



---

**Student Engagement Evidence Summary**

**Vicki Trowler and Paul Trowler**

**Department of Educational Research**

**University of Lancaster**

---

**Deliverable 2 for the Higher Education Academy Student Engagement Project**

June 2010

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Criteria for inclusion.....	5
1.2 Scope of studies included .....	5
1.3 Health warnings: evidence and practice.....	6
2. Presentation of evidential base.....	7
2.1 Engagement and individual student learning .....	7
2.1.1 Student Engagement improves outcomes:.....	7
2.1.2 Specific features of Engagement improve outcomes: .....	8
2.1.3 Engagement improves specific desirable outcomes:.....	9
2.1.4 The value of Engagement is no longer questioned:.....	9
2.1.5 Responsibility for Engagement is shared:.....	10
2.2 Engagement and structure/process.....	10
2.2.1 Student engagement in university governance benefits student representatives: .....	10
2.2.2 Student representation on committees in the UK is generally felt to be effective:.....	10
2.2.3.High-performing institutions share several “best practice” features regarding student engagement in governance: .....	11
2.2.4 High-performing institutions share several “best practice” features regarding student leadership.....	11
2.2.5 Students in the UK are most commonly “engaged” through feedback questionnaires..	11
2.3 Engagement and identity.....	12
2.3.1 Prior characteristics do not determine whether students will engage: .....	12
2.3.2 Engagement benefits all students – but some more than others: .....	12

2.3.3 Engagement requires successful transition: .....	12
Conclusion.....	14
References .....	15

## Executive Summary

This report distils from our review of the student engagement literature some of the key statements that can be made with a reasonable degree of confidence about engagement. Bearing in mind the diversity of understandings of the term “student engagement”, claims should be read and interpreted with caution, extending implications only as far as the context and constraints allow. We categorise these statements in terms of the three dimensions of engagement we identified in that report: student engagement in individual student learning; student engagement with structure and process; student engagement with identity. This report should be read in conjunction with the literature review, where full references can also be found.

### **Student Engagement in Individual Student Learning:**

- Student Engagement improves outcomes
- Specific features of Engagement improve outcomes
- Engagement improves specific desirable outcomes
- The value of Engagement is no longer questioned
- Responsibility for Engagement is shared

### **Student Engagement with Structure and Process:**

- Student Engagement in university governance benefits student representatives
- Student representation on committees in the UK is generally felt to be effective
- High-performing institutions share several “best practice” features regarding student engagement in governance
- High-performing institutions share several “best practice” features regarding student leadership
- The most commonly reported form of “engagement” of students in the UK is through feedback questionnaires

### **Student Engagement with Identity:**

- Prior characteristics do not determine whether students will engage
- Engagement benefits all students – but some more than others
- Engagement requires successful transition
- Some students experience engagement negatively

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Criteria for inclusion

This document presents an account of the findings of those studies of student engagement founded upon a robust evidential base. These studies are abstracted from deliverable 1, the literature review, and are presented in more detail here.

We define 'robust' in terms of studies which meet these criteria:

1. Having clear and researchable questions
2. Using an appropriate methodology to address those questions
3. Presenting evidence of an amount and type to give reasonable confidence in conclusions
4. Conclusions based on, and limited to, the evidence presented

In the UK, studies are much more often qualitative in character, based on case studies. Often these fail the test of robustness, set out above. This is not however to detract from their value. Studies of this nature can be extremely illuminative in terms of conceptualising the issues, developing theory in a way which the more positivist Australian and North American studies tend not to do, particularly in elaborating 'sensitising' theory and frameworks (Sibeon, 2007). They also indicate appropriate ways forward for research and development in valuable ways. However we have in the main excluded them from this review as they do not meet our criteria for robustness.

### 1.2 Scope of studies included

Deliverable 1 presents a matrix of areas covered by the term 'student engagement'. Attempting to cover each aspect of that matrix according to the criteria set out above would be a major task, even limiting studies to those meeting the criteria above. In this evidence summary, we have followed the schema proposed in Deliverable 1 (Literature Review) of the three axes along which student engagement literature can be located, *viz.* Individual Student Learning, Structure and Process, and Identity

The main focus of the HEA's interest in student engagement is on students being engaged in shaping the design and delivery of curriculum, and so we have concentrated on presenting evidence related to that objective, insofar as that evidence exists. However, given the relative absence in the literature surveyed on that topic, other aspects (notably "individual student learning") dominate the evidence reported.

We note from the literature review that the robust evidential base in this area is much stronger in some areas of engagement than others, with strengths especially in the areas of individual student learning – particularly the correlation between student engagement in "educationally purposive" activities and positive outcomes related to grades, persistence and graduation, at a generalised

level. There is a very limited amount known with any degree of assurance in the areas of specific, local interventions, such as whether introducing “clickers” (electronic ‘voting’ devices to answer closed-ended questions) in lectures to a large, diverse second year class would engage students and lead to improved performance and persistence to an extent sufficient to offset the expense of the investment (or at all). Similarly, while several small-scale case studies (which may not be replicable or generalisable) attest to success in teaching innovations *to engage students* in the classroom via particular tools, techniques or environments, studies involving the *students themselves actively engaged* in the design and delivery of curriculum are conspicuously absent.

Moreover, the approach taken to studying student engagement in different countries is noticeably diverse. Many Australian studies and those in the United States of America tend to be founded upon more positivist<sup>1</sup> principles, being quantitative in nature with statistical analysis of data collected in large surveys.

### **1.3 Health warnings: evidence and practice**

There are four good reasons to treat the evidence presented here with some caution.

First, while the studies described in this deliverable meet the criteria above, the evidence and conclusions are time and place specific. Temporally, in each case they present a snapshot; in general there is a dearth of longitudinal studies of student engagement in any of the domains to which that term applies. In relation to context, the studies are (of course) situated by country, region, institution and sometimes discipline. These have important influences on the practices and their effects studied, so that findings may not be transferred, or completely transferred, to a different context.

According to Kuh (2009 (b) 314,

*...given the increasing diversity of college students today, it is erroneous to presume that what works in one setting for certain students will have the same effects in other settings for different types of students. Because institutional contexts differ, students' experiences will differ, as will what they get out of college.*

For example, Kuh (2009(a), 687) cautions that institution-specific analysis of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data “sometimes produce factor structures different than the five benchmarks or clusters of effective educational practices that NSSE uses to report its findings”, citing Gordon, Ludlum & Hoey (2006) as an example. Similarly, Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie & Gonyea (2008, 556) warn that:

*...simply offering [engaging] programs and practices does not guarantee that they will have the intended effects on student success institutional programs and practices must be of high quality, customised to meet the needs of students they are intended to reach, and firmly rooted in a student success-oriented campus culture.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Postivist research aims for objectivity, replicability and freedom from values. In social as well as natural sciences, it foregrounds the testing of hypotheses through empirical observation.

Second, several of the studies described here do not move beyond analysing findings and drawing conclusions from them. Student engagement is generally an area where research interest, particularly funded research, is sparked by a desire for enhancement. Yet many of the recommendations for practice based on the research conducted tend to be general and non-specific: the reader is left to infer how best these might translate into practice in their own situation. It is the researcher, however, who is best placed to make judgements about which direction, and how far, one can travel in terms of policy and practice based on their findings. This is a deficiency in this area as in many other substantive areas of educational research. We echo Janet Finch's comment as long ago as 1988 about the frequent absence of a final section entitled 'policy recommendations' in these studies of student engagement. Other studies err in the opposite direction, making recommendations for practice that are innocent of context or situation, assuming that what worked for them would necessarily work in all other cases and places.

Third, and related to the points above, great care is needed in considering whether and how to apply the evidence presented in these studies and others like them in one's own context. 'Evidence-based practice', much lauded in recent years, inherently contains a number of pitfalls. Contextual differences mean that what works in one place may not work, and even be counter-productive, in another. We know from numerous evaluation and research studies in different areas of education that the outcomes of a single policy or strategy are very different from place to place (see for example Bowe et al, 1992). Fullan and Scott (2009) for example talk about action based on evidence, but as important is interpretation of that evidence based on *good theory* and careful thought. Donald Schon warned about the alluring but deceptively simple link between evidence and practices in 1983, making a compelling argument for the necessity of cognitive work at the ground level by reflective practitioners. But to do this work they need tools for thinking. Action for change needs to be **both** evidentially and theoretically informed. Here we present only evidence.

