie (2019)	Australia	2 079	977 (M) 1107 (F)	7-10 (G)	2 (W)	BBT (Fredrickson, 2001)	Schoolwork School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	Path Analysis with Moderator
Maynard et al. (2014)	USA	916			2 (W)	BT (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994)	School Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Interview Self-designated items/scale	DeFries-Fulker Analysis

Study	Country	N	Gender	Age/Grade	Waves	Theory	Dimensions	Orientation	Measure	Analysis
McKellar et al. (2020)	USA	860	417 (M) 443 (F)	5-6 (G)	2 (W)	EVT (Eccles et al., 1993) SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000)	Subject Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Observation EDS (Skinner et al., 2009) Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta et al., 2008)	HLM (Hierarchical Linear Modeling)
Mitchell et al (2015)	England	5	0 (M) 5 (F)		Intervention	SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985)	Subject	Variable-oriented	Interview	Thematic and Content Analysis
Moreira & Lee (2020)	Portugal	2 646	664 (M) 735 (F)	7-11 (G)	2 (W)	SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2008)	Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire SEI (Appleton et al., 2006)	HLM
Motti-Stefanidi et al. (2015)	Greece	1 057	560 (M) 497 (F)	13-15 (A)	3 (W)		Classroom School Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire	CLPM
Oga-Baldwin & Nakata (2015)	Japan	344	194 (M) 150 (F)	10-11 (A) 5-5 (G)	2 (W)	SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2002)	Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner, Marchand et al., 2008)	CLPM
Olivier et al. (2019)	Canada	671	323 (M) 348 (F)	4-7 (G)	3 (W)	Self-Efficacy Theory (SET; Bandura, 1997) SSMMD (Connell & Wellborn, 1991)	Schoolwork Subject Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Dimensions of School Engagement Scale (DSES; Archambault et al., 2014)	CLPM

						EVT (Eccles et al., 1983)				
Olivier et al (2018)	Canada	582	287 (M) 295 (F)	5 (G; start)	3 (W)		Schoolwork Subject Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire DSES (Archambault et al., 2014)	Latent Profile Analysis
Owen et al. (2018)	Australia	2 194	651 (M) 655 (F)	12.9 (A; start) 8-9 (G)	2 (W)		Schoolwork Subject Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Physiological SES-B (Fredricks et al., 2005)	LCSM
Park et al. (2012)	USA	94	46 (M) 48 (F)	9-9 (G)	1 (W) 7 (I)	SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2002)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Other EDS (Furrer & Skinner, 2003)	HLM
Patall et al. (2019)	USA	208	96 (M) 112 (F)	13-18 (A)	17 (I; structured)	SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000)	Subject Classroom Cognitive Emotional Behavioral Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner et al., 2009) Metacognitive Strategies Questionnaire (MSQ; Wolters, 2004) Agentic Engagement Scale (AES; Reeve & Tseng, 2011)	HLM (multilevel modeling)

Phan (2016) – study 1 only	Fiji	319	180 (M) 139 (F)	11-12 (G)	2 (W)	SET (Bandura, 1997)	Schoolwork Subject	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Schaufeli's et al. Engagement Scale adapted in Math (Schaufeli, Martinez, et al., 2002)	Path analysis
Poorthuis et al. (2015)	Netherlands	438	206 (M) 232 (F)	11-14 (A)	3 (W)	EVT (Eccles, 2004) Approach Tendencies (Watson et al., 1999)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner, Marchand et al., 2008)	Path analysis
Qu & Pomerantz (2015) – study 1	China	451	240 (M) 211 (F)	7-8 (G)	4 (W)	SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985)	Schoolwork Cognitive	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire GOLS-S (Dowson & McInerney, 2004)	LGCM
Qu & Pomerantz (2015) – study 2	USA	374	187 (M) 187 (F)	7-8 (G)	4 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Schoolwork Cognitive	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire GOLS-S (Dowson & McInerney, 2004)	LGCM
Quin et al. (2018)	Australia	665	291 (M) 374 (F)	10-11 (G)	2 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993) BMHD (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006)	Schoolwork School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire International Youth Development Study (IYDS; Bond et al., 2000) Adolescent self-report of risk and protective factors (Glaser et al., 2005)	HLM (multilevel modeling)
Reeve (2013)	South Korea	315	169 (M) 146 (F)		3 (W)		Classroom Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire AES (Reeve & Tseng, 2011)	HLM

Study	Country	N	Gender	Age/Grade	Waves	Theory	Dimensions	Orientation	Measure	Analysis
Rogers et al. (2017)	USA	280	128 (M) 152 (F)	6 (G; start)	2 (W)		Schoolwork Cognitive Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Experience Sampling Form (ESF; Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987)	Two Wave Latent Change Score Model Path analysis
Rogers-Sirin et al. (2016)	USA	270	109 (M) 161 (F)	15.7-18.7 (A) 10-12 (G)	3 (W)	Social Capital Theory (Bourdieu, 1986)	Schoolwork Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral Engagement Scale (Suarez-Orozco et al., 2009)	GCA
Rushton et al. (2020)	Australia	388		10.5-12 (A)	2 (W)		Schoolwork Classroom Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Child report on the Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth (LSAY) Attitudes Towards School Survey Positive Affect (PA) subscale (Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth, 2018)	Path analysis
Ruzek & Schenke (2019)	USA	910		6-12 (G)	3 (W)	SCT (Bandura, 1986)	Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral Engagement and Disaffection Scales (BEDS; Wellborn, 1991)	Random-Intercept Cross-Lagged Panel Model

Salmela-Aro et al. (2017) – study 1	Finland	1 636	528 (M) 1047 (F)	17-18 (A)	2 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Schoolwork	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDA (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012)	CLPM
Salmela-Aro et al. (2017) – study 2	Finland	1 702	720 (M) 906 (F)	12-14 (A) 6-7 (G)	2 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Schoolwork	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDA (Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2012)	CLPM
Schwartz et al. (2016)	USA	415	193 (M) 222 (F)	14.6 (A; start) 9-10(G)	2 (W)	Developmental Cascades Model (Masten et al., 2006)	Schoolwork Classroom School Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Items from SES (Fredricks et al, 2004)	Path analysis
Shin (2020)	South Korea	736	346 (M) 390 (F)	5-6 (G)	2 (W)		Schoolwork Classroom Cognitive Behavioral Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Peer nominations (no reference)	CLPM
Shoshani et al. (2016)	Israel	2 517	1251 (M) 1266 (F)	13.5 (A; start) 7 (G; start)	2 (W) Intervention	PERMA (Seligman, 2011)	Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire School engagemen survey (National Center for School Engagement [NCSE], 2006)	HLM (multilevel modeling)
Smith et al. (2020)	USA	354	159 (M) 195 (F)	10 (A; start)	3 (W)	Risk and Resilience (integrated from different authors)	Schoolwork Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale	LGCM with Mediators

