Appendix 1.

Scoping Review Protocol

Student Engagement Research in Adolescence: A Scoping Review

Abstract[1]:

Background: In the last years, studies on student engagement increased in quantity but also in their conceptual and methodological diffusion. For these reasons, more rigorous and up-to-date systematization is needed. **Objectives:** To understand the extent and nature of research on multidimensional student engagement focusing on adolescence (10-19 years), published in the last decade (2011-2020); to identify directions for future research and intervention. **Method:** Following a protocol grounded on Arksey and O'Malley and PRISMA-ScR framework, a scoping review will be conducted using eight scientific literature databases. **Results:** Published studies will be analyzed to understand the research extent, the conceptual options, the design and measures used, the main subjects, and suggestions for research and promotion. **Conclusions:** This study complements previous literature systematizations, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of research on student engagement, its challenges, and possible gaps, useful for research and intervention.

Keywords: Student engagement; systematic literature review; school adjustment; adolescent development

Introduction

Adolescence is a pivotal phase of the life course when the best opportunities are needed to thrive (UNICEF, 2018). In what concerns education, opportunities must go beyond the mere enrolment or presence in school (Tomasevisk, 2001; UNESCO, 2019) to encompass student engagement, understood as orientation and commitment toward learning and school (Appleton et al., 2008; Fredricks et al., 2004; Fredricks & McColskey, 2012; Veiga, Burden, et al., 2014). Some authors explain that although many adolescents are at school, they are not engaged, risking missing vital opportunities for their present and future lives (Appleton et al., 2008; Fredricks et al., 2004; Li, 2011; Reschly & Christenson, 2012; Stefansson et al., 2018; Veiga, Festas, et al., 2014). Although research of the last decades has produced enough evidence to underline student engagement's critical role in adolescent learning, academic achievement, school dropout, delinquency, substance use, anti-social behaviors, well-being, mental health,

---

[1] Structured summary (PRISMA-ScR 2)

and positive development (Furlong & Rebelez-Ernst, 2014; Li, 2011; Veiga, Burden, et al., 2014; Veiga, Festas, et al., 2014), several authors bring forward research haziness or diffusion (Appleton et al., 2008; Lam et al., 2012; Quin, 2017; Reschly & Christenson, 2012).

The rationale (PRISMA-ScR 3) to conduct a scoping review is related to a former and exploratory search, including literature reviews published in the last decade concerning student engagement. The objective was to understand the existing systematization of research on student engagement, its strengths, and its limits. This search was conducted in December 2020 using Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science. The search strategy, visible in Table 1, used *Student* and *school* engagement, both recurrently appearing in research and often used interchangeably. Nevertheless, both terms express different perspectives of the concept (Appleton et al., 2008). In APA's thesaurus, the reference concept is *Student engagement*, introduced in 2006. The search was refined to include peer-reviewed articles published between 2010-2020, within the topics of psychology and education or social sciences, and written in English, Spanish, or Portuguese.

Table 1. *Final Search Strategy*

"Student engagement" **OR** "school engagement"
AND Review
AND NOT (higher **OR** university **OR** college)

The search rendered 395 results after removing duplicates. All the studies were analyzed according to inclusion criteria (literature review, published articles, peer-reviewed, multidimensional student engagement approach, adolescence, lower or upper secondary school). From all the results, only 20 literature reviews were selected (Bailey, 2017; Bundick et al., 2014; Campos et al., 2020; Harbour et al., 2015; Kinsella et al., 2016; Landis & Reschly, 2013; Lee & Shute, 2010; Lei et al., 2018; Li, 2018; McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015; Muñoz-Hurtado, 2018; Murphy & Holste, 2016; Pedler et al., 2020; Quin, 2017; Rivas-Drake et al., 2014; Roorda et al., 2011, 2017; Vallee, 2017; Veiga et al., 2016; Wang & Degol, 2014; Wang & Hofkens, 2020). Table 2 present the primary information about the studies.