Fourth, as noted above, research into student learning is often motivated by a desire for change; specifically the enhancement of student learning. Presenting evidence is only one dimension of this. As we just noted, tools for thinking such as theory and concepts are important too. But in considering enhancement issues, so is good thinking about how to bring about change. A good theory of change, and a subtle understanding of how research findings can be most effectively be used in any given context, especially in terms of strategy-development and implementation approaches, are crucial if effective change is to be invoked.

## 2. Presentation of evidential base

From the literature, we can assert with reasonable confidence, the following:

### 2.1 Engagement and individual student learning

#### 2.1.1 Student Engagement improves outcomes:

The National Survey of Student Engagement, pioneered in the USA and adopted in Canada, and modified for use in Australia and New Zealand (as AUSSE) and South African (as SASSE), and

currently being piloted in China, rests upon a body of knowledge built up since the mid-1980s establishing correlation between students' investment of time, effort and interest in a range of educationally-orientated activities, and favourable outcomes such as increased performance, persistence and satisfaction.

Astin's 1984 paper dealt with student involvement in their own learning, a concept that was subsequently expanded to incorporate earlier aspects such as "quality of effort" (Pace 1980, 1984) and "time-on-task" (Merwin 1969) as well as later work (Pace 1990, Chickering & Gamson 1987) on effective practices in teaching and learning, emerging as "student engagement" (Kuh *et al.* 1991, 1997 (b); Kuh 2004, 2008 (a); Pascarella & Terenzini 1991, 2005; Ewell & Jones 1996; Pace 1995; Tinto 1993; Coates 2006).

### **2.1.2 Specific features of Engagement improve outcomes:**

Specific aspects of engagement, such as involvement, time on task, and quality of effort, have repeatedly been linked to positive outcomes (see Astin 1984, 1999; Braxton, Milem & Sullivan 2000; Goodsell, Maher & Tinto 1992; Feldman & Newcomb 1969; Kuh 1995; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh & Whitt 2005; Kuh, Pace & Vesper 1997; Kuh, Whitt & Strange 1989; LaNasa, Cabrera & Trangsrud 2009; Pace 1990, 1995; Pascarella 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini 1991, 2005; Pike 2006(a), 2006(b); Tinto 1987, 1993). Chickering & Gamson (1987) summarised the evidence into seven effective practices in undergraduate teaching & learning, viz.

- student-staff contact;
- active learning;
- prompt feedback;
- time on task;
- high expectations;
- respect for diverse learning styles; and
- cooperation among students.

**Academic challenge** is central to the engagement construct (NSSE 2002, 10) and some disciplines are experienced as more challenging than others (see Pascarella 2001, Coates & Ainley 2007; Marks & Coates 2007). **Interacting with staff** has been shown to have a powerful impact on learning (Pascarella & Terenzini 1991, 2005; Astin 1993; Kuh & Hu 2001; Hausmann *et al.* 2007; Cuseo 2007) especially when it takes place **outside of the classroom** and responds to **individual student needs** (Kuh & Hu 2001; Chickering & Reisser 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini 1991). Participation in **extra-curricular activities** has also been shown to be positively correlated to improved outcomes (Pascarella & Terenzini 1991; McInnis *et al.* 2001, 2005; Scott 2006).

**Living on campus** has been positively correlated to engagement (Chickering 1975; Pike & Kuh 2005; Terenzini *et al.* 1996) and **participating in a learning** community has been linked to substantial increases in engagement (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research 2002; Pike 1999;



Pike et al. 1997; Zhao & Ku 2004). **Interactions with diverse peers** (in and out of the classroom) has been positively correlated with a range of positive outcomes, both personal and social (antonio *et al.* 2004; Chang, Astin & Kim 2004; Chang, Denson, Saenz & Misa 2006; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin 2002; Harper & antonio 2008; Hu & Kuh 2003; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn & Terenzini 1996; Villalpando 2002).

### **2.1.3 Engagement improves specific desirable outcomes:**

Studies have consistently shown correlations between engagement and improvements in specific desirable outcomes, including:

- general abilities and critical thinking (Endo & Harpel 1982; Gellin 2003; Kuh 2003; Kuh, Hu & Vesper 1997; Pascarella, Duby, Terenzini & Iverson 1983; Pascarella *et al.* 1996; Pike 1999, 2000; Pike & Killian 2001; Pike, Kuh & Gonyea 2003; Shulman 2002; Terenzini, Pascarella & Bliming 1996);
- practical competence and skills transferability (Kuh 1993, 1995);
- cognitive development (Anaya 1996; Astin 1993; Baxter Magolda 1992; Kuh 1993, 1995; Pascarella, Seifert & Blaich 2009; Pascarella & Terenzini 2005);
- self-esteem, psychosocial development, productive racial and gender identity formation (Bandura, Peluso, Ortman & Millard 2000; Chickering & Reisser 1993 Evans, Forney & Guido-DiBrito 1998; Harper 2004; Harper & Quaye 2007; Torres, Howard-Hamilton & Cooper 2003);
- moral & ethical development (Evans 1987; Jones & Watt, 1999; Liddell & Davis 1996; Rest 1993);
- student satisfaction (Kuh & Vesper 1997; Kuh *et al.* 2005; Kuh *et al.* 2007);
- accrual of social capital (Harper 2008);
- improved grades (Astin 1977, 1993; Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research 2002; Pike, Schroeder & Berry 1997; Tross, Harper Osher & Kneidinger 2000); and
- persistence (Astin 1975, 1984, 1993; Bean 2005; Berger & Milem 1999; Braxton, Milem & Sullivan 2000; Bridges, Cambridge, Kuh & Leegwater 2005; Milem & Berger 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini 2005; Peltier, Laden & Matranga 1999: Pike *et al.* 1997; Stage & Hossler 2000; Swail, Redd & Perna 2003; Tinto 1993, 2000, 2005).

### **2.1.4 The value of Engagement is no longer questioned:**

Since the publication in 1984 of the (US) National Institute of Education's *Involvement in Learning* Report, according to Kuh (2009 (a), 684):

*...virtually every report... emphasized to varying degrees the important link between student engagement and desired outcomes of college.*

Kuh (*ibid.*) goes on to list a string of reports including Association of American Colleges and Universities 2002, 2005, 2007; American College Personnel Association 1994; Education Commission of the States 1995; Joint Task Force on Student Learning 1998; Keeling 2004; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges 1997; National Commission on the Future of Higher Education 2006; and Wingspread Group on Higher Education 1993. In addition, Coates (2005, 26) lists reports from the UK and Australia which take the “engagement improves outcomes” proposition as read (Brennan *et al.* 2003; [Australian] Department of Education, Science and Training 2004).

### **2.1.5 Responsibility for Engagement is shared:**

While engagement ultimately requires the agency of the individual student (Krause & Coates 2008, Hu & Kuh 2001, the role of the institution (Kuh 2009; Kuh & Whit 1988; Coates 2005; Blackburn & Lawrence 1995; Fairweather 1996, 2002; Harper & Quaye 2009 (a)), teaching staff (Umbach & Wawrzynski 2005; Astin 1993; Kezar 1999; Davis & Murrell 1993; Quaye & Harper 2007) and other staff, such as student affairs professionals (Kuh 2009 (a)) has also been demonstrated. This is summed up by Coates (2005, 26):

*The concept of student engagement is based on the constructivist assumption that learning is influenced by how an individual participates in educationally purposeful activities. Learning is seen as a “joint proposition”..., however, which also depends on institutions and staff providing students with the conditions, opportunities and expectations to become involved. However, individual learners are ultimately the agents in discussions of engagement.*

## **2.2 Engagement and structure/process**

Literature on engagement in structure and process was very scant, and compelling evidence hard to come by. That which was found was concerned with student engagement in governance and leadership, rather than student involvement in shaping the design and delivery of curriculum in any direct sense – beyond student feedback questionnaires, which, as described by Kuh (2009), themselves constitute a form of engagement.

