

TO WHAT EXTENT DO TEACHERS
AND ADMINISTRATORS PERCEIVE
THEY IMPACT STUDENT
ENGAGEMENT IN A RURAL
SOUTHWEST GEORGIA SCHOOL
SYSTEM

By
Priscilla G. Yarbrough

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Education
in Curriculum and Leadership

Columbus State University
Columbus, GA

May 2018

Copyright

Priscilla Graham Yarbrough

May 19, 2018

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated in loving memory of my father-in-law, William Yarbrough, who passed away on August 9, 2016; and to my mother, Mary Mays Graham, who passed away on August 17, 2016. I wish you both were here to celebrate with me. Without your unconditional love and support, I would not have had the courage or the endurance to complete this journey. Your love of knowledge and your words of encouragement will always be remembered. You both are greatly missed. Your memories will live on forever.

Acknowledgements

Above all, I would like to thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, for providing me the opportunity to pursue my childhood dream of becoming a doctor and for shedding His light upon my path. My time spent in devotion to You helped me to rely on Your strength to continue when times were difficult, and I felt incapable of completing the task. Your Holy Word constantly reminded me that, “...*everything that was written in the past was written to teach us, so that through endurance and encouragement of the scriptures we might have hope.*” (Romans 15:4)

Special thanks to my loving family (my husband, Donnie; our children, Courtney, Ladonis, Aaliyah, and Aaron; and, our grandchildren, Teionna and Alayla), my extended family, and my church family, the faithful members of the Newberry A.M.E. Church. I deeply thank my pastor and soul mate, Rev. Anthony “Donnie” Yarbrough, for the great investment of time, energy, and self-sacrificing love you continuously give to support our family. You are a wonderful provider, a great encourager, and an awesome spiritual leader. Thank you for being an excellent example of “educational leadership” at its best. Thank you, Ladonis, Aaliyah, and Aaron, for listening intently—most days without complaining—as I incessantly talked about my work. Thank you to my extended family and my church family for your fellowship, love, and support. Your belief in me and your words of encouragement helped me to endure this process. I am forever grateful and blessed to call you all “my family.”

Thank you to my parents, Garfield and Mary Graham, for laying a strong spiritual foundation and creating a home environment that encouraged the importance of a good education for me and my siblings (my sister, Fannie White; and my brothers, Reginald,

Lewis, and Irvin Graham). You instilled in me the love of words, the joy of reading, and the persistent pursuit of knowledge. You demonstrated the value of hard work and constantly reminded me that “*anything in life worth having was worth working for.*” Special thanks to my sister, Fannie, for your many acts of love and kindness. I especially appreciate your willingness and desire to try to fill the tremendous void in my heart during the loss of our mother, even when you were hurting, too.

I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Richardson, Dr. Pamela Lemoine, Dr. Tom Hackett, and Dr. Christopher Garretson for your patience, dedication, and expert knowledge. Dr. Richardson, thank you for bringing a doctoral cohort to the Leesburg area. Without you, this journey would not have been possible. Dr. Lemoine, thank you for agreeing to serve as my committee chair. I appreciate the many hours you spent reading, editing, and encouraging me more than words could say. Dr. Hackett, thank you for serving as my methodologist. The time you spent answering my many questions and addressing my concerns helped me tremendously throughout this process. Dr. Garretson, thank you for serving on my committee. You always challenged me to look a little deeper at the topics discussed in my literature review. I am extremely grateful for your guidance.

Thank you, Dr. Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Professor Emeritus of Psychological Studies in Education at The Ohio State University for granting me permission to use and alter the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale in my research. Also, thank you, Dr. Hoy, for sharing links to your Ohio State research webpage, instructions for scoring the assessment measure, and information about the measures construct validity. Your generosity is graciously appreciated.

I acknowledge Dr. Bronwyn Ragan-Martin, my superintendent, the school administrators, (Mr. Anthony Yarbrough, Mrs. Angela Bell, and Dr. Matthew Cullifer), and all the participants of my study. Thank you all for your participation, for without your willingness to give of your time I could not have completed this study.