Stefansson et al. (2018)	Iceland	561	303 (M) 258 (F)	14-16 (A) 9-10 (G)	4 (W)	DSMMD (Skinner & Pitzer, 2012)	Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire BEC-SES (Li & Lerner, 2013)	CLPM
Steinhoff & Buchmann (2017)	Switzerland	1 273		6-16 (A)	6 (W)	EVT (Eccles, 1983) SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985) Feedback Loops (Self-System Model; Skinner, Marchand et al., 2008) Effectance Motivation (Harter, 1978)	Subject School Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Scale based on students' self-assessed school-related effort exertion (Moser, 1997) and perseverance during task completion (Forschungsbereich et al., 2000)	MLCSM (Multivariate Latent Change Score Model) and Path Analysis
Symonds & Hargreaves (2016)	UK	20	11 (M) 9 (F)	6 (G; start)	4 (I)	SEF (Eccles & Midgley, 1989)	Emotional Other	Variable-oriented	Interview	Thematic and Content Analysis
Terrenghi et al. (2019)	Italy	101	27 (M) 74 (F)	11-12 (G)	2 (W) Intervention		Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Observation SES (Fredricks et al., 2011)	Paired sample t-tests
Thomas & Dyment (2019)	Australia	46	8 (M) 11 (F)	12 (A; start)	3 (W) Intervention	Ecological Systems Theory (EST; Bronfenbrenner, 1992)	School Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Other	T-Test

Torsney & Symonds (2019)	Ireland	277	139 (M) 138 (F)	12-16 (A)	2 (W) Intervention	Momentary Engagement Model (Symonds et al. 2019)	Schoolwork Classroom School Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Record of experience (RoE) survey (Shernoff et al., 2016) Pupil Record Schedule (PRS; Hargreaves & Galton, 2002) Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (Pekrun et al., 2011) Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990)	ANCOVA
Ulmanen et al. (2016)	Finland	170	94 (M) 76 (F)	12.00- 17(A) 5 (G; start)	3 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Classroom School Emotional Other	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Self-designated items/scale - Emotional and Cognitive Engagement and School-Related Wellbeing (ECW; Pietarinen et al., 2014)	Path Analysis
Van den Berghe et al. (2016)	Belgium	100		12 (A; start)	1 (W) 3 (I)	SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985)	Schoolwork Classroom	Variable-oriented	Observation Other Self-designated items/scale adapted from EDS (Furrer &	Correlations and Path Analysis

Skinner; Skinner et al., 2009)

Study	Country	N	Gender	Age/Grade	Waves	Theory	Engagement	Orientation	Measure	Analysis
Van Ryzin & Roseth (2020)	USA	1 890	1002 (M) 892 (F)	7-8 (G)	4 (W) Intervention		Classroom Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Items from the Behavioral Engagement subscale of the Engagement versus Disaffection with Learning Scale (Skinner & Belmont, 1993)	LGA
Vollet & Kindermann (2020)	USA	366	190 (M) 276 (F)	11-13 (A) 6-8 (G)	2 (W)	Motivational resilience (MR; Skinner et al., 2013)	Schoolwork Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Other Motivational resilience/re-engagement (Skinner et al., 2013) 14-item Likert-type scale (teachers' perceptions; Wellborn, 1991).	SEM
Vollet et al. (2017)	USA	366	188 (M) 175 (F)	11-14 (A) 6-6 (G)	2 (W)	SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985) SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Schoolwork Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire 14-item Likert-type scale (teachers' perceptions; Wellborn, 1991).	Path Analysis
Wang et al. (2015)	Finland	362	174 (M) 188 (F)	9- 11(G)	3 (W)	School Identification Model (Finn, 1989)	School Emotional	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire	Conditional Latent Growth Curve Model

									School value scale (Eccles et al., 1993a)	
Wang & Eccles (2012a)	USA	1 479	710 (M) 769 (F)	12.9-17.2 (A) 7-11 (G)	3 (W)	BT (Bronfenrenner, 2005)	School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Student self-report items available in the data set (Wang et al., 2011) School compliance (Elliott, et al., 1989) Participation in extracurricular activities (Eccles & Barber, 1999) School identification (Michigan Study of Adolescent Life Transitions – MSALT; Eccles et al., 1993b) Subjective valuing of learning (MSALT; Eccles et al., 1993b)	Multilevel Growth Model
Wang & Eccles (2012b)	USA	1 148	551 (M) 597 (F)	7-11 (G)	3 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	Schoolwork Classroom School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire MADICS and SAMC (Wang et al., 2011)	LGCM and HLM (multilevel modeling)

Wang & Eccles (2013)	USA	1 157	556 (M) 601 (F)	7-8 (G)	2 (W)	SDT (Connell & Wellborn, 1991) SEF and EVT (Eccles et al., 1993)	Schoolwork Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Scales adapted from existing well-established scales (Finn & Voelkl, 1993; Pintrich, 2000; Skinner & Wellborn, 1994)	Path Analysis
Wang & Fredricks (2014)	USA	1 272	623 (M) 649 (F)	7-11 (G)	3 (W)	EST(Bronfenbrenner, 1992) Self-System Model (Skinner et al., 2009)	Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire School Participation scale School Identification scale Self-Regulated Learning scale (adapted from Finn & Voelkl, 1993; Pintrich, 2004; Skinner & Wellborn, 1994)	MLCSM
Yu et al. (2016)	China	236	101 (M) 135 (F)	7-8 (G)	2 (W)	SEF (Eccles et al., 1993)	School Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire School Engagement Scale (Zhang et al., 2011)	Path Analysis
Zee & Koomen (2019)	Netherlands	472	236 (M) 236 (F)	10.8 (A; start) 4 (G; start)	2 (W)	Person-Environment Fit in Sschool (Eccles & Roeser, 1999)	Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire EDS (Skinner, Marchand et al., 2008)	Path Analysis

Zhang et al. (2018) – study 1	USA	934	212 (M) 208 (F)	7 (G; start)	3 (W)		School	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Peer nominations (Graham et al., 1998)	CLPM SEM
Zhang et al. (2018) – study 2	China	514	276 (M) 238 (F)	7 (G; start)			School	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Peer nominations (Graham et al., 1998)	CLPM SEM
Zhen, Ru-De et al. (2020)	China	523	253 (M) 273 (F)	3-6 (G)	3 (W)	EVT (Eccles, 2004) MR (Skinner et al. 2008)	Schoolwork School Subject Cognitive Emotional Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire Math and Science Engagement scale (Wang et al., 2016)	Growth Mixture Model
Zhen, Wu et al. (2020)	China	342	161 (M) 181 (F)	12 (A; start) 7 (G)	3 (W)	Social-Cognitive Processing Model (Lepore & Kernan, 2003)	Schoolwork Classroom Emotional Behavioral	Person-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral and Psychological engagement (Glanville & Wildhagen, 2007)	Latent Growth Mixture Model
Zhu et al. (2019)	China	1 057	572 (M) 485 (F)	3-6 (G)	4 (W)	BBT (Fredrickson, 2001)	Schoolwork Classroom School Behavioral	Variable-oriented	Questionnaire Behavioral subscale – SES-B (Fredricks et al., 2005)	LGCM

Note. Empty cells or cells lacking information about one of the study components in the analysis indicate that the authors did not report such information. All references can be found in the supplemental material with the full list of references of the studies reviewed.