### **2.2.1 Student engagement in university governance benefits student representatives:**

Individual students benefit through their engagement as student representatives (Cress *et al.* 2001; Kuh 1994; Kuh & Lund 1994; Lizzio & Wilson 2009; Terenzini, Pascarella & Blimling 1996). Institutions also benefit (Kezar 2005; Magolda 2005; Little, Locke, Scesa & Williams 2009), as does society, more broadly (Teune 2001; Colby *et al.* 2003; Sumner 2008; Thornton & Jaeger 2007; Astin 1997).

### **2.2.2 Student representation on committees in the UK is generally felt to be effective:**

UK-based literature on student engagement through representation is typically not tagged as “student engagement” by its authors, resulting in a paucity of such literature falling within the scope of this review.

The CHERI study on student engagement in England found student representation on university committees to be near universal, usually through student union officers. Student representation at faculty/school level, and at programme level, is also common, though much variation exists about operation at these levels. Institutions consider student representation to be reasonably or very

effective, while student unions consider it less so. Institutions consider student representation to be more effective at programme and school level than at faculty level . (Little, Locke, Scesa & Williams 2009).

### **2.2.3.High-performing institutions share several “best practice” features regarding student engagement in governance:**

Kezar (2005), drawing on NSSE data of high-performing institutions, distilled several “best practice” tactics to foster shared leadership and collaboration between administrators, students and staff:

- develop a shared understanding of institutional mission and philosophy;
- use celebrations to engage the campus community in conversations about student success;
- advocate for shared governance;
- ensure that students have a prominent voice in campus governance;
- alter structures to encourage cross-function activities focussed on student success;
- tighten the philosophical and operational links between academic and student affairs;
- empower and support staff leadership;
- create and capitalise on cross-function, boundary-spanning activities.

### **2.2.4 High-performing institutions share several “best practice” features regarding student leadership**

Similarly, Magolda (2005) distilled “best practice” guidelines from NSSE data of best-performing institutions, relating to student leadership:

- understand and embrace your organisation’s mission, history and culture;
- collaboration is essential;
- improve group performance by doing less, better;
- focus on creating win-win scenarios for the organisational members and the students they serve;
- strengthen the organisation by strengthening its members;
- celebrate important events, transitions and passages.

### **2.2.5 Students in the UK are most commonly “engaged” through feedback questionnaires**

The CHERI study found a variety of methods existed for the administering of student feedback questionnaires at institutions in England. Limited evidence was found that student leadership in

investigating specific issues affecting students' learning experience led to greater student engagement. (Little, Locke, Scesa & Williams 2009)

## **2.3 Engagement and identity**

### **2.3.1 Prior characteristics do not determine whether students will engage:**

Studies have been unable to produce consistent relationships between characteristics that students bring with them to their studies – such as gender, ethnicity or ability levels on entering HE – and the extent to which they engage as students (see Bauer & Liang 2003; Endo & Harpel 1982; Hu & Kuh 2002; (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research 2002; Iverson, Pascarella & Terenzini 1984; Kuh *et al.* 2000; Pike 1999, 2000,; Pike & Killian 2001; Pike *et al.* 1997) and those relationships which were found were very weak (Pike 1999, 2000,; Pike & Killian 2001; Pike *et al.* 2003).

### **2.3.2 Engagement benefits all students – but some more than others:**

Engagement factors measured by survey instruments such as NSSE and AUSSE include time spent on campus and participation in extra-mural activities such as membership of university sports teams or clubs and societies, leading to concerns from some (see Bensimon 2007, Harper & Quay 2009) about whether the assumptions underlying the conceptualisation of engagement apply equally to “non-traditional” students – those who are not full-time, residential, straight-from-school aged students from dominant racial / ethnic groups and historically advantaged socio-economic classes.

However, empirical research has shown the opposite: while all students benefit from engagement, some students benefit more than others (Pascarella & Terenzini 2005). Studies have revealed the compensatory effect of engagement – meaning that those students who are least prepared academically benefit more from engagement than those who are most prepared, in terms of effects on grades and persistence (Carini, Kuh & Klein 2006; Cruce, Wolniak Seifert & Pascarella 2006; Kuh 2009 (b); Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie & Gonyea 2008; NSSE 2007; Pascarella & Terenzini 2005).

### **2.3.3 Engagement requires successful transition:**

“Becoming a student” and developing an identity as a student is a prerequisite for successful engagement (Crossan, Field, Gallacher & Merrill 2003; Gallacher *et al.* 2002; Jackson 2003; Kuh *et al.* 2005; Krause & Coates 2008) and developing a sense of belonging to the university community (Zhao & Kuh 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini 2005; Krause 2005, 2006; Krause *et al.* 2005). Many students from “non-traditional” backgrounds experience “culture shock” on entering university (Griffiths, Winstanley & Gabriel 2005; Forsyth & Furlong 2003; Krause & Coates 2008; Christie *et al.* 2008). They experience tensions between normative, essentialised notions of student identity and their experiences as “non-traditional” students (Christie, Munro & Wager 2005; Christie *et al.* 2008; Thomas & Quinn 2006; Hughes 2002; Waller 2006). Bensimon (2009, xxii-xxiii) describes how

*...productive engagement is an important means by which students develop feelings about their peers, professors and institutions that give them a sense of connectedness, affiliation, and belonging, while simultaneously offering rich opportunities for learning and development.*

Thus, for students struggling with transition, engagement in those activities strongly correlated with positive educational outcomes can facilitate a sense of belonging and a positive student identity (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella & Hagedorn 1999; Kuh, Palmer & Kish 2003; Kuh *et al.* 2005).

#### **2.3.4 Some students experience engagement negatively:**

Some students, particularly “non-traditional” students, experience university culture as foreign, alienating or hostile (Krause 2005, 2006; Forsyth & Furlong 2003; Gallego & Hollingsworth 2000; MacKinnon & Manathunga 2003; Ten Yew & Farrell 2001). Despite demonstrating high levels of engagement against measures of participation, they still feel overwhelmed and isolated (Forsyth & Furlong 2003; Krause 2005, 2006). These groups include:

- international students (Anderson, Carmichael, Harper & Huang 2009);
- students with disabilities (Nichols & Quaye, 2009);
- LGBTQ [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning] students (Schueler, Hoffman & Peterson 2009);
- students from minority religious groups (Mahaffey & Smith 2009);
- racial / ethnic minority students in different contexts (Harper 2009; Quaye, Tambascia & Talesh 2009; Hawkins & Larabee 2009; Sallee, Logan, Sims & Harrington 2009);
- gender minority students in different contexts (Rypisi, Malcom & Kim 2009; Harris & Lester 2009);
- commuter / part-time / transfer / returning students (Silverman, Aliabadi & Stiles 2009;) and
- low income, first generation students (Gupton, Castelo-Rodriguez, Martinez & Quintanar 2009).

Campuses in the USA are reportedly becoming increasingly segregated (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson & Allen 1999), with minority student groups reporting little interaction between themselves and dominant groupings and little attention on improving climate (Ancis, Sedlacek & Mohr 2000; Cabrera *et al.* 1999; Harper & Hurtado 2007; Hurtado 1992). Hostile climates reduce “non-traditional” students’ chances of engagement, persistence or success (Harper & Quaye 2009 (a))

Thus, Harper & Quaye (2009 (a), 3) note:

*We are persuaded by a large volume of empirical evidence that confirms that strategizing ways to increase the engagement of various student populations, especially those for whom engagement is known to be problematic, is a worthwhile endeavour. The gains and outcomes are too robust to leave to chance, and social justice is unlikely to ensue if some students come to enjoy the beneficial byproducts of engagement but others do not.*

## Conclusion

A substantial, robust body of evidence exists to support assertions that individual student engagement in educationally purposive activities leads to more favourable educational outcomes. Despite the rhetoric on the (uncontested) value of student engagement for individual students, their institutions, the higher education sector and society more generally, very little evidence can be found in the literature of students being engaged in issues beyond their own learning, as individuals, in any direct way. Students are typically presented as the customers of engagement, rather than co-authors. Where students are involved in shaping the design and delivery of curriculum, it tends mostly to be indirectly through feedback surveys, often with problems reported around closing the feedback loop. Student participation on programme or departmental committees has been found in several institutions in England, but great variability exists at this level and there little evidence of the nature, function or quality of this form of engagement.