Table 2. Literature reviews in the exploratory search

Author, year	Origin	Concept & dimensions	Approach	Methodology	Main topic
(Lee & Shute, 2010)	US-NA	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Systematic review	Academic achievement

(Roorda et al., 2011)	NL-EU	Students' School Eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Meta-analysis	Teacher-student relation
(Landis & Reschly, 2013)	US-NA	Student eng.	4D – Aca., beh., emo., cog.	Narrative review	Disengagement and dropout of gifted students
(Rivas-Drake et al., 2014)	US-NA	Academic eng.	Global engagement	Systematic review	Ethnic and racial identity (ERI)
(Bundick et al., 2014)	US-NA	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Narrative review	Classroom ecology (SEC model)
(Wang & Degol, 2014)	US-NA	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Narrative review	Knowledge and research needs
(Harbour et al., 2015)	US-NA	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Narrative review	Teacher-student relation
(McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015)	AU-OC	Student's academic eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Systematic review	Teacher-student relation
(Murphy & Holste, 2016)	US-NA	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Narrative review	What is and what are the main findings
(Kinsella et al., 2016)	UK-EU	Lerner eng.	Global engagement	Meta-narrative analysis	Interdisciplinary work
(Veiga et al., 2016)	PT-EU	Student eng. in school	Global engagement	Narrative review	Family and parental variables
(Roorda et al., 2017)	NL-EU	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Meta-analysis	Teacher-student relation
(Quin, 2017)	AU-OC	Student eng.	4D – Aca., beh., emo., cog.	Systematic review	Teacher-student relation
(Bailey, 2017)	DE-UE	School eng.	2 D – Cog., psy.	Literature review	Sports and physical activity
(Vallee, 2017)	US-NA	Student eng.	Global engagement	Narrative review	Inclusive education
(Lei et al., 2018)	CN-AS	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Meta-analysis	Academic achievement
(Li, 2018)	US-NA	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Literature review	Teacher-student relation
(Muñoz-Hurtado, 2018)	CL-SA	School engagement	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Systematic review	Teachers role in peer relations
(Campos et al., 2020)	BR-SA	School engagement	Different approaches	Scoping review	General research on student engagement
(Pedler et al., 2020)	AU-OC	Student eng.	3D – Beh., emo., cog.	Studies review	Teachers strategies and intervention

The difference between the literature reviews found and the few selected raised doubts on the extent of student engagement research focusing on adolescence. Nevertheless, an increase was found from the first half of the decade (8 reviews) to the second half (12 reviews), with two published in 2020. There was also a change regarding the reviews' geographic origin.

While in the first decade most of the reviews were from the United States (75%), in the second decade, their origin includes countries from Europe (33%), the United States (25%), Australia (17%), South America (17%), and one study from China (8%). Regarding the quality of the journals, twelve reviews were published in journals featuring the first quartile of Scimago Journal Rank (Q1).

About conceptual understanding, 11 reviews opted for the concept of *Student engagement*. One literature review used *Student engagement in school* and another *Students' school engagement*. Just three reviews used *School engagement*. The remaining three used *Academic engagement*, *Learner engagemen*t, or *Student's academic engagement*. Most reviews acknowledged student engagement multidimensionality, and 12 literature pointed out Fredricks et al. (2004) threefold dimensions approach as a reference. These findings are not consistent with the emphasis on student engagement's conceptual and methodological haziness (Appleton et al., 2008; Lam et al., 2012; Quin, 2017; Reschly & Christenson, 2012). Nonetheless, results reinforced APA's thesaurus option for "Student engagement" (APA, 2021).

About literature reviews' main topics, findings highlighted the scope of school dimension, including teacher-students relations (6 studies), teacher's strategies and role (2 studies), academic achievement (2 studies), classroom ecology (1 study), and disengagement of gifted students (1 study). Other isolated reviews focused on a general revision of the concept, on Ethnic and racial identity, family and parental variables, and sports and physical activity. However, these findings are thematically narrowed, failing to present the richness of student engagement research.