[a] The studies are presented according to the order in which they show in the supplemental material with the full list of references of the studies reviewed.

[b] The total number of female participants in the study are reported as "(F)"; the total number of male participants in the study are presented as "(M)".

[c] Studies reported either participants' age or school grade, and several studies reported both. Studies reporting participants' age at the start/end of the study are identified with "(A)", and the age or mean age of the participants at the start/end of the study is included in the cell (e.g., 11-14 (A)). Studies that only report participants' age or mean age at the start of study are identified with

(A; start). Studies reporting the school grade participants attended at the start/end of the study are identified with "(G)", and the school grade participants attended at the start/end of the study is included in the cell (e.g., 7-11(G)). Studies that only report participants' school grade at the start of study are identified with (G; start).

[d] Number of waves in the study are reported as "(W) "; number of intervals in the study are reported as "(I)". In some studies an intervention was conducted; these studies are identified with "Intervention". The notation "structured" refers to studies relying on structured data collection methods.

Figure S1. Timeline of Study Publication Date by Geographic Area

References for the Supplementary Material
References

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blechar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 427-445. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.002

Archambault, I., & Vandenbossche-Makombo, J. (2014). Validation de l'échelle des dimensions de l'engagement scolaire (ÉDES) chez les élèves du primaire [Validation of the scale of the dimensions of school engagement among primary school students]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 46*(2), 275–288. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031951

Bakadorova, O., Lazarides, R., & Raufelder, D. (2020). Effects of social and individual school self-concepts on school engagement during adolescence. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 35*(1), 73-91. doi:10.1007/s10212-019-00423-x

Bakadorova, O., & Raufelder, D. (2017). The interplay of students' school engagement, school self-concept and motivational relations during adolescence. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*(DEC). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02171

Baltes, P. B. (1987). Theoretical propositions of life-span developmental psycho logy: On the dynamics between growth and decline. *Developmental Psychology*, *23*, 611–626. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.471.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercice of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Benner, A. D., Boyle, A. E., & Bakhtiari, F. (2017). Understanding students' transition to high school: Demographic variation and the role of supportive relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46*(10), 2129-2142. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0716-2

Berzonsky, M. D. (1989). Identity style: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *4*(3), 268–282. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/074355488943002.

Blondal, K. S., & Adalbjarnardottir, S. (2012). Student disengagement in relation to expected and unexpected educational pathways. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 56*(1), 85-100. doi:10.1080/00313831.2011.568607

Bond, L., Butler, H., Thomas, L., Carlin, J., Glover, S., Bowes, G., & Patton, G. (2007). Social and school connectedness in early secondary school as predictors of late teenage substance use, mental health, and academic outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *40*, 357.e9-357e.18. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.10.013

Bond, L., Thomas, L., Toumbourou, J. W., Patton, G. C., & Catalano, R. F. (2000). Improving the lives of young Victorians in our community: A survey of risk and protective factors. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for Adolescent Health. Retrieved from http://ercweb.rch.org.au/cah/Improving_the_lives_of_young_Victorians.pdf.

Borofsky, L. A., Kellerman, I., Baucom, B., Oliver, P. H., & Margolin, G. (2013). Community violence exposure and adolescents' school engagement and academic achievement over time. *Psychology of Violence, 3*(4), 381-395. doi:10.1037/a0034121

Brody, G.H., Chen, Y.F., Murry, V.M., Ge, X., Simons, R.L., Gibbons, F.X., Gerrard, M., Cutrona, C.E. (2006). Perceived discrimination and the adjustment of African American youths: A five-year longitudinal analysis with contextual moderation effects. *Child Development*, *77*(5):1170-1189. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00927.x

Brody, G. H., Kogan, S. M., & Chen, Y.-f. (2012). Perceived discrimination and longitudinal increases in adolescent substance use: Gender differences in mediational pathways.

American Journal of Public Health, 102(5), 1006-1011. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300588

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241 258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). Ecological systems theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Six theories of child development: Revised formulations and current issues*, (187–250). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (Ed.). (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review*, *101*, 568–586. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R.M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., Vol.1, pp.793–828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Burns, E. C., Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2018). Adaptability, personal best (PB) goals setting, and gains in students' academic outcomes: A longitudinal examination from a social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 53*, 57-72. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.02.001

Burns, E. C., Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2019). Understanding the role of personal best (PB) goal setting in students' declining engagement: A latent growth model. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(4), 557-572. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000291

Caldarella, P., Larsen, R. A. A., Williams, L., Wills, H. P., & Wehby, J. H. (2020). "Stop Doing That!": Effects of teacher reprimands on student disruptive behavior and engagement.

Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions. doi:10.1177/1098300720935101

Camacho, V., Elena, D. L. G., Olivares, T., Flores Gallego, J., & Orozco Barbosa, L. (2020). Data capture and learning analytics focused on engagement with a new wearable IoT approach. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*. doi:10.1109/TLT.2020.2999787

Chang, M., Evans, M. A., Kim, S., Norton, A., Deater-Deckard, K., & Samur, Y. (2016). The effects of an educational video game on mathematical engagement. *Education and Information Technologies, 21*(5), 1283-1297. doi:10.1007/s10639-015-9382-8

Chase, P. A., Hilliard, L. J., John Geldhof, G., Warren, D. J., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Academic achievement in the high school years: The changing role of school engagement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*(6), 884-896. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0085-4

Chen, S., Benner, A., & Wang, Y. (2020). Discrimination and adolescents' academic and socioemotional adjustment: The moderating roles of family and peer cultural socialisation. *International Journal of Psychology, 55*(5), 702-712. doi:10.1002/ijop.12637

Cheung, C. S. (2019). Parents' involvement and adolescents' school adjustment: Teacher–student relationships as a mechanism of change. *School Psychology, 34*(4), 350. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000288

Cipriano, C., Barnes, T. N., Rivers, S. E., & Brackett, M. (2019). Exploring changes in student engagement through the RULER approach: An examination of students at risk of academic failure. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 24*(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/10824669.2018.1524767

Connell, J. P. (1990). Context, self, and action: A motivational analysis of self-system processes across the life- span. In D. Cicchetti M. Beeghly (Eds.), *The self in transition: From infancy to childhood* (pp. 61–97). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Connell, J. P., Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self- system processes. In M. Gunnar L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child*