I must acknowledge Mrs. Corene Hamilton, a former assistant superintendent; Mrs. Alma Hollinger, a former curriculum director; Mrs. Mandy Moses, my children's Godmother and former daycare provider; and Mrs. Betty Orange, a former school superintendent; all educators who have been abundant resources and have poured into my life by serving as my mentors. Thank you all for sharing treasured lessons from your life experiences. I deeply value your words of wisdom and greatly appreciate your friendship. You all invested in me at pivotal moments in my life and I am eternally grateful.

And lastly, I acknowledge seven amazing women with whom I have worked with for the past seven years and who have allowed me to pour into their lives daily: Ms. Deanne Allen, Ms. Sherida Holmes, Ms. Sakinah Ismial, Mrs. Lashonda Smith, Ms. Beverly Slaton, Dr. Shanice Richardson, and Mrs. Natasha Wimberly. Thank you all for allowing me to share with you from my life experiences and for helping me to stay focused on the most important things in life—the Light and the Truth! May you forever be the “Beacons of Light” God has called you to be. Always remember, *“You cannot hold a torch to light another’s path without brightening your own.”* (Rumi)

Vita

PRISCILLA GRAHAM YARBROUGH

Columbus State University (Spring 2018)
Email: yarbrough_priscilla@columbusstate.edu

EDUCATION

Doctor of Education Degree Major: Curriculum and Leadership	Columbus State University Concentration: Leadership	Columbus, GA May 2018
Education Specialist Degree Major: Educational Leadership	Valdosta State University	Valdosta, GA December 2012
Master of Science Degree Major: Educational Leadership	Troy State University—Dothan	Dothan, AL December 2004
Bachelor of Science Degree Major: Business Education	Georgia Southwestern State University	Americus, GA June 1990

WORK EXPERIENCE

Early County Board of Education Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Director		Blakely, GA July 2017 – Present
Early County Board of Education Early County High School Served as school-based Response to Intervention Coordinator Certified in Teacher Keys Effectiveness System and Leader Keys Effectiveness System	Assistant Principal	Blakely, GA July 2010 – June 2017
Early County Board of Education Early County High School Chaired the Career, Technical and Agricultural Education (CTAE) Department Served as the lead adviser of Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) Served as the Varsity Football and Basketball Cheerleading Coach	Business Education Instructor	Blakely, GA August 1990 – June 2017

AFFILIATIONS

Member of the Georgia Association of Educators
Member of Student Support Team Association for Georgia
Member of Newberry African Methodist Episcopal Church

Abstract

The concept of engagement emerged to understand and improve outcomes for students whose academic performance in school was marginal or poor. The importance of student engagement for achieving success in school was proven in many studies. Lessons designed to engage students helped to improve student achievement at all levels including lower academic performing students and helped to create positive school cultures and classroom learning environments. Very little was known about how teacher beliefs (perceptions of student engagement) influenced student engagement within the classroom. There were only a few studies in which student engagement was examined from the teacher's perspective. To further the research on student engagement, the researcher conducted a correlational design study using a sequential mixed-methods approach. The participants were teachers and administrators from a rural school system located in southwest Georgia. An online self-efficacy assessment measure (Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale) was used to assess teachers' and administrators' perception of student engagement in three factors: *Efficacy in Student Engagement*, *Efficacy in Instructional Strategies*, and *Efficacy in Classroom Management*. Semi-structured follow-up interviews were also conducted to look for reoccurring themes between teachers and administrators regarding their beliefs about their impact on student engagement. Statistically significant differences were found between the mean score of the Administrators and Teachers category of groups on the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale in all areas. Administrators perceived teachers had a greater capacity to impact student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management in the classroom than teachers perceived teachers had.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Copyright Page.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Vita.....	vii
Abstract Page	viii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures.....	xiv

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	10
Research Questions.....	11
Conceptual Framework.....	12
Methodology.....	12
Significance.....	13
Delimitations/Limitations	13
Definition of Terms.....	14
Summary	16