Among selected literature reviews, a more comprehensive systematization of student research was found (Campos et al., 2020), using three databases (ERIC, PsycINFO e SciELO), a short-range of time (2014-2018), but with no specific results for adolescent students.

In synthesis, this previous and exploratory search suggested the need to complement existing literature reviews on student engagement with a more up-to-date and broad research systematization focusing on adolescence. Therefore, the authors decided to conduct a rigorous and comprehensive scoping review: (i) to compile and analyze the piecemeal research on student engagement; (ii) to understand the extent and nature of research focusing on adolescence; (iii) to identify future directions for research and intervention.

Methods and analysis

Protocol Design

This scoping review protocol (PRISMA-ScR 5) thoroughly describes the main design options that will guide the study. Although not registered, it will be presented as support information with the research. This protocol was designed using two important references that warrant its scientific trustworthiness. The first was Arksey and O'Malley's framework (2005; Levac et al., 2010), whose five stages are used as subchapters of this section. The second was PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (Tricco et al., 2018), which encompasses a comprehensive checklist of 27 items to conduct a scoping review. In this protocol, each PRISMA's checklist item is highlighted, which explains the note regarding the title (PRISMA-ScR 1), abstract (PRISMA-ScR 2), and rationale (PRISMA-ScR 3). In addition, two other high-quality articles were significant models for this protocol, particularly in what concerns sources of information and results presentation (O'Flaherty & Phillips, 2015; Pham et al., 2014).

Stage 1: Identifying the Research Question

The conceptual and methodological haziness appears as one of the issues regarding research on student engagement (Appleton et al., 2008; Lam et al., 2012; Reschly & Christenson, 2012). For this reason, aiming for concrete and clear conceptual focus, two options were made. Consistent with APA's thesaurus (APA, 2021) and several authors (Appleton et al., 2008; Quin, 2017; Wang & Degol, 2014), the first option is the search strategy focused exclusively on *Student engagement*. The second option is to focus on multidimensional student engagement. This option followed Fredricks et al. (2004) understanding of student engagement as a *meta construct*, a concept that can be better explained by gathering other different but complementary constructs.

These two options have consequences in all the research design, starting with the research problem (PRISMA-ScR 4). Our research problem is: What are the main characteristics of research produced over the last decade on multidimensional student engagement during adolescence? Five overarching study questions or SQ were identified to address the problem and guide the study: (SQ1) What is the extent of the research? (SQ2) What conceptual definitions are used? (SQ3) What designs and measures are used? (SQ4) What are the main topics and variables studied? (SQ5) What implications for research and intervention can be suggested?

Stage 2: Identifying the Relevant Studies

About the information sources (PRISMA-ScR 7), meaning the studies included in the review, a search of solely peer-review published studies will be conducted using eight electronic databases: (1) Academic search complete, (2) Education source, (3) Eric - Educational Resources Information Center, (4) PsycARTICLES, (5) PsycINFO, (6) Scielo, (7) Scopus, and (8) Web of Science (WoS).

The research search strategy (PRISMA-ScR 8) is presented in Table 2. In each database, refinements will be made considering the time frame (2011-2020), the language (English, Spanish and Portuguese), the subject areas (Psychology and Social sciences), and to retrieve only published and peer-reviewed studies.

Table 2. *Search Strategy*

"student engagement"
AND (adolescen* OR "early adolescen*" OR youth)
NOT ("higher education" OR university OR college OR undergraduate)

Stage 3: Study Selection

Balancing comprehensiveness with feasibility (Levac et al., 2010), eligibility criteria are critical (PRISMA-ScR 6). Although previous decisions, these criteria will be worked iteratively throughout the selection process. Table 3 presents the final inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Table 3. *Inclusion and Exclusion criteria for Study Selection*

+ Peer review	-	Not scientific journals
+ Published between 2011-2020	-	To be published
+ Quantitative or qualitative research	-	Theoretical articles
+ English, Spanish or Portuguese	-	Other languages
+ Psychological concept	-	Only objective indicators such as attendance
+ Multidimensional concept	-	Unidimensional or specific[1] approach
+ Lower and upper secondary school levels	-	Higher education, college, or university

Note: [1] Specific of an area, discipline, or activity.