Psychology. Self processes in development (*Vol.* 23, pp. 43–77). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cook, C. R., Fiat, A., Larson, M., Daikos, C., Slemrod, T., Holland, E. A., Thayer, A. J., & Renshaw, T. (2018). Positive greetings at the door: Evaluation of a low-cost, high-yield proactive classroom management strategy. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 20*(3), 149-159. doi: 10.1177/1098300717753831

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1987). Validity and reliability of the experience-sampling method. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *175*(9), 526–536. doi: https://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-198709000-00004

Damian, L. E., Stoeber, J., Negru-Subtirica, O., & Baban, A. (2017). Perfectionism and school engagement: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 105*, 179-184. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.09.044

Datu, J. A. D., & King, R. B. (2018). Subjective well-being is reciprocally associated with academic engagement: A two-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of School Psychology, 69*, 100-110. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2018.05.007

Datu, J. A. D., King, R. B., & Valdez, J. P. M. (2017). The academic rewards of socially-oriented happiness: Interdependent happiness promotes academic engagement. *Journal of School Psychology, 61*, 19-31. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2016.12.004

Deci, E. L. (2009). Large-scale school reform as viewed from the self- determination theory perspective. *School Field*, *7*(2), 244–252. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104329.

Deci, E. L., and Ryan, R.M. (1985.) *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1994). Promoting self-determined education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *38*(1), 3–14. doi:10.1080/ 0031383940380101

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well- being across

life's domains. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(1), 14–23. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14.

De Laet, S., Colpin, H., Van Leeuwen, K., Van den Noortgate, W., Claes, S., Janssens, A., . . . Verschueren, K. (2016). Transactional links between teacher-student relationships and adolescent rule-breaking behavior and behavioral school engagement: Moderating role of a dopaminergic genetic profile score. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(6), 1226-1244. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0466-6

De Laet, S., Colpin, H., Vervoort, E., Doumen, S., Van Leeuwen, K., Goossens, L., & Verschueren, K. (2015). Developmental trajectories of children's behavioral engagement in late elementary school: Both teachers and peers matter. *Developmental Psychology, 51*(9), 1292-1306. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039478

Dockx, J., Van den Branden, N., & Bieke De, F. (2020). Effortless or less effort? Effects of tracks on students' engagement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 487-516. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12290

Dowd, K., Kinsey, S., Wheeless, S., Suresh, S., & the NSCAW Research Group. (2004). *National survey of child and adolescent well-being: Combined waves 1–4 data file user's manual.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.

Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2004). The development and validation of the Goal Orientation and Learning Strategies Survey (GOALS-S). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64,* 290–310. doi: http://dx .doi.org/10.1177/0013164403251335

Dunbar, M., Mirpuri, S., & Yip, T. (2017). Ethnic/racial discrimination moderates the effect of sleep quality on school engagement across high school. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 23*(4), 527-540. doi:10.1037/cdp0000146

Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Eccles, J. S. (2004). Schools, academic motivation, and stage- environment fit. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 125–153). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Eccles, J. S., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., & Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives: Psychological and sociological approaches* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *14*, 10–43. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558499141003

Eccles, J., & Midgley, C. (1989). Stage/environment fit: Developmentally appropriate classrooms for young adolescents. In R. E. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation and education: Goals and cognitions* (Vol. 3, pp. 139-186). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C. M., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., & MacIver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: the impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist*, *48*(2), 90–101. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.2.90.

Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., Midgley, C., Reuman, D., Iver, D. M., & Feldlaufer, H. (1993). Negative effects of traditional middle schools on students' motivation. *The Elementary School Journal*, *93*(5), 553-574. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/461740

Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2009). An ecological view of schools and development. In J. L. Meece & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Handbook of research on schools, schooling, and human development* (pp.6–23). New York, NY: Routledge.

Elder, G. H. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development*, *69*, 1–12. doi: 10.2307/1132065.

Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., & Menard, S. (1989). *Multiple problem youth: Delinquency, substance, and mental health problems*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Elmore, G. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2010). Adolescents' satisfaction with school experiences: Relationships with demographics, attachment relationships, and school engagement behavior. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*(6), 525-537. doi:10.1002/pits.20488

Elsaesser, C., Gorman-Smith, D., Henry, D., & Schoeny, M. (2020). The longitudinal relation between community violence exposure and academic engagement during adolescence: Exploring families' protective role. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(17-18), 3264-3285. doi:10.1177/0886260517708404

Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. *Science, 196,* 129–136. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science .847460

Engels, M. C., Colpin, H., Van Leeuwen, K., Bijttebier, P., Den Noortgate, W. V., Claes, S., . . . Verschueren, K. (2017). School engagement trajectories in adolescence: The role of peer likeability and popularity. *Journal of School Psychology, 64*, 61-75. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2017.04.006

Engels, M. C., Colpin, H., Van Leeuwen, K., Bijttebier, P., Van Den Noortgate, W., Claes, S., . . . Verschueren, K. (2016). Behavioral engagement, peer status, and teacher-student relationships in adolescence: A longitudinal study on reciprocal influences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(6), 1192-1207. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0414-5

Engels, M. C., Colpin, H., Wouters, S., Van Leeuwen, K., Bijttebier, P., Van Den Noortgate, W., . . . Verschueren, K. (2019). Adolescents' peer status profiles and differences in school engagement and loneliness trajectories: A person-centered approach. *Learning and Individual Differences, 75*. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101759

Engels, M. C., Pakarinen, E., Lerkkanen, M.-K., & Verschueren, K. (2019). Students' academic and emotional adjustment during the transition from primary to secondary school: A cross-

lagged study. *Journal of School Psychology, 76*, 140-158. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.07.012

Engels, M. C., Phalet, K., Gremmen, M. C., Dijkstra, J. K., & Verschueren, K. (2020). Adolescents'

engagement trajectories in multicultural classrooms: The role of the classroom context.

Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 69. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101156

Erentaite, R., Vosylis, R., Gabrialaviciute, I., & Raiziene, S. (2018). How does school experience

relate to adolescent identity formation over time? Cross-lagged associations between school

engagement, school burnout and identity processing styles. *Journal of Youth and*

Adolescence, 47(4), 760-774. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0806-1

Finn, J.D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(2), 117–142. doi:

https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543059002117

Finn, J. D., & Voelkl, K. E. (1993). School characteristics related to school engagement. *Journal of*

Negro Education, *62*, 249–268. doi:10.2307/2295464

Forschungsbereich Schulqualitaet & Schulentwicklung. (2000). *Fragebogen des Young Adult Survey.*

eidgenoessische jugend-und rekrutenbefragung 2000/2001 [Questionnaire of the Young Adult Survey.