Engagement was found to be particularly beneficial to those groups of students least prepared for higher education, though these students were more likely to view engagement as a negative process owing to feelings of isolation, alienation or being overwhelmed.

The “student engagement” construct enjoys widespread uncritical acceptance across educational structures and has become pervasive in reports in several countries, particularly the USA and Australia.

*Recommendations for further study* include UK-based longitudinal, cross-institution studies (possibly by discipline / discipline cluster) to glean a picture of student engagement against which to frame case studies; more in-depth study to understand causation of observed phenomena such as the compensatory effect of engagement or the conflicting evidence surrounding expenditure and engagement; and studies of direct student engagement in the shaping of design and delivery of curriculum.

## References

- Anaya, G. 1999, "College Impact on Student Learning: Comparing the Use of Self-Reported Gains, Standardized Test Scores and College Grades.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 40, pp. 499-527.
- Ancis, J., Sedlacek, W. & Mohr, J. 2000, "Student Perceptions of Campus Cultural Climate by Race.", *Journal of Counseling and Development*, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 180-185.
- Anderson, G., Carmichael, K.Y., Harper, T.J. & Huang, T. 2009, "International Students at Four-Year Institutions: Developmental Needs, Issues and Strategies." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 17-37.
- antonio, a.I., Chang, M.J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D.A., Levin, S. & Milem, J.F. 2004, "Effects of Racial Diversity on Complex Thinking in College Students.", *Psychological Science*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 507-510.
- Astin, A.W. 1999, "Involvement in Learning revisited", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. March / April, no. 9.
- Astin, A.W. 1997, "Liberal Education and Democracy: The Case for Pragmatism." in *Education and Democracy Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America.*, ed. R. Orill, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, pp. 207-223.
- Astin, A.W. 1993, *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Astin, A.W. 1984, "Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 25, pp. 297-308.
- Astin, A.W. 1977, *Four Critical Years*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Astin, A.W. 1975, *Preventing Students From Dropping Out*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Bamber, V., Trowler, P., Saunders, M. & Knight, P. (eds) 2009, *Enhancing Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Theory, Cases, Practices.*, Open University Press / SRHE, Buckingham.
- Bandura, A., Millard, M., Peluso, E.A. & Ortman, N. 2000, "Effects of Peer Education Training on Peer Educators: Leadership, Self-Esteem, Health Knowledge and health Behaviors.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 41, pp. 471-478.
- Bauer, K.W. & Liang, Q. 2003, "The Effect of Personality and Precollege Characteristics on First Year Activities and Academic Performance.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 44, pp. 277-290.
- Baxter Magolda, M.B. 1992, "Cocurricular Influences on College Students' Intellectual Development.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 33, pp. 203-213.
- Bean, J.P. 2005, "Nine Themes of College Student Retention." in *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success*, ed. A. Seidman, ACE & Praeger, Washington DC, pp. 215-244.
- Bensimon, E.M. 2009, "Foreword" in *Student Engagement in Higher Education*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & Oxon, pp. xxi-xxvi.

- Bensimon, E.M. 2007, "The Underestimated Significance of Practitioner Knowledge in the Scholarship of Student Success.", *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 30, pp. 441-469.
- Berger, J.B. & Milem, J.F. 1999, "The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a causal model of student persistence", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 40, pp. 641-664.
- Blackburn, R. & Lawrence, J. 1995, *Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Bloom, B.S. (ed) 1956, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: the classification of educational goals*, D McKay & Co, Inc., New York.
- Bowe, R., Ball, S.J. & with Gold, A. 1992, *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology*, Routledge, London.
- Braxton, J.M., Milem, J.F. & Sullivan, A.S. 2000, "The Influence of Active Learning on the College Student Departure Process: Towards a Revision of Tinto's Theory.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 71, pp. 569-590.
- Brennan, J., Brighton, R., Moon, N., Richardson, J., Rindi, J. & Williams, R. 2003, *Collecting and Using Student Feedback on Quality and Standards of Learning and Teaching in HE: A report to Higher Education Funding Council for England.*, HEFCE, Bristol.
- Bridges, B.K., Cambridge, B., Kuh, G.D. & Leegwater, L.H. 2005, "Student Engagement at Minority Serving Institutions: Emerging Lessons from the BEAMS Project." in *What Works: Achieving Success in Minority Retention. New Directions for Institutional Research.*, ed. G.H. Gaither, 125th edn, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 25-43.
- Cabrera, A.F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E.T. & Hagedorn, L.S. 1999, "Campus Racial Climate and the Adjustment of Students to College: A Comparison between White Students and African American Students.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 134-202.
- Carini, R.M., Kuh, G.D. & Klein, S.P. 2006, "Student Engagement and Student Learning: Testing the Linkages", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 1-24.
- Chang, M.J., Astin, A.W. & Kim, D. 2004, "Cross-Racial Interaction Among Undergraduates: Some Consequences, Causes and Patterns.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 529-553.
- Chang, M.J., Chang, J.C. & Ledesma, M.C. 2005, "Beyond Magical Thinking: doing the real work of diversifying our institutions", *About Campus*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 9-16.
- Chang, M.J., Denson, N., Saenz, V. & Misa, K. 2006, "The Educational Benefits of Sustaining Cross-Racial Interaction Among Undergraduates.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 77, pp. 430-455.
- Chickering, A.W. 1975, *Commuting versus Resident Students: Overcoming the Educational Inequities of Living Off Campus*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Chickering, A.W. & Gamson, Z.F. 1987, "Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education", *AAHE Bulletin*, vol. March, pp. 3-7.
- Chickering, A.W. & Reisser, L. 1993, *Education and Identity*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Christie, H., Munro, M. & Wager, F. 2005, ""Day Students" in Higher Education: Widening Access Students and Successful Transition to University Life.", *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 3-29.



- Christie, H., Tett, L., Cree, V., Hounsell, J. & McCune, V. 2008, "'A Real Rollercoaster of Confidence and Emotions': Learning to be a University Student", *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 567-581.
- Coates, H. 2010, "Development of the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE)", *Higher Education*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Coates, H. 2009, *Engaging Students for Success - 2008 Australasian survey of student engagement.*, Australian Council for Educational Research, Australia.
- Coates, H. 2005, "The Value of Student Engagement for Higher Education Quality Assurance", *Quality in Higher Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 25-36.
- Coates, H.C. 2006, *Student Engagement in Campus-based and Online Education: University Connections*. Routledge, London.
- Coates, H.C. & Ainley, J. 2007, *Graduate Course Experience, 2006: The Report of the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)*, GCA, Parkville.
- Coates, H. 2007, "A Model of Online and General Campus-Based Student Engagement.", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 121-141; pp. 21.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E. & Stephens, J. 2003, *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Cress, C.M., Astin, H.S., Zimmerman, B., Oster, K. & Burkhardt, J.C. 2001, "Developmental Outcomes of College Students' Involvement in Leadership Activities.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 15-29.
- Crossan, B., Field, J., Gallacher, J. & Merrill, B. 2003, "Understanding Participation in Learning for Non-Traditional Adult Learners: Learning Careers and the Construction of Learner Identities", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 55-67.
- Cruce, T., Wolniak, G.C., Seifert, T.A. & Pascarella, E.T. 2006, "Impacts of Good Practices on Cognitive Development, Learning Orientations, and Graduate Degree Plans during the First Year of College.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 47, pp. 365-383.
- Cuseo, J. 2007, "The Empirical Case Against Large Class Size: Adverse Effects on the Teaching, Learning and Retention of First-Year Students.", *The Journal of Faculty Development*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5-21.
- Dale, C. & Lane, A.M. 2007, "A wolf in sheep's clothing? An analysis of student engagement with virtual learning environments.", *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 100-108.
- Davis, T.M. & Murrell, P.H. 1993, *Turning Teaching into Learning: The Role of Student Responsibility in the Collegiate Experience.*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington DC.
- Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) 2004, *Learning and Teaching Performance Fund: Issues paper.*, Department of Education Science and Training, Canberra.
- Endo, J.J. & Harpel, R.L. 1982, "The Effect of Student-Faculty Interaction on Students' Educational Outcomes.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 16, pp. 115-137.
- Evans, N.J. 1987, "A Framework for Assisting Student Affairs Staff in Fostering Moral Development.", *Journal of Counseling and Development*, vol. 66, pp. 191-193.

- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S. & Guido-DiBrito, F. 1998, *Student Development in College: Theory, Research & Practice*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Ewell, P.T. & Jones, D.P. 1996, *Indicators of "Good Practice" in Undergraduate Education: A Handbook for Development and Implementation*. Boulder, Colorado edn, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Fairweather, J. 2002, "The Mythologies of Faculty Productivity: Implications for Institutional Policy and Decision Making.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 73, pp. 26-48.
- Fairweather, J. 1996, *Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life*. Allyn & Bacon, Boston.
- Feldman, K.A. & Newcomb, T. 1969, *The Impact of College on Students*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Finch, J. 1988, "Ethnography and Public Policy" in *Education, Training and the New Vocationalism*, ed. A.e.a. Pollard, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 185-200.
- Forrester, G., Motteram, G., Parkinson, G. & Slaouti, D. 2004, "Going the distance: students experiences of induction to distance learning in higher education.", *Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference* England., pp. 1.
- Forsyth, A. & Furlong, A. 2003, "Access to Higher Education and Disadvantaged Young People.", *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 205-225.
- Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C. & Paris, A.H. 2004, "School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence", *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 59-109.
- Fullan, M. & Scott, G. 2009, *Turnaround Leadership for Higher Education*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Gallacher, J., Crossan, B., Field, J. & Merrill, B. 2002, "Learning Careers and the Social Space: Exploring the Fragile Identities of Adult Returners in the New Furthr Education.", *International Journal of Lifelong Learning*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 493-509.
- Gallego, M.A. & Hollingsworth, S. (eds) 2000, *What Counts as Literacy.*, Teachers College Columbia University, New York.
- Gellin, A. 2003, "The Effect of Undergraduate Student Involvement on Critical Thinking: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature, 1991-2000", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 44, pp. 746-762.
- Gonyea, R.M. & Kuh, G.D. 2009, "NSSE, Organizational Intelligence, and the Institutional Researcher.", *New Directions for Institutional Research*, vol. 141, no. Spring, pp. 107.
- Goodsell, A., Maher, M. & Tinto, V. (eds) 1992, *Collaborative learning: A sourcebook for higher education*, National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Gordon, J., Ludlum, J. & Hoey, J.J. 2006, "Validating the National Survey of Student Engagement Against Student Outcomes: Are They Related?", *Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research*. Chicago, Illinois, .
- Graham, C.R., Tripp, T.R., Seawright, L. & Joeckel, G.L., III 2007, "Empowering or Compelling Reluctant Participators Using Audience Response Systems.", *Active Learning in Higher Education*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 233-258; pp. 26.

- Greenbank, P., Hepworth, S. & Mercer, J. 2009, "Term-time employment and the Student Experience", *Education and Training*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 43-55.
- Griffiths, S., Winstanley, D. & Gabriel, Y. 2005, "Learning Shock: The Trauma of Return to Formal Learning.", *Management Learning*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 275-197.
- Gupton, J.T., Castelo-Rodriguez, C., Martinez, D.A. & Quintanar, I. 2009, "Creating a Pipeline to Engage Low-Income, First-Generation College Students." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 243-259.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E.L., Hurtado, S. & Gurin, G. 2002, "Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes.", *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 72, pp. 330-366.
- Habib, B. 2007, "Breaking the ritual : getting students to participate in discussion-based tutorials in the social sciences.", *Enhancing higher education, theory and scholarship : proceedings of the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference, 8-11 July 2007, Adelaide, Australia'*, eds. G. Crisp, M. Hicks, J. Burdett, L. Gannaway, L. Maddox & T. Winning, HERDSA, , pp. 205.
- Harper, S.R. 2008, "Realizing the intended outcomes of *Brown*: High-Achieving African American Male Undergraduates and Social Capital.", *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 1-24.
- Harper, S.R. 2004, "The Measure of a Man: Conceptualizations of Masculinity Among High-Achieving African American Male College Students.", *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 89-107.
- Harper, S.R. & Antonio, A.I. 2008, "Not by Accident: Intentionality in Diversity, Learning, and Engagement." in *Creating Inclusive Campus Environments for Cross-Cultural Learning and Student Engagement.*, ed. S.R. Harper, NASPA, Washington DC, pp. 1-18.
- Harper, S.R. 2009, "Institutional Seriousness Concerning Black Male Student Engagement: Necessary Conditions and Collaborative Partnerships." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 137-155.
- Harper, S.R., Carini, R.M., Bridges, B.K. & Hayek, J.C. 2004, "Gender Differences in Student Engagement among African American Undergraduates at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 271-284; pp. 14.
- Harper, S.R. & Hurtado, S. 2007, "Nine Themes in Campus Racial Climates and Implications for Institutional Transformation." in *Responding to the Realities of Race on Campus.*, eds. S.R. Harper & L.D. Patton, New Directions for Student Services No 120 edn, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 7-24.
- Harper, S.R. & Quaye, S.J. 2007, "Student Organizations as Venues for Black Identity Expression and Development among African American Male Student Leaders.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 133-159.
- Harper, S.R. & Quaye, S.J. 2009 (a), "Beyond Sameness, with Engagement and Outcomes for All" in *Student Engagement in Higher Education*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 1-15.
- Harper, S.R. & Quaye, S.J. (eds) 2009 (b), *Student Engagement in Higher Education*, Routledge, New York & Oxon.
- Harris, F.I. & Lester, J. 2009, "Gender-Specific Approaches to Enhancing Identity Development among Undergraduate Women and Men." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education:*

- Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 99-115.
- Haug, K.H. 2006, "Students development of assessment criteria and enhancement of learning potential.", *Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research*England., pp. 1.
- Hausman, L., Schofield, J. & Woods, R. 2007, "Sense of Belonging as a Predictor of Intentions to Persist Among African American and White First-Year College Students.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 803-839.
- Hawkins, V.M. & Larabee, H.J. 2009, "Engaging Racial/Ethnic Minority Students in Out-of-Class Activities on Predominantly White Campuses." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 179-197.
- HEFCE 2008, *Tender for a study into student engagement*, Call for tenders edn, Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol.
- Heiberger, G. & Harper, R. 2008, "Have You Facebooked Astin Lately? Using Technology to Increase Student Involvement.", *New Directions for Student Services*, vol. 124, no. Winter 2008, pp. 19-35.
- Hillard, V.E. 1988, "Boredom and the Pedagogy of Responsibility.", *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association*Central States Speech Association, , pp. 1.
- Hockings, C. 2009, "Reaching the Students that Student-Centred Learning Cannot Reach.", *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 83-98; pp. 16.
- Holley, D. & Oliver, M. 2010, "Student Engagement and Blended Learning: Portraits of Risk.", *Computers and Education*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 693-700; pp. 8.
- Hu, S. & Kuh, G.D. 2003, "Diversity Experiences and College Student Learning and Development.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 320-334.
- Hu, S. & Kuh, G.D. 2001, "Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposeful activities: the influences of student and institutional characteristics.", *Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Annual Conference*.
- Hu, S. & Kuh, G.D. 2002, "Being (Dis)Engaged in Educationally Purposeful Activities: The Influences of Student and Institutional Characteristics.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 555-575.
- Hu, S., Kuh, G.D. & Li, S. 2008, "The Effects of Engagement in Inquiry-Oriented Activities on Student Learning and Personal Development.", *Innovative Higher Education*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 71-81; pp. 11.
- Hughes, C. 2002, "Beyond the Poststructuralist-modern Impasse: The Woman Returner as "exile" and "nomad".", *Gender and Education*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 411-424.
- Hurtado, S. 1992, "The Campus Racial Climate: Contexts for Conflict.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 539-569.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A. & Allen, W. 1999, *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Vol 26 No 8 edn, The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Washington DC.