The sources of evidence selection (PRISMA-ScR 9) will use Microsoft Office Excel and will happen in three phases: (i) an organization phase aiming to identify and exclude duplicated studies; (ii) a screening phase that aims to exclude studies not complying with criteria by the analysis of the title, abstract, and keywords; (iii) the selection phase, entailing a deeper analysis of each study to decide, according to the criteria, on inclusion or exclusion.

Stage 4: Charting the Data

Data extraction will use a characterization tool filled in excel (Appendix 2 - supplementary material) to help retrieve, organize, and prepare the relevant information, allowing its analysis, charting, and later discussion.

Data charting (PRISMA-ScR 10) is an iterative process to produce meaningful categories or data items (PRISMA-ScR 11) that will guide information search and presentation. Table 4 presents the study questions and, for each, the main categories. Categories for the first three study questions will be defined in advance and improved throughout the review process. However, for the fourth and fifth study questions, categories will have to be created according to the results found in the studies, using APA's Thesaurus (APA, 2021) or APA's Psychology Dictionary (APA, 2020) as the ground base.

Table 4. *Variables for Data Charting*

Study Questions	Categories and Brief Explanation
(SQ1) what is the extent of the research?	2011-2015; 2016-2020
	Continent or region of the study
	Main concept
(SQ2) What conceptual definitions are used?	Dimensions
	Theoretical approach and its consistency between conceptualization and assessment options
	Design
(SQ3) What designs and measures are used?	Type of measures
	The measure used to assess student engagement (name, acronym, and author)
(SQ4) What are the main variables studied?	The main topic of the study (descriptive)
	Most meaningful variables[2] and main results (descriptive)

---

[2] Variable: "anything that can be measured and can differ across entities or across time." (Field, 2009, pp. 795–796).

| (SQ5) What implications for research and intervention are suggested? | Suggestions for future research (descriptive) |
| | Suggestions for promotion (descriptive) |

Stage 5: Collating, Summarizing, and Reporting the Results

The results sections begin by presenting three important pieces of information. The first will be a global view of the studies' selection process (PRISMA-ScR 14), using PRISMA's[3] flow diagram. The second is a table offering an index of the studies ordained alphabetically by the author. The third is also a table presenting an overview of the main findings for each study question.

Because many studies are expected, two options were made to ensure the article's legibility. The first option followed Pham et al. (2014) suggestion to present both the characteristics and results of individual sources of evidence (PRISMA-ScR 15, 16) as support information (Appendix 3 - supplementary material). Following O'Flaherty & Phillips' (2015) suggestion, the second option was to use a numerical reference (Ref.) for each study, answering the challenge of the significant number of in-text quotations in the results and discussion sections.

The discussion section will summarize evidence (PRISMA-ScR 19) for each study question, compare results with previous studies, present the study's implications and limitations (PRISMA-ScR 20). Finally, conclusions (PRISMA-ScR 21) will synthesize the main findings, emphasizing suggestions for future research and promotion.

Discussion

The present-day scientific literature on student engagement provides critical findings for adolescents' well-being and right to thrive, with high significance in educational endeavors. Nevertheless, the rapid pace and quantity of published studies demand a methodologically sound systematization that points out trends, commonalities, and differences. Although demanding in what concerns methodology to ensure data integrity and bias control, the Scoping review thorough method is a valuable contribution to answering this systematization shortcoming.

Therefore, as a strength, the present scoping review has a sound methodological basis, grounded on cutting-edge protocols and the critical appraisal of high-quality scoping reviews.