CHAPTER II: THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The Achievement Gap	18
The origin of the achievement gap.....	24
The achievement gap in early childhood	26
Culture and family structure	29
Motivation gap.....	30
Structural and institutional factors.....	31
Narrowing the achievement gap	33
Standards-based reform	33
School-based reform	39
Teacher-focused reform.....	42

Table of Contents (continued)

Student Engagement	46
Definition of student engagement.....	47
Theories of student engagement	55
Improvement of student engagement.....	56
Responsibility for student engagement.....	64
Assessment of student engagement	66
Relation of curricular design to student engagement.....	68
Self-Efficacy	69
Theoretical Framework.....	80
Major Research Studies	82
Summary	87

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction.....	91
Research Questions.....	91
Research Design.....	92
Participants.....	95
Setting	96
Instrumentation	96
Reliability and Validity.....	102
Procedures.....	104
Summary	108

CHAPTER IV: REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction.....	109
Quantitative Analysis.....	111
Research Questions.....	111
Research Design.....	112
Respondents	112
Findings.....	114
Quantitative Data Analysis	119
Independent Samples t-test of TSES Data	120
Independent Samples t-test of Engagement Data	122
Independent Samples t-test of Strategies Data.....	123
Independent Samples t-test of Management Data	125
Results.....	126

Table of Contents (continued)

Qualitative Analysis.....	127
Research Questions.....	127
Research Design.....	127
Respondents	128
Findings.....	130
Qualitative Data Analysis	135
Coding and Analysis.....	135
Individual Interview Findings.....	142
Summary	155

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Chapters I-IV.....	158
Analysis of Research Findings.....	163
Discussion of Research Findings	169
Studies Related to the Achievement Gap.....	169
Studies Related to Student Engagement	172
Studies Related to Teacher Self-Efficacy	178
Conclusions.....	184
Limitations	190
Implications for Practice	190
Recommendations.....	193
Recommendations for Future Studies.....	194
Concluding Thoughts.....	195
Dissemination	195

REFERENCES	197
------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter of Consent from Superintendent.....	220
Appendix B: Letter of Consent from Principals	221
Appendix C: Letter of Participation.....	224
Appendix D: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol.....	225
Appendix E: Informed Consent Form.....	226
Appendix F: Permission to Use the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale.....	228
Appendix G: Permission to Alter the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale	229
Appendix H: Teachers' Version of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale	230
Appendix I: Administrators' Version of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale.....	235

List of Tables

Table 1: <i>Studies Related to the Achievement Gap</i>	82
Table 2: <i>Studies Related to Student Engagement</i>	83
Table 3: <i>Studies Related to Teacher Self-Efficacy</i>	85
Table 4: <i>The TSES Developers Computed Unweighted Means</i>	105
Table 5: <i>Demographic Profile of the Respondents</i>	113
Table 6: <i>The TSES Developers Computed Unweighted Means</i>	115
Table 7: <i>Summary Statistics Table for Interval and Ratio Variables Split by Groups</i>	119
Table 8: <i>Independent Samples t-test for the Difference Between TSES (Administrators) and TSES (Teachers)</i>	121
Table 9: <i>Independent Samples t-test for the Difference Between Engagement (Administrators) and Engagement (Teachers)</i>	123
Table 10: <i>Independent Samples t-test for the Difference Between Strategies (Administrators) and Strategies (Teachers)</i>	124
Table 11: <i>Independent Samples t-test for the Difference between Management (Administrators) and Management (Teachers)</i>	126
Table 12: <i>Demographic Profile for the Respondents of the Follow-up Interviews</i>	129
Table 13: <i>Administrator Themes</i>	137
Table 14: <i>Teacher Themes</i>	138
Table 15: <i>Statements Made in Administrators’ Interviews About the ‘Student’ Theme</i>	143
Table 16: <i>Statements Made in Teachers’ Interviews About the ‘Student’ Theme</i>	145
Table 17: <i>Statements Made in Administrators’ Interviews About the ‘Learner’ Theme</i>	147
Table 18: <i>Statements Made in Teachers’ Interviews About the ‘Learner’ Theme</i>	148
Table 19: <i>Statements Made in Administrators’ Interviews About the ‘Engagement’ Theme</i>	150