- Hyland, F. 2003, "Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback.", *System*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 217-230.
- Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research 2002, *From Promise to Progress: How Colleges and Universities are Using Student Engagement Results to Improve Collegiate Quality.*, Indiana Center for Postsecondary Research, Bloomington.
- Iversen, B.K., Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P.T. 1984, "Informal Faculty-Student Contact and Commuter College Freshmen.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 21, pp. 123-136.
- Jackson, C. 2003, "Transitions into Higher Education: Gendered Implications for Academic Self-Concept.", *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 331-346.
- Jankowska, M. & Atlay, M. 2008, "Use of Creative Space in Enhancing Students' Engagement.", *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 271-279; pp. 9.
- Jary, D. & Lebeau, Y. 2009, "The student experience and subject engagement in UK sociology: a proposed typology", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 697-712.
- Jones, C.E. & Watt, J.D. 1999, "Psychosocial Development and Moral Orientation Among Traditional-Aged College Students.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 40, pp. 125-132.
- Jones, R.C. 2008, "The "Why" of Class Participation: A Question Worth Asking.", *College Teaching*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 59-63; pp. 5.
- Kandiko, C.B. 2008, "Student engagement in two countries : a comparative study using National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data.", *Journal of Institutional Research*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 71-86.
- Keenan, C. 2007, "Case 6 : students getting down to work before they start at university : a model for improving retention." in *Improving student retention in higher education : the role of teaching and learning*, eds. G. Crosling, L. Thomas & M. Heagney, ED: 20080912. edn, Routledge, London, pp. 82-87.
- Kezar, A. 1999, *Higher Education Trends: Faculty.*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington DC.
- Kezar, A. 2007, "Creating and Sustaining a Campus Ethos Encouraging Student Engagement.", *About Campus*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 13-18; pp. 6.
- Kezar, A. 2005, *Promoting Student Success: The Importance of Shared Leadership and Collaboration. Occasional Paper No. 4.*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Bloomington Indiana.
- Kezar, A.J. 2006, "The Impact of Institutional Size on Student Engagement.", *NASPA Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 87-114; pp. 28.
- King, S.O. & Robinson, C.L. 2009, ""Pretty Lights" and Maths! Increasing Student Engagement and Enhancing Learning through the Use of Electronic Voting Systems.", *Computers and Education*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 189-199; pp. 11.
- Kinzie, J. 2005, *Promoting Student Success: What Faculty Members Can Do.* , National Survey of Student Engagement, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Kinzie, J.L., Thomas, A.D., Palmer, M.M., Umbach, P.D. & Kuh, G.D. 2007, "Women Students at Coeducational and Women's Colleges: How Do Their Experiences Compare?", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 145-165; pp. 21.

- Kinzie, J. & Kuh, G.D. 2004, "Going DEEP: Learning from Campuses that Share Responsibility for Student Success.", *About Campus*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 2-8; pp. 7.
- Knight, P. & Trowler, P. 2001, *Departmental Leadership for Higher Education: new directions for communities of practice*, Open University Press / SRHE, Buckingham.
- Koljatic, M. & Kuh, G.D. 2001, "A Longitudinal Assessment of College Student Engagement in Good Practices in Undergraduate Education.", *Higher Education*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 351-371.
- Krause, K. 2006. *Accommodating diverse approaches to student engagement*. Keynote paper presented at New Zealand Quality Enhancement Meeting 11, Wellington, New Zealand, 28-29 September.
- Krause, K. 2005, "Understanding and Promoting Student Engagement in University Learning Communities", *Engaged, inert or otherwise occupied?: Deconstructing the 21st century undergraduate student; Keynote address at the James Cook University Symposium "Sharing Scholarship in Learning and Teaching: Engaging Students"* James Cook University, Townsville / Cairns, Queensland, Australia, pp. 1.
- Krause, K. & Coates, H. 2008, "Students' Engagement in First-Year University.", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 493-505; pp. 13.
- Krause, K., Hartley, R., James, R. & McInnis, C. 2005, *The First Year Experience in Australian Universities: Findings from a Decade of National Studies.*, Department of Education Science and Training, Canberra.
- Kuh, G.D. 2009 (c), "The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual and Empirical Foundations.", *New Directions for Institutional Research*, vol. Spring 2009, no. 141, pp. 5-20.
- Kuh, G.D. 2009 (b), "Afterword" in *Student Engagement in Higher Education*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & Oxon, pp. 313-318.
- Kuh, G.D. 2009 (a), "What Student Affairs Professionals Need to Know about Student Engagement.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 683-706; pp. 24.
- Kuh, G.D. 2008 (b), "Diagnosing why some students don't succeed.", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 55, no. 16, pp. A72.
- Kuh, G.D. 2008 (a), *High-Impact Practices: What they Are, Who has Access to them, and Why they Matter.*, Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington DC.
- Kuh, G.D. 2007, "How to Help Students Achieve.", *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 53, no. 41, pp. 12-pp. 1.
- Kuh, G.D. 2005 (a), *Promoting Student Success: What Campus Leaders Can Do.* , National Survey of Student Engagement, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Kuh, G.D. 2005 (b), "Putting Student Engagement Results to Use: Lessons from the Field.", *Assessment Update*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 12-13; pp. 2.
- Kuh, G.D. 2003, "What We're Learning about Student Engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for Effective Educational Practices.", *Change*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 24-32.
- Kuh, G.D. 2001, "Assessing What Really Matters to Student Learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement.", *Change*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 10-17.

- Kuh, G.D. 1995, "The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 66, pp. 123-155.
- Kuh, G.D. 1994, *Student Learning Outside the Classroom: Transcending Artificial Boundaries.*, Office of Educational Research & Improvement, Washington DC.
- Kuh, G.D. 1993, "In their Own Words: What Students Learn Outside the Classroom.", *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 30, pp. 277-304.
- Kuh, G.D., Cruce, T.M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J. & Gonyea, R.M. 2008, "Unmasking the Effects of Student Engagement on First-Year College Grades and Persistence.", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 79, no. 5, pp. 540-563; pp. 24.
- Kuh, G.D., Hu, S. & Vesper, N. 2000, ""They Shall Be Known By What They Do": An Activities-Based Typology of College Students.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 41, pp. 228-244.
- Kuh, G.D. & Hu, S. 2001, "The effects of student faculty interaction in the 1990s", *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 309-332.
- Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J.A., Bridges, B.K. & Hayek, J.C. 2007, "Piecing together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and recommendations", *ASHE Higher Education Report*, vol. 32, no. 5.
- Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H. & Whitt, E.J. 2005, "Never Let It Rest: Lessons about Student Success from High-Performing Colleges and Universities.", *Change The Magazine of Higher Learning*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 44-pp. 8.
- Kuh, G.D. & Lund, J.P. 1994, "What Students Gain from Participating in Student Government.", *New Directions for Student Services*, vol. 66, pp. 5-17.
- Kuh, G.D., Pace, C.R. & Vesper, N. 1997 (a), "The development of process indicators to estimate student gains associated with good practice in undergraduate education", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 435-454.
- Kuh, G.D., Palmer, M. & Kish, K. 2003, "The Value of Educationally Purposeful Out-of-Class Experiences." in *Involvement in Campus Activities and the Retention of First Year College Students.*, eds. T.L. Skipper & R. Argo, The First-Year Monograph Series No 36 edn, University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition, Columbia, South Carolina, pp. 19-34.
- Kuh, G.D. & Umbach, P.D. 2004, "College and Character: Insights from the National Survey of Student Engagement.", *New Directions for Institutional Research*, vol. Summer, no. 122, pp. 37-54.
- Kuh, G.D. & Vesper, N. 1997, "A comparison of student experiences with good practices in undergraduate education between 1990 and 1994", *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 21, pp. 43-61.
- Kuh, G.D., Vesper, N., Connolly, M.R. & Pace, C.R. 1997 (b), *College Student Experiences Questionnaire: Revised Norms for the Third Edition*, Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Kuh, G.D. & Whitt, E.J. 1988, *The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Vol 17 No 1 edn, The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Washington DC.