Swiss federal surveys of adolescents 2000/2001]. Zurich, Switzerland: Paedagogisches Institut

der Universtiaet Zurich.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., Friedel, J., & Paris, A. (2005). School engagement. In K.A. **Moore**

& L.H. Lippman (Eds.), *What do children need to flourish?* (pp. 305-321). Boston, MA:

Springer.

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. doi:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/3516061

Fredricks, J., McColskey, W., Meli, J., Mordica, J., Montrosse, B., and Mooney, K. (2011). *Measuring*

student engagement in upper elementary through high school: A description of 21 instruments.

Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 218–226. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Positive emotions broaden and build. In E. Ashby Plant, & P. G. Devine (Vol. Eds.), *Advances on experimental social psychology* (Vol. 47, pp. 1–53). Burlington: Academic Press. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-407236-7.00001-2.

Furrer, C., & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 148–162. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.148

Gallup. (2009). *Hope, engagement, and wellbeing as predictors of attendance, credits earned, and GPA in high school freshmen*. Omaha, NE: Unpublished raw data.

Geng, L., Zheng, Q., Zhong, X., & Li, L. (2020). Longitudinal relations between students' engagement and their perceived relationships with teachers and peers in a Chinese secondary school. *The Asia - Pacific Education Researcher, 29*(2), 171-181. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00463-3

Glaman, R., & Chen, Q. (2018). Measurement invariance of a classroom engagement measure among academically at-risk students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*(JAN). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02345

Glanville, J. L., & Wildhagen, T. (2007). The measurement of school engagement: Assessing dimensionality and measurement invariance across race and ethnicity. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, *67*, 1019–1041. doi: 10.1177/0013164406299126

Glaser, R. R., Horn, M. L. V., Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., & Catalano, R. F. (2005). Measurement properties of the Communities That Care youth survey across demographic groups. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *21*, 73–102. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10940-004-1788-1.

Graham, S., Taylor, A. Z., & Hudley, C. (1998). Exploring achievement values among ethnic minority early adolescents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90,* 606 – 620. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.4 .606

Gutman, L. M., & Schoon, I. (2018). Emotional engagement, educational aspirations, and their association during secondary school. *Journal of Adolescence, 67*, 109-119. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.05.014

Hafen, C. A., Allen, J. P., Mikami, A. Y., Gregory, A., Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). The pivotal role of adolescent autonomy in secondary school classrooms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41*(3), 245-255. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9739-2

Hargreaves, L., & Galton, M. (2002). *Transfer from the primary classroom 20 years on*. London, England: Routledge Falmer.

Harris, C., Vazsonyi, A. T., Özdemir, Y., & Sağkal, A. S. (2020). Family environment and school engagement: An investigation of cross-lagged effects. *Journal of Adolescence, 84*, 171-179. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.08.006

Harter, S. (1978). Effectance motivation reconsidered: Toward a developmental model. *Human Development*, *21*, 36–64. doi:10.1159/000271574

Hietajärvi, L., Lonka, K., Hakkarainena, K., Alho, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2020). Are schools alienating digitally engaged students? Longitudinal relations between digital engagement and school engagement. *Frontline Learning Research, 8*(1), 33-55. doi: https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v8i1.437

Higashi, R., & Schunn, C. D. (2020). Perceived relevance of digital badges predicts longitudinal change in program engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(5), 1020-1041. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000401

Huebner, E. S. (1994). Preliminary development and validation of a multidimensional life satisfaction scale for children. *Psychological Assessment*, *6*, 149–158. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.2.149

Hughes, J. N., & Cao, Q. (2018). Trajectories of teacher-student warmth and conflict at the transition to middle school: Effects on academic engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Psychology, 67*, 148-162. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2017.10.003

Hughes, J. N., Im, M., Kwok, O.-m., Cham, H., & West, S. G. (2015). Latino students' transition to middle school: Role of bilingual education and school ethnic context. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 25*(3), 443-458. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jora.12142

Hwang, S., Waller, R., Hawes, D. J., & Allen, J. L. (2020). Callous-unemotional traits and antisocial behavior in South Korean children: Links with academic motivation, school engagement, and teachers' use of reward and discipline. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 48*(9), 1183-1195. doi:10.1007/s10802-020-00663-2

Kariippanon, K. E., Cliff, D. P., Lancaster, S. J., Okely, A. D., & Parrish, A. M. (2019). Flexible learning spaces facilitate interaction, collaboration and behavioural engagement in secondary school. *PLoS ONE, 14*(10). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0223607

Kwak, Y., Mihalec-Adkins, B., Mishra, A. A., & Christ, S. L. (2018). Differential impacts of participation in organized activities and maltreatment types on adolescent academic and socioemotional development. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 78*, 107-117. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.09.026

Ladd, G. W., Buhs, E. S., & Seid, M. (2000). Children's initial sentiments about kindergarten: Is school liking an antecedent of early classroom participation and achievement? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *46*, 255–279. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23093716

Leffert, N., Beson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Sharma, A. R., Drake, D. R., & Blyth, D. A. (1998). Developmental assets: Measurement and prediction of risk behaviors among adolescents. *Applied Developmental*

Science, 2, 209 –230. doi:10.1207/s1532480xads0204_4

Lamote, C., Speybroeck, S., Van Den Noortgate, W., & Van Damme, J. (2013). Different pathways towards dropout: The role of engagement in early school leaving. *Oxford Review of Education, 39*(6), 739-760. doi:10.1080/03054985.2013.854202

Lemos, M. S., Gonçalves, T., & Cadima, J. (2020). Examining differential trajectories of engagement over the transition to secondary school: The role of perceived control. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 44*(4), 313-324. doi:10.1177/0165025419881743

Lepore, S. J., & Kernan, W. D. (2003). Positive life change and the social context of illness: An expanded social-cognitive processing model. In C. L. Park, S. C. Lechner, M. H. Antoni, & A. L. Stanton (Eds.), *Medical illness and positive life change: Can crisis lead to personal transformation?* (pp 139–152). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lerkkanen, M.-K., Eklund, K., Löytynoja, H., Poikkeus, A.-M., & Aro, M. (2017). *Luku-ja kirjoitustaidon arviointi 7. ja 9. luokalla* [*Tests for reading achievement at secondary school*]. Jyväskylä, Finland: Niilo Mäki Instituutti.

Lerner, R. M. (1998). Theories of human development: Contemporary perspectives. In W. Damon (Series Ed. & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed., Vol.1, pp. 1–24). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Lerner, R. M. (2006). Developmental science, developmental systems, and contemporary theories. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 1–17). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdo´ttir, S., et al. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth-grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *25*(1), 17–71. doi:

https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604272461

Lewis, A. D., Huebner, E. S., Malone, P. S., & Valois, R. F. (2011). Life satisfaction and student engagement in adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*(3), 249-262. doi:10.1007/s10964-010-9517-6

Li, Y., & Lerner, R. M. (2011). Trajectories of school engagement during adolescence: Implications for grades, depression, delinquency, and substance use. *Developmental Psychology, 47*(1), 233-247. doi:10.1037/a0021307

Li, Y., & Lerner, R. M. (2013). Interrelations of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive school engagement in high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*(1), 20-32. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9857-5

Li, Y., Lynch, A. D., Kalvin, C., Liu, J., & Lerner, R. M. (2011). Peer relationships as a context for the development of school engagement during early adolescence. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35*(4), 329-342. doi:10.1177/0165025411402578

Lindeman, J. (1998). *Ala-asteen lukutesti ALLU [Test of reading Performance for primary school]*. Turku, Finland: Turun yliopisto, Oppimistutkimuksen keskus.

Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth (2018). *About LSAY*. Retrieved from https://www.lsay.edu.au/aboutlsay

Lyons, M. D., Huebner, E. S., & Hills, K. J. (2013). The dual-factor model of mental health: A short-term longitudinal study of school-related outcomes. *Social Indicators Research, 114*(2), 549-565. doi:10.1007/s11205-012-0161-2

Madjar, N., & Chohat, R. (2017). Will I succeed in middle school? A longitudinal analysis of self-efficacy in school transitions in relation to goal structures and engagement. *Educational Psychology, 37*(6), 680-694. doi:10.1080/01443410.2016.1179265

Markowitz, A. J. (2018). Changes in school engagement as a function of no child left behind: A comparative interrupted time series analysis. *American Educational Research Journal,*

55(4), 721-760. doi:10.3102/0002831218755668

Marques, S. C. (2016). Psychological strengths in childhood as predictors of longitudinal outcomes. *School Mental Health, 8*(3), 377-385. doi:10.1007/s12310-016-9195-y

Martin, A. J. (2009). Motivation and engagement across the academic life span: A developmental construct validity study of elementary school, high school, and university/college students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69,* 794–824. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001316 4409332214

Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2019). Teacher-student relationships and students' engagement in high school: Does the number of negative and positive relationships with teachers matter? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(5), 861-876. doi:10.1037/edu0000317

Masten, A. S., Burt, K. B., & Coatsworth, J. D. (2006). Competence and psychopathology in development. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 696–738). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Maynard, B. R., Beaver, K. M., Vaughn, M. G., DeLisi, M., & Roberts, G. (2014). Toward a bioecological model of school engagement: A biometric analysis of gene and environmental factors. *Social Work Research, 38*(3), 164-176. doi:10.1093/swr/svu018

McKellar, S. E., Cortina, K. S., & Ryan, A. M. (2020). Teaching practices and student engagement in early adolescence: A longitudinal study using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 89*, 102936. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2019.102936

Midgley, C., Maehr, M. L., Hruda, L. A., Anderman, E., Anderman, L., Gheen, M., et al. (2000). *Manual for the patterns of adaptive learning scale*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Mitchell, F., Gray, S., & Inchley, J. (2015). 'This choice thing really works … ' Changes in experiences and engagement of adolescent girls in physical education classes, during a school-based physical activity programme. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 20*(6), 593-611. doi:10.1080/17408989.2013.837433

Moreira, P. A. S., & Lee, V. E. (2020). School social organization influences adolescents' cognitive engagement with school: The role of school support for learning and of autonomy support. *Learning and Individual Differences, 80*. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101885

Moser, U. (1997). TREE - *Transitionen von der erstausbildung ins erwerbsleben (2001). Wie weiter nach der schule? Befragung 2001. Fragebogen fuer schueler/innen [TREE - Transitions from education to employment (2001). What comes after school? Survey 2001. Questionnaire for pupils].* Bern, Switzerland: Amt fuer Bildungsforschung.

Motti-Stefanidi, F., Masten, A., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2015). School engagement trajectories of immigrant youth: Risks and longitudinal interplay with academic success. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 39*(1), 32-42. doi:10.1177/0165025414533428

National Center for School Engagement (2006). *Quantifying school engagement: Research report*. Denver, CO: National Center for School Engagement.

National Longitudinal Surveys. (2017). National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979. Children and young adults. Retrieved from https://www.nlsinfo.org/content/cohorts/nlsy79-children

Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Nakata, Y. (2015). Structure also supports autonomy: Measuring and defining autonomy-supportive teaching in Japanese elementary foreign language classes. *Japanese Psychological Research, 57*(3), 167-179. doi:10.1111/jpr.12077

Olivier, E., Archambault, I., De Clercq, M., & Galand, B. (2019). Student self-efficacy, classroom engagement, and academic achievement: Comparing three theoretical frameworks. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*(2), 326-340. doi: 10.1007/s10964-018-0952-0

Olivier, E., Archambault, I., & Dupéré, V. (2018). Boys' and girls' latent profiles of behavior and social adjustment in school: Longitudinal links with later student behavioral engagement and academic achievement? *Journal of School Psychology, 69*, 28-44. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2018.05.006

Owen, K. B., Parker, P. D., Astell-Burt, T., & Lonsdale, C. (2018). Regular physical activity and

educational outcomes in youth: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 62*(3), 334-340. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.09.014

Park, S., Holloway, S. D., Arendtsz, A., Bempechat, J., & Li, J. (2012). What makes students engaged in learning? A time-use study of within- and between-individual predictors of emotional engagement in low-performing high schools. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41*(3), 390-401. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9738-3

Patall, E. A., Pituch, K. A., Steingut, R. R., Vasquez, A. C., Yates, N., & Kennedy, A. A. U. (2019). Agency and high school science students' motivation, engagement, and classroom support experiences. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 62*, 77-92. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2019.01.004

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A. C., Barchfeld, P., & Perry, R. P. (2011). Measuring emotions in students' learning and performance: The Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ). Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36(1), 36–48. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.10. 002

Phan, H. P. (2016). Interrelations that foster learning: An investigation of two correlational studies. *International Journal of Psychology, 51*(3), 185-195. doi:10.1002/ijop.12127

Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement, and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher*, *38*, 109–119. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09332374

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)*. Charlottesville: VA: University of Virginia.

Pietarinen, J., Soini, T., & Pyhältö, K. (2014). Students' emotional and cognitive engagement as the determinants of well-being and achievement in school. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *67*, 40–51. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2014.05.001.

Pintrich, P. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self–regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, *16*, 385–407. doi:

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 451-502). Cambrige, MA: Academic Press. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50043-3.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regu- lated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*(1), 33. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663. 82.1.33

Pomerantz, E. M., Kim, E. M., & Cheung, C. S. (2012). Parents' involvement in children's learning. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. C. Urdan, S. Graham, J. M. Royer, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook* (pp. 417–440). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Poorthuis, A. M. G., Juvonen, J., Thomaes, S., Denissen, J. J. A., Orobio de Castro, B., & van Aken, M. A. G. (2015). Do grades shape students' school engagement? The psychological consequences of report card grades at the beginning of secondary school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(3), 842.