List of Tables (continued)

Table 20: <i>Statements Made in Teachers' Interviews About the 'Engagement' Theme</i>	152
Table 21: <i>Statements Made in Administrators' Interviews About the 'Teacher' Theme</i>	153
Table 22: <i>Statements Made in Teachers' Interviews About the 'Teacher' Theme</i>	154

List of Figures

Figure 1: *Conceptual Framework for Teachers' and Administrators Perception on Student Engagement Created by the Researcher*.....12

Figure 2: *The Mean of TSES by Levels of Groups*.....121

Figure 3: *The Mean of Engagement by Levels of Groups*.....123

Figure 4: *The Mean of Strategies by Levels of Groups*.....124

Figure 5: *The Mean of Management by Levels of Groups*.....126

Figure 6: *Chart of Themes for Administrators*.....141

Figure 7: *Chart of Themes for Teachers*.....141

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The concept of engagement emerged as a method to understand and improve outcomes for students whose academic performance in school was marginal or poor (Finn & Zimmer, 2012). Student engagement was an essential component of academic learning, high school graduation, and postsecondary enrollment and completion (Christenson, Reschly, & Wylie, 2012; Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Rumberger & Rotermund, 2012). The importance of student engagement for achieving success in school was reported in many studies (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong, 2008; Archambault, Janosz, Fallu, & Pagani, 2009; Fredricks & McColskey, 2012; Elffers, 2011). Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris studied student engagement in 2004 in order to understand student engagement. However, only a few studies examined student engagement from the perspective of the teacher (Harris, 2008, 2010, 2011; McMahon & Zyngier, 2009; Ravet, 2007; Zyngier, 2007, 2008).

Evidence of the influence of engagement on learning and student achievement was well established. According to Conroy and Rothstein (2013), achievement levels differed significantly between students from low-income homes and students from high-income homes. The term “achievement gap” was often used to define the differences between the test scores of minority and/or low-income students and the test scores of their Caucasian and Asian peers (Achievement Gap, 2011; National Education Association, 2015; Vanneman, Hamilton, Anderson, & Rahman, 2009). However, in Georgia, the achievement gap was defined as a measure of the change in the gap in standardized achievement scores between school-based high-need students and a statewide benchmark from one year to the next (GaDOE, 2016). The causes of the

achievement gap were studied since the 1966 publication of the Equality of Educational Opportunity report, known as the Coleman Report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education (Berliner, 2009). Another source of evidence of the achievement gap was supported by the National Assessment of Educational Progress data (NAEP) (2013). The NAEP was a congressionally mandated project of the U.S. Department of Education that informed the public periodically about the academic achievement of elementary and secondary students at grades 4, 8, and 12 in reading, mathematics, science, writing and other subjects (Vanneman et al., 2009). The NAEP was an assessment that revealed how well states were doing in improving student achievement, and the results were comparable across states thereby, allowing valid comparisons that would be unavailable using results from each state's individual assessments (Rowan, Hall, & Haycock, 2010). According to the NAEP, achievement gaps occurred when one group of students (e.g. students grouped by race/ethnicity, gender) outperformed another group and the difference in average scores for the two groups was statistically significant (e.g. larger than the margin of error) (Bohrnstedt, Kitmitto, Ogut, Sherman, & Chan, 2015).

Many factors affected student achievement and contributed to the achievement gap. Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, and York (1966) suggested that both in-school factors and home/community factors impacted the academic achievement of students and contributed to the gap. Coleman et al., (1966) found that family backgrounds had a greater impact on academic achievement than the characteristics of the school. However, Edmonds (1979) and Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, and Ouston (1979) challenged the Coleman Report findings and suggested

that student achievement was greatly influenced by the characteristics of the school as an organization. Rutter et al. (1979) also found that differences in behavior and achievements in schools were associated with climate and expectations, and not with the financial or physical resources available to students.