- Kuh, G.D., Whitt, E.J. & Strange, C.C. 1989, "The Contributions of Institutional Agents to High Quality Out-of-Class experiences for College Students.", *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association* San Francisco, .
- Kuh, G.D., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., Andreas, R.E., Lyons, J.W., Strange, C.C., Krehbiel, L.E. & MacKay, K.A. 1991, *Involving Colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- LaNasa, S.M., Cabrera, A.F. & Trangsrud, H. 2009, "The Construct Validity of Student Engagement: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis Approach.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 315-332; pp. 18.
- Leese, M. 2009, "Out of Class--Out of Mind? The Use of a Virtual Learning Environment to Encourage Student Engagement in Out of Class Activities.", *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 70-77; pp. 8.
- Levy, S. & Campbell, H. 2007, "Promoting motivation and engagement among academically at risk students.", *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 17-25.
- Liddle, D.L. & Davis, T.L. 1996, "The Measure of Moral Orientation: Reliability and Validity Evidence.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 37, pp. 485-493.
- Little, B., Locke, W., Scesa, A. & Williams, R. 2009, *Report to HEFCE on Student Engagement*, Centre for Higher Education Research and Information, London.
- Lizzio, A. & Wilson, K. 2009, "Student participation in university governance: the role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees", *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 69-84.
- Lizzio, A. & Wilson, K. 2006, "Enhancing the Effectiveness of Self-Managed Learning Groups: Understanding Students' Choices and Concerns.", *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 689-703; pp. 15.
- Lovatt, J., Finlayson, O.E. & James, P. 2007, "Evaluation of student engagement with two learning supports in the teaching of 1st year undergraduate chemistry.", *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 390-402.
- Luan, J., Zhao, C.M. & Hayek, J.C. 2009, "Using a Data Mining Approach to Develop a Student Engagement-Based Institutional Typology. ", *IR Applications*, vol. 18, pp. 1-19.
- Mackinnon, D. & Manathunga, C. 2003, "Going Global with Assessment: What to do when the Dominant Culture's Literacy Drives Assessment.", *Higher Education Research and Development*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 131-144.
- Magolda, P. 2005, *Promoting Student Success: What Student Leaders Can Do*. , National Survey of Student Engagement, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Mahaffey, C.J. & Smith, S.A. 2009, "Creating Welcoming Campus Environments for Students from Minority Religious Groups." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 81-97.
- Maier, H.R. & Rowan, T.S.C. 2007, "Increasing student engagement with graduate attributes.", *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, [Online], vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 21-29.
- Mann, S.J. 2001, "Alternative Perspectives on the Student Experience: Alienation and Engagement.", *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 7-19.



- Marks, G.N. & Coates, H.C. 2007, *Refinement of the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund Adjustment Process.*, Department of Education Science and Training, Canberra.
- Markwell, D. 2007, "The Challenge of Student Engagement", *Keynote address at the Teaching and Learning Forum, University of Western Australia, 30-31 January 2007* University of Western Australia, , pp. 1.
- Marton, F. & Saljo, R. 1976, "On qualitative differences in learning - I: Outcomes and process", *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 46, pp. 4-11.
- McClenney, K.M. & Greene, T. 2005, "A Tale of Two Students: Building a Culture of Engagement in the Community College.", *About Campus*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 2-7; pp. 6.
- McCormick, A.C. 2009, "Toward Reflective Accountability: Using NSSE for Accountability and Transparency.", *New Directions for Institutional Research*, vol. Spring, no. 141, pp. 97-106.
- McInnis, C., Coates, H.C., Jenz, F., Hooper, C. & Vu, T. 2005, *Study Abroad and study Exchange Systems in Industrialised Countries.*, Australian Education International, Canberra.
- McInnis, C., Griffin, P., James, R. & Coates, H.C. 2001, *Development of the Course Experience Questionnaire.*, Department of Education Science and Training, Canberra.
- McRae, D. 2007, *Student engagement : attendance, participation and belonging.*, Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.
- Merwin, J.C. 1969, "Historical View of Changing Concepts of Evaluation" in *Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Methods.*, ed. R.L. Tyler, 68th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II edn, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Milem, J.F. & Berger, J.B. 1997, "A Modified Model of College Student Persistence: Exploring the Relationship between Astin's Theory of Involvement and Tinto's Theory of Student Departure.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 387-400.
- Mills, C.W. 1959, *The Sociological Imagination*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Moore, S., Armstrong, C. & Pearson, J. 2008, "Lecture Absenteeism among Students in Higher Education: A Valuable Route to Understanding Student Motivation.", *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 15-24; pp. 10.
- Mullen, C.A. 2000, "Linking research and teaching: a study of graduate student engagement.", *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 5-21.
- Nair, C.S., Adams, P. & Mertova, P. 2008, "Student Engagement: The Key to Improving Survey Response Rates.", *Quality in Higher Education*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 225-232; pp. 8.
- National Survey of Student Engagement 2009 (a), *Assessment for Improvement: Tracking Student Engagement Over Time. Annual Results 2009.*, NSSE, Bloomington Indiana.
- National Survey of Student Engagement 2009 (b), *Using NSSE to Assess and Improve Undergraduate Education: Lessons from the Field.*, NSSE, Bloomington Indiana.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2007, *Experiences that Matter: Enhancing Student Learning and Success.*, Indiana Center for Postsecondary Research, Bloomington.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2002, *From Promise to Progress: How Colleges and Universities are using Student Engagement results to improve Collegiate Quality.*, Indiana Center for Postsecondary Research, Bloomington.

- Neumann, D.L. & Hood, M. 2009, "The Effects of Using a Wiki on Student Engagement and Learning of Report Writing Skills in a University Statistics Course.", *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 382-398; pp. 17.
- Nichols, A.H. & Quaye, S.J. 2009, "Beyond Accommodation: Removing Barriers to Academic and Social Engagement for Students with Disabilities." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 39-59.
- Nulty, D.D. & Meyers, N.M. 2002, "Assessment and student engagement: some principles.", *Learning Communities and Assessment Cultures Conference organised by the EARLI Special Interest Group on Assessment and Evaluation* EARLI, England., pp. 1.
- Pace, C.R. 1995, "From good practices to good products: Relating good practices in undergraduate education to student achievement", *Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research* Association for Institutional Research, .
- Pace, C.R. 1990, *The Undergraduates: A Report of their Activities and College Experiences in the 1980s*. Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, Los Angeles.
- Pace, C.R. 1984, *Measuring the Quality of College Student Experiences. An Account of the Development and Use of the College Student Experience Questionnaire*, Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles.
- Pace, C.R. 1980, "Measuring the Quality of Student Effort.", *Current Issues in Higher Education*, vol. 2, pp. 10-16.
- Pascarella, E.T. 2001, "Using Student Self-Reported Gains to Estimate Collegiate Impact: A Cautionary Tale.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 42, pp. 488-492.
- Pascarella, E.T. 1985, "College Environmental Influences on Learning and Cognitive Development: A Critical Review and Synthesis." in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research.*, ed. J.C. Smart, Agathon, New York, pp. 1-62.
- Pascarella, E.T., Duby, P.D., Terenzini, P.T. & Iverson, B.K. 1983, "Student-Faculty Relationships and Freshman Year Intellectual Growth in a Nonresidential Setting.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 24, pp. 395-402.
- Pascarella, E.T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L.S. & Terenzini, P.T. 1996, "Influence of Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College", *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 67, pp. 174-195.
- Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P.T. 2005, *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research (Vol. 2)*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P.T. 1991, *How College Affects Students: Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Pascarella, E.T., Seifert, T.A. & Blaich, C. 2010, "How Effective Are the NSSE Benchmarks in Predicting Important Educational Outcomes?", *Change The Magazine of Higher Learning*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 16-22; pp. 7.
- Peltier, G.L., Laden, R. & Matranga, M. 1999, "Student Persistence in College: A Review of Research", *Journal of College Student Retention*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 357-375.
- Pike, G.D., Schroeder, C.C. & Berry, T.R. 1997, "Enhancing the Educational Impact of Residence Halls: The Relationship between Residential Learning Communities and First Year College Experiences and Persistence.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 38, pp. 609-621.