Qu, Y., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2015). Divergent school trajectories in early adolescence in the United States and China: An examination of underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 44*(11), 2095-2109. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0201-0

Quin, D., Heerde, J. A., & Toumbourou, J. W. (2018). Teacher support within an ecological model of adolescent development: Predictors of school engagement. *Journal of School Psychology, 69*, 1-15. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2018.04.003

Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149–172). Boston, MA: Springer.

Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for

    themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology,*

    105(3), 579-595. doi:10.1037/a0032690

Reeve, J. & Tseng, C-M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning

    activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*(4), 257-267. doi:

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002.

Roeser, R. W., Eccles, J. S., & Strobel, K. R. (1998). Linking the study of schooling and mental health:

    Selected issues and empirical illustrations at the level of the individual. *Educational Psychologist*,

    33, 153 – 176. doi: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3304_2

Rogers, A. A., DeLay, D., & Martin, C. L. (2017). Traditional Masculinity During the Middle

    School Transition: Associations with Depressive Symptoms and Academic Engagement.

    Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46(4), 709-724. doi:10.1007/s10964-016-0545-8

Rogers-Sirin, L., Sirin, S. R., & Gupta, T. (2016) Discrimination-related stress and behavioral

    engagement: The moderating effect of positive school relationships. In. L.E. Bass (Ed.),

    Sociological Studies of Children and Youth (Vol. 20, pp. 3-29). Bingley, UK: Emerald

    Publishing.

Rushton, S., Giallo, R., & Efron, D. (2020). ADHD and emotional engagement with school in the

    primary years: Investigating the role of student–teacher relationships. *British Journal of*

    Educational Psychology, 90(S1), 193-209. doi:10.1111/bjep.12316

Ruzek, E. A., & Schenke, K. (2019). The tenuous link between classroom perceptions and

    motivation: A within-person longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(5),

    903-917. doi:10.1037/edu0000323

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation,

    social development, and well- being. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 68–78. doi: 10.1037110003-

    066X.55.1.68

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). An overview of self-determination theory: An organismic- dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3–33). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Ryzin, M. J. V. Gravely, A. A., & Roseth, C. J. (2007). Autonomy, belongingness, and engagement in school as contributors to adolescent psychological well-being. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*(1), 1–12. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007- 9257-4.

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2012). The schoolwork engagement inventory: Energy, dedication, and absorption (EDA). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 28*(1), 60-67. doi: https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000091

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2014). School burnout and engagement in the context of demands–resources model. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 137–151. doi: 10.1111/bjep.12018

Salmela-Aro, K., Upadyaya, K., Hakkarainen, K., Lonka, K., & Alho, K. (2017). The dark side of internet use: Two longitudinal studies of excessive internet use, depressive symptoms, school burnout and engagement among Finnish early and late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46*(2), 343-357. doi:10.1007/s10964-016-0494-2

Sameroff, A. J., & Mackenzie, M. J. (2003). Research strategies for capturing transactional models of development: The limits of the possible. *Development and Psychopathology*, *15*(3), 613–640. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579403000312.

Sammons, P., Taggart, B., Siraj-Blatchford, I., Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Barreau, S. and Manni, L. (2006). *Effective pre-school and primary education 3-11 (EPPE 3-11). Summary Report: Variations in teacher and pupil behaviours in year 5 classes*. Research Report No. 817. Nottingham, UK: DfES Publications.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire a cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *66*(4), 701–716. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471.

Schaufeli, W.B., Martinez, I.M., Pinto, A.M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A.B.(2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(5), 464–481. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005003

Schoon, I., & Lyons-Amos, M. (2017). A socio-ecological model of agency: The role of psycho-social and socio-economic resources in shaping education and employment transitions in England. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, *8*(1), 35–56. doi: 10.14301/llcs.v8i1.404

Schwartz, D., Kelly, B. M., Mali, L. V., & Duong, M. T. (2016). Exposure to violence in the community predicts friendships with academically disengaged peers during middle adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(9), 1786-1799. doi: 10.1007/s10964-016-0485-3

Science Learning Activation Lab. (2016). *Measures technical brief: Engagement in science learning activities* (Version 3.2). Retrieved Novem- ber 6, 2017, from http://activationlab.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/ Engagement-Report-3.2-20160803.pdf

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Shapiro, E. S. (2004). *Academic skills problems workbook* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press

Shernoff, D. J., Kelly, S., Tonks, S. M., Anderson, B., Cavanagh, R. F., Sinha, S., & Abdi, B. (2016). Student engagement as a function of environmental complexity in high school classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, *43*, 52–60. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2015.12.003

Shin, H. (2020). Who Are popular, liked, and admired? Longitudinal associations between three social status and academic-social behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 49*(9), 1783-1792. doi:10.1007/s10964-020-01222-0

Shoshani, A., Steinmetz, S., & Kanat-Maymon, Y. (2016). Effects of the maytiv positive psychology school program on early adolescents' well-being, engagement, and achievement. *Journal of School Psychology, 57*, 73-92. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2016.05.003

Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms: An experimental analysis*. Appleton-Century.

Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*, 571-581. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.85.4.571

Skinner, E., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*(4), 765–781. doi:10.1037/a0012840

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2008). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *69*(3), 493–525. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1177/0013164408323233.

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Well- born, J. G. (2009). Engagement as an organizational construct in the dynamics of motivational development. In K. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation in school* (pp. 223–245). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., and Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *69*, 493–525. doi: 10.1177/0013164408323233

Skinner, E. A., Marchand, G., Furrer, C., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(4), 765-781. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012840

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 21–44). New York, NY, US: Springer. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_2.

Skinner, E., Pitzer, J., & Steele, J. (2013). Coping as part of motivational resilience in school: A multidimensional measure of families, allocations, and profiles of academic coping. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *73*, 803–835. doi:10.1177/0013164413485241

Skinner, E. A., & Wellborn, J. G. (1994). Coping during childhood and adolescence: A motivational perspective. In D. Featherman, R. Lerner, & M. Perlmutter (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (pp. 91–133). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Skinner, E. & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. & Connell, J. (1998). Individual differences and the development of perceived control. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *63*, i-vi. doi: 1. 10.2307/1166220.

Smith, N. A., Brown, J. L., Tran, T., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2020). Parents, friends and immigrant youths' academic engagement: A mediation analysis. *International Journal of Psychology, 55*(5), 743-753. doi:10.1002/ijop.12672

Smits, J. A. E., & Vorst, H. C. M. (1990). *Schoolvragenlijst voor basisonderwijs en voortgezet onderwijs: SVL. Handleiding voor gebruikers [School questionnaire for elementary and secondary school: User's manual]*. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Berkhout.

Smits, J., & Vorst, H. (1982). *Schoolvragenlijst voortgezet onderwijs [School questionnaire secondary education]*. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Berkhout.