Researchers found teacher effectiveness to be the most important in-school factor affecting student achievement (Aaronson, Barrow, & Sanders, 2007; Marzano, Pickering, & Heflebower, 2011). However, schools in lower-income districts tended to acquire less qualified teachers and have fewer educational resources because funding systems allocated fewer resources to poorer districts than to wealthier districts. Schools with high concentrations of low-income and minority students received fewer instructional resources than others in the same district (Clark, 2013). Furthermore, minority students tended to be concentrated in low-achieving, highly segregated schools. Minority students were often over-represented in special education programs and placed into lower educational tracks based on teachers' and administrators' expectations for minority students (Clark, 2013). Typically, African American and Hispanic students were enrolled in greater numbers in special education programs and were underrepresented in gifted programs (Yoon & Gentry, 2009).

Although educational reform efforts were initially focused on teacher quality, school leadership was studied extensively with research findings supporting an empirical link between school leadership and improved student achievement (Wallace Foundation, 2011a). The current emphasis in educational reform focused on the need for highly capable school leadership to change educational outcomes (Cheney, Davis, Garrett, & Holleran, 2010). Subsequently, researchers found, it was neither teachers alone nor

principals alone who improved schools, but teachers and principals working together (Schmidt-Davis & Bottoms, 2011).

Principal leadership was the second largest in-school factor in determining student achievement with the first being quality teaching (Wallace Foundation, 2011b; 2012).

“There were virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around in the absence of intervention by talented leaders” (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 5). While there were other factors within the school that contributed to these turnarounds, leadership was the catalyst. Both highly effective teaching and highly capable school leadership promoted change outcomes for children in schools. Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, Anderson, Michlin, and Mascall (2010) found effective school leadership was critical to student achievement and was even more important in turning around low-performing schools (Orr, King, & LaPointe, 2010; Wallace Foundation, 2011a).

Cheney et al., (2010) suggested schools needed effective principals who created a school culture of high expectations and focused on learning for both students and adults. According to the Wallace Foundation (2012) effective principals performed five key practices well: 1) They shaped a vision of academic success for all students; 2) created a climate hospitable to education; 3) cultivated leadership in others; 4) improved instruction; and 5) managed people, data, and processes to foster school improvement. Leithwood et al. (2004) further suggested that recruitment, training, evaluation and ongoing professional development was considered highly cost-effective approaches to successful school improvement. Effective principals worked relentlessly to improve achievement by focusing on the quality of instruction (Portion, Knapp, Dareff, Feldman,

Russel, Samuelson, & Yeh, 2009). The researchers posited that the job of the school principal was one of the toughest in our nation and one of the most valuable. High-quality school leaders were in great demand and there were strong calls for better principal preparation programs (Knapp, Copland, Honig, Plecki, & Portin, 2010).

To promote school improvement efforts, several federal accountability initiatives (e.g. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, 1965), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1975), No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001), Race to the Top (RTTT, 2009), and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015) and Georgia's accountability measures (e.g., Response to Intervention process, College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) reports, and Teacher Keys Effectiveness System) (GaDOE, 2016) were initiated to provide high quality research-based instruction, intervention strategies, and data driven practices to help all students succeed within the general education curriculum (GaDOE, 2016). Initially, ESSA implementation was set for the 2017-2018 school year; however, as of March 2017 state and federal government agencies had not developed or implemented the ESSA mandates (USDOE, 2017). The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE, 2016) Accountability Division and the Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA, 2017) provided all stakeholders with important information on the performance and progress of Georgia schools, districts, and the state, and published the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) reports (GaDOE, 2016). The CCRPI (2016) was a score that helped educational leaders measure and promote college and career readiness for all Georgia public school students. This score included four main components: achievement, progress, achievement gap, and

challenge points. The performance of student subgroups, school climate, and financial efficiency status was also reported (GaDOE, 2016).