- Pike, G.R. 2006 (b), "The Convergent and Discriminant Validity of NSSE Scalet Scores.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 47, pp. 551-564.
- Pike, G.R. 2006 (a), "The Dependability of NSSE Scales for College and Department-led Assessmen", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 47, pp. 177-195.
- Pike, G.R. 2000, "The Influence of Fraternity or Sorority Membership on Students' College Experiences and Cognitive Development", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 41, pp. 117-139.
- Pike, G.R. 1999, "The Effects of Residential Learning Communities and Traditional Residential Living Arrangements on Educational Gains during the First Year of College.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 40, pp. 269-284.
- Pike, G.R. & Killian, T.S. 2001, "Reported Gains in Student Learning Do Academic Disciplines Make a Difference?", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 42, pp. 429-454.
- Pike, G.R., Kuh, G.D. & Gonyea, R.M. 2003, "The Relationship Between Institutional Mission and Students' Involvement and Educational Outcomes.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 44, pp. 243-263.
- Pike, G.R. & Kuh, G.D. 2005, "A Typology of Student Engagement for American Colleges and Universities.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 185-209.
- Pike, G.R., Smart, J.C., Kuh, G.D. & Hayek, J.C. 2006, "Educational Expenditures and Student Engagement: When Does Money Matter?", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 847-872; pp. 26.
- Quaye, S.J. & Harper, S.R. 2007, "Faculty Accountability for Culturally-Inclusive Pedagogy and Curricula.", *Liberal Education*, vol. 93, no. 3, pp. 32-39.
- Quaye, S.J. & Baxter Magolda, M.B. 2007, "Enhancing Racial Self-Understanding through Structured Learning and Reflective Experiences.", *New Directions for Student Services*, vol. Winter, no. 120, pp. 55-66.
- Quaye, S.J., Tambascia, T.P. & Talesh, R.A. 2009, "Engaging Racial/Ethnic Minority Students in Predominantly White Classroom Environments." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 157-177.
- Rest, J.R. 1993, "Research on Moral Judgment in College Students." in *Approaches to Moral Development.*, ed. A. Garrod, Teachers College Press, New York, pp. 201-213.
- Richardson, S. & Coates, H. 2010, *AUSSE Research Briefing*, Australian Council for Educational Research, Camberwell, Australia.
- Ross, M. & Welsh, M.P. 2007, "Reflective practitioners in first year? E-portfolios as an effective tool to promote formative assessment.", *European Conference on Educational Research*, University of GhentEngland., pp. 1.
- Rush, L. & Balamoutsou, S. 2006, "Dominant voices, silent voices and the use of Action Learning Groups in HE: A social constructionist perspective.", *Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Warwick, 6-9 September 2006*England., pp. 1.
- Ryan, J.F. 2005, "Institutional Expenditures and Student Engagement: A Role for Financial Resources in Enhancing Student Learning and Development?", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 235-249.

- Rypisi, C., Malcom, L. & Kim, H.S. 2009, "Environmental and Developmental Approaches to Supporting Women's Success in STEM Fields." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 117-135.
- Sallee, M.W., Logan, M.E., Sims, S. & Harrington, W.P. 2009, "Engaging White Students on a Multicultural Campus: Developmental Needs and Institutional Challenges" in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 223-241.
- Schon, D. 1983, *The Reflective Practitioner*, Temple Smith, London.
- Schueler, L.H., Hoffman, J.A. & Peterson, E. 2009, "Fostering Safe, Engaging Campuses for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning Students." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 61-79.
- Schuh, J.H. & Kuh, G.D. 2005, *Promoting Student Success: What Department Chairs Can Do.* , National Survey of Student Engagement, Bloomington Indiana.
- Scott, G. 2006, *Accessing the Student Voice: Using CEQuery to Identify What Retains Students and Promotes Engagement in Productive Learning in Australian Higher Education.*, Department of Education Science and Training, Canberra.
- Shulman, L.S. 2002, "Making Differences: A Table of Learning.", *Change*, vol. 34, pp. 24-32.
- Sibeon, R. 2007, *Contemporary Sociology & Policy Analysis*, Tudor Business Publishing, Eastham.
- Silverman, S.C., Aliabadi, S. & Stiles, M. 2009, "Meeting the Needs of Commuter, Part-Time, Transfer, and Returning Students." in *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations.*, eds. S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye, Routledge, New York & London, pp. 223-243.
- Skinner, E. 2009, "Using Community Development Theory to Improve Student Engagement in Online Discussion: A Case Study.", *ALT J Research in Learning Technology*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 89-100; pp. 12.
- Slocum, J. & Rhoads, R.A. 2009, "Faculty and Student Engagement in the Argentine Grassroots Rebellion: Toward a Democratic and Emancipatory Vision of the University.", *Higher Education The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 85-105.
- Stage, F.K. & Hossler, D. 2000, "Where is the Student? Linking Student Behaviours, College Choice, and College Persistence." in *Reworking the Student Departure Puzzle*, ed. J.M. Braxton, Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville Tennessee, pp. 170-195.
- Strange, C.C. & Banning, J.H. 2001, *Educating by design: Creating Campus Learning Environments that Work*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Sumner, J. 2008, "From Academic Imperialism to the Civil Commons: Institutional Possibilities for Responding to the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development.", *Interchange*, vol. 39, pp. 77-94.
- Swail, W.S., Redd, K.E. & Perna, L.W. 2003, *Retaining Minority Students in Higher Education A Framework for Success*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol 30 No ) edn, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

- Ten Yew, S. & Farrell, L. 2001, "The root of the confusion: Identity.", *Sources of Confusion: Refereed Proceedings of the National Language and Academic Skills Conference, La Trobe University*, ed. K. Chanock, La Trobe University Academic Skills Unit, Melbourne.
- Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E.T. & Blimling, G.S. 1996, "Students' Out-of-Class Experiences and Their Influence on Learning and Cognitive Development: A Literature Review.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 37, pp. 149-162.
- Teune, H. 2001, *Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility: United States study.*, International Consortium for Higher Education Civic Responsibility & Democracy, Philadelphia.
- Thomas, L. & Quinn, J. 2006, *First Generation Entry into Higher Education: An International Study*. Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Thornton, C.H. & Jaeger, A.J. 2007, "A New Context for Understanding Civic Responsibility: Relating Culture to Action at a Research University.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 48, pp. 993-1019.
- Tinto, V. 2005, "Moving from Theory to Action." in *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success*, ed. A. Seidman, ACE & Praeger, Washington DC, pp. 317-333.
- Tinto, V. 2000, "Taking Retention Seriously: Rethinking the First Year of College.", *NACADA Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 5-10.
- Tinto, V. 1993, *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*, 2nd edn, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Tinto, V. 1987, *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*, 1st edn, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Torres, V., Howard-Hamilton, M.F. & Cooper, D.L. 2003, *Identity Development of Diverse Populations: Implications for Teaching and Administration in Higher Education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol 29, No 6) edn, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Tross, S.A., Harper, J.P., Osherr, L.W. & Kneidinger, L.M. 2000, "Not Just the Usual Cast of Characteristics: Using Personality to Predict College Performance and Retention.", *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 325-336.
- Trowler, P. & Wareham, T. 2008, *Tribes, territories, research and teaching: Enhancing the teaching-research nexus.*, Higher Education Academy, York.
- Trowler, P. 1998, *Academics Responding to Change: new higher education frameworks and academic cultures*. Open University Press/ SRHE, Buckingham.
- Umbach, P.D. & Wawrzynski, M.R. 2005, "Faculty Do Matter: The Role of College Faculty in Student Learning and Engagement.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 153-184.
- Villalpando, O. 2002, "The Impact of Diversity and Multiculturalism on All Students: Findings from a National Survey.", *NASPA Journal*, vol. 40, pp. 124-144.
- Waller, R. 2006, "'I don't feel like 'a student', I feel like 'me'": The Over-Simplification of Mature Learners' Experiences.", *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 115-130.
- Warde, A. 2005, "Consumption and Theories of Practice", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 131-153.

Zhao, C. & Kuh, G.D. 2004, "Adding Value: Learning Communities and Student Engagement.", *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 45, pp. 115-138.