Stefansson, K. K., Gestsdottir, S., Birgisdottir, F., & Lerner, R. M. (2018). School engagement and intentional self-regulation: A reciprocal relation in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 64*, 23-33. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.01.005

Steinhoff, A., & Buchmann, M. (2017). Co-development of academic interest and effortful engagement and its role for educational attainment in a tracked school system. *Research in Human Development, 14*(2), 122-142. doi:10.1080/15427609.2017.1305810

Suarez-Orozco, C., Pimentel, A., & Martin, M. (2009). The significance of relationships: Academic

engagement and achievement among newcomer immigrant youth. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(3), 712 749.

Symonds, J., & Hargreaves, L. (2016). Emotional and motivational engagement at school transition: A qualitative stage-environment fit study. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 36*(1), 54-85. doi:10.1177/0272431614556348

Symonds, J., Kaplan, A., Upadyaya, K., Salmela-Aro, K., Torsney, B. M., & Eccles, J. (2019). *Momentary student engagement as a dynamic developmental system.* Preprint available at psyarxiv.com/ fuy7p. doi:10.31234/osf.io/fuy7p

Terrenghi, I., Diana, B., Zurloni, V., Rivoltella, P. C., Elia, M., Castaner, M., . . . Anguera, M. T. (2019). Episode of situated learning to enhance student engagement and promote deep learning: Preliminary results in a high school classroom. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01415

Thomas, J., & Dyment, J. (2019). The role of flexible learning programs in enabling behavioural engagement. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 24*(4), 405-420. doi:10.1080/13632752.2019.1633740

Torsney, B. M., & Symonds, J. E. (2019). The professional student program for educational resilience: Enhancing momentary engagement in classwork. *Journal of Educational Research, 112*(6), 676-692. doi:10.1080/00220671.2019.1687414

Ulmanen, S., Soini, T., Pietarinen, J., & Pyhältö, K. (2016). Students' experiences of the development of emotional engagement. *International Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 86-96. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2016.06.003

Van den Berghe, L., Cardon, G., Tallir, I., Kirk, D., & Haerens, L. (2016). Dynamics of need-supportive and need-thwarting teaching behavior: The bidirectional relationship with student engagement and disengagement in the beginning of a lesson. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 21*(6), 653-670. doi:10.1080/17408989.2015.1115008

Van Ryzin, M. J., & Roseth, C. J. (2020). The Cascading effects of reducing student stress: Cooperative learning as a means to reduce emotional problems and promote academic engagement. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. doi:10.1177/0272431620950474

Vollet, J. W., & Kindermann, T. A. (2020). Promoting persistence: Peer group influences on students' re-engagement following academic problems and setbacks. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 44*(4), 354-364. doi:10.1177/0165025419880614

Vollet, J. W., Kindermann, T. A., & Skinner, E. A. (2017). In peer matters, teachers matter: Peer group influences on students' engagement depend on teacher involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*(5), 635-652. doi:10.1037/edu0000172

Wang, M.-T., Chow, A., Hofkens, T., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2015). The trajectories of student emotional engagement and school burnout with academic and psychological development: Findings from Finnish adolescents. *Learning and Instruction, 36*, 57-65. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.11.004

Wang, M.-T., & Eccles, J. S. (2012a). Adolescent behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement trajectories in school and their differential relations to educational success. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 22*(1), 31-39. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2011.00753.x

Wang, M.-T., & Eccles, J. S. (2012b). Social support matters: Longitudinal effects of social support on three dimensions of school engagement from middle to high school. *Child Development, 83*(3), 877-895. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01745.x

Wang, M.-T., & Eccles, J. S. (2013). School context, achievement motivation, and academic engagement: A longitudinal study of school engagement using a multidimensional perspective. *Learning and Instruction, 28*, 12-23. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.04.002

Wang, M. T., & Fredricks, J. A. (2014). The reciprocal links between school engagement, youth

problem behaviors, and school dropout during adolescence. *Child Development, 85*(2), 722-737. doi:10.1111/cdev.12138

Wang, M. T., Fredricks, J. A., Ye, F., Hofkens, T. L., & Linn, J. S. (2016). The math and science engagement scales: Scale development, validation, and psychometric properties. *Learning & Instruction, 43*, 16–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.01.008

Wang, M. T., Willett, J. B., & Eccles, J. S. (2011). The assessment of school engagement: Examining dimensionality and measurement invariance by gender and race ⁄ ethnicity. *Journal of School Psychology*, *49*, 465– 480. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2011.04.001

Watson, D., Wiese, D., Vaidya, J., & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 820 – 838. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76 .5.820

Wellborn, J. G. (1991). *Engaged and disaffected action: The conceptualization and measurement of motivation in the academic domain*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 68–81. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1015

Witkow, M. R. (2006). *Perceived social norms for schoolwork and achievement during adolescence*. Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University.

Wolters, C. A. (2004). Advancing achievement goal theory: Using goal structures and goal orientations to predict students' motivation, cognition, and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*, 236–250. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.2.236.

Yu, C., Li, X., Wang, S., & Zhang, W. (2016). Teacher autonomy support reduces adolescent anxiety and depression: An 18-month longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence, 49*, 115-123. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.03.001

Zee, M., & Koomen, H. (2019). Engaging children in the upper elementary grades: Unique

contributions of teacher self-efficacy, autonomy support, and student-teacher relationships. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*. doi:10.1080/02568543.2019.1701589

Zhang, W., Du, D., Zhen, S., Warren, A. E. A., Lerner, R. M., & Phelps, E. (2011). Belief systems and positive youth development among Chinese and American youth. In A. E. A. Warren, R. M. Lerner, & E. Phelps (Eds.), *Thriving and spirituality among youth: Research perspectives and future possibilities* (pp. 309e331). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Zhang, X., Pomerantz, E. M., Qin, L., Logis, H., Ryan, A. M., & Wang, M. (2018). Characteristics of likability, perceived popularity, and admiration in the early adolescent peer system in the United States and China. *Developmental Psychology, 54*(8), 1568-1581. doi:10.1037/dev0000544

Zhen, R., Ru‐De, L., Ming‐Te, W., Ding, Y., Jiang, R., Fu, X., & Sun, Y. (2020). Trajectory patterns of academic engagement among elementary school students: The implicit theory of intelligence and academic self-efficacy matters. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(3), 618-634. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12320

Zhen, R., Wu, X., & Zhou, X. (2020). Longitudinal development of adolescent academic engagement following the Wenchuan earthquake: Domain-specific trajectories. *School Psychology International, 41*(2), 89-109. doi:10.1177/0143034319884615

Zhu, X., Tian, L., Zhou, J., & Huebner, E. S. (2019). The developmental trajectory of behavioral school engagement and its reciprocal relations with subjective well-being in school among Chinese elementary school students. *Children and Youth Services Review, 99*, 286-295. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.01.024