With guidance from the federal education accountability initiatives, Georgia focused on providing high quality research-based instruction, interventions, and data driven practices to help all students succeed in the general education curriculum by using Student Support Teams (SST) and Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies (GaDOE, 2016). Student Support Teams first emerged in the 1970's as a school-level intervention team whose primary purpose was to ensure high learning outcomes for all students (Chalfant, Pysh & Moultrie, 1979). In addition, Georgia mandated SSTs as a part of a legal permanent injunction from the federal court case, *Marshall v. GA, 1984*, to deal primarily with disproportionate placement of minority students in special education. While the state prevailed in this case, it became obvious that there was no standard process for students to receive individualized help in the general education classroom for learning or behavior difficulties. Instead, students requiring extra help usually were placed in special education and removed from the general classroom (GaDOE, 2016). The SST's function was to offer a problem-solving team approach to preventing inappropriate referrals to special education and unnecessary removal of students from the general education classroom.

To prevent inappropriate referrals to special education and unnecessary removal of students from general education, Georgia implemented a framework to guide this process. Georgia's RTI process, the Georgia Pyramid of Interventions, was a four-tier model designed to find and address students' academic and/or behavioral needs (GaDOE, 2016). RTI was a practice of academic and/or behavioral interventions designed to offer

early, effective help to underperforming students (National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2017). Standards-based instruction, universal screening, and progress monitoring were the critical foundation elements of this model. The tiered instruction included varying levels of instructional intensity within a tiered delivery model (i.e., Tier 1 – Standards-based classroom learning; Tier 2 – Needs-based learning; Tier 3 – SST-driven learning; and, Tier 4 – Specially-designed learning). The core principle was that Tier 1 high quality, evidence-based instruction was provided with fidelity in the general education class, student progress was monitored often, students' responsiveness to intervention was evaluated, and instruction was adapted as needed (GaDOE, 2016; National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2017).

Research evidence on the potential of RTI to decrease the disproportionate number of minority students being placed in special education was rare. A review of the literature found that there were only two studies that addressed RTI's effect on disproportionality. Disproportionality was the inappropriate over-identification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children as children with disabilities (GaDOE, 2016). Marston, Muyskens, Lau, and Canter (2003) found that the RTI process significantly decreased placement rates of minority students in special education and reduced disproportionality for African American male students; however, VanDerHeyden, Witt, and Gilbertson's (2007) study findings reported no significant statistical differences in placement rates.

The challenge that teachers faced when engaging students of different abilities, genders and ethnicities was significant. However, the more equipped teachers were to meet a variety of student ability levels, the more instructional impact they had. Although

the literature did not agree on a definition for student engagement, earlier researchers defined student engagement primarily by observable behaviors such as participation and time-on-task (Brophy, 1983; Natriello, 1984). More recent researchers incorporated emotional or affective aspects into their definition of student engagement (Fredricks, Filsecker, & Lawson, 2016; Hamre & Pianta, 2005). Fredricks et al. (2004) studied aspects of cognitive engagement, such as students' investment in learning, perseverance in the face of challenges, and teachers' use of deep instead of superficial strategies.

Appleton et al. (2008) included self-regulation (the extent to which students demonstrated control over their learning actions) as a part of cognitive engagement. Engagement, as defined by Marzano et al. (2011) answered the question of importance and self-efficacy for students. Exploring the areas of student engagement and authentic learning opportunities, Hallermann, Larmer and Mergendoller (2011) emphasized that authentic, project-based, hands-on learning opportunities improved engagement, increased student achievement and helped develop lifelong learners. Additional definitions for student engagement included: participation in educationally effective practices, both inside and outside the classroom that led to a range of measurable outcomes (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2011) the extent to which students engaged in activities that research findings reported linked to high-quality learning outcomes (Krause & Coates, 2008); and, the quality of effort students themselves devoted to educationally purposeful activities that contributed directly to desired outcomes (Hu, Kuh, & Li, 2008).

Several educational researchers conceptualized student engagement as a meta-construct consisting of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions (Appleton et al., 2008; Archambault et al., 2009; Axelson & Flick, 2010; Boekaerts, 2016; Finn &