---

[3] PRISMA Flow Diagram: http://prisma-statement.org/PRISMAStatement/FlowDiagram

On the other hand, there are limitations to be considered. The first is the focus of the research strategy on *Student engagement*. Although the option's coherence with the need for precise and clear concepts and APA's thesaurus, it may leave out some studies that use other terminologies such as *School engagement* or *Academic engagement*. Due to budget and time restrictions, the second limitation is the difficulty to enroll more researchers, improving safeguarding odds regarding bias control, the results integrity, and their richer discussion. Finally, the third limitation concerns the impossibility to include the sixth stage of Arksey and O'Malley's (2005; Levac et al., 2010) framework. This stage challenges researchers to open a consultation period with stakeholders (schools, teachers, parents, adolescents), undoubtedly enriching the results' significance for education and schools.

Ethics and Dissemination

The studies used in this research are publicly available. Therefore no ethical approval is needed. In addition, the results will be disseminated through the publication of an article and possible presentations at scientific conferences.

Supporting Information

Appendix 1: Scoping review protocol

Appendix 2: Studies characterization form

Appendix 3: Summary of the reviewed studies

References

APA. (2020). *APA Dictionary of Psychology* [APA.org]. APA Dictionary of Psychology. https://dictionary.apa.org/

APA. (2021). *Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms—APA Publishing*. Https://Www.Apa.Org. https://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/training/thesaurus

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools*, *45*(5), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20303

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616

Bailey, R. (2017). Sport, physical activity and educational achievement – towards an explanatory model. *Sport in Society*, *20*(7), 768–788. https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2016.1207756

Bundick, M. J., Quaglia, Russell J., Corso, M. J., & Haywood, D. E. (2014). Promoting student engagement in the classroom. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(4). https://ucarecdn.com/dba5c18c-c833-4279-aaf0-c5f27496dd5d/

Campos, L. V. e, Schmitt, J. C., & Justi, F. R. dos R. (2020). Um panorama sobre engajamento escolar: Uma revisão sistemática: An overview of school engagement: A systematic review. *Revista Portuguesa de Educação*, *33*(1), 221–246. https://doi.org/10.21814/rpe.18145

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Fredricks, J. A., & McColskey, W. (2012). The measurement of student engagement: A comparative analysis of various methods and student self-report instruments. Em S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 763–782). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_37

Furlong, M., & Rebelez-Ernst, J. (2014). School and student engagement. Em A. C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 5681–5685). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2604

Harbour, K. E., Evanovich, L. L., Sweigart, C. A., & Hughes, L. E. (2015). A brief review of effective teaching practices that maximize student engagement. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *59*(1), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2014.919136

Kinsella, C., Putwain, D. W., & Kaye, L. K. (2016). Learner Engagement: A Review of Approaches in the Psychology of Education and Art Education. *Review of Education*, *4*(3), 266–289. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3063

Lam, S., Wong, B. P. H., Yang, H., & Liu, Y. (2012). Understanding student engagement with a contextual model. Em S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 403–419). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_19

Landis, R. N., & Reschly, A. L. (2013). Reexamining gifted underachievement and dropout through the lens of student engagement. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *36*(2), 220–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353213480864

Lee, J., & Shute, V. J. (2010). Personal and social-contextual factors in k–12 academic performance: An integrative perspective on student learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *45*(3), 185–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2010.493471

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

Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: Advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science*, *5*(1), 69. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69

Li, Y. (2011). School engagement: What it is and why it is important for positive youth development. Em *Advances in child development and behavior* (Vol. 41, pp. 131–160). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-386492-5.00006-3

Li, Y. (2018). Teacher–student relationships, student engagement, and academic achievement for non-Latino and Latino youth. *Adolescent Research Review*, *3*(4), 375–424. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-017-0069-9

McGrath, K. F., & Van Bergen, P. (2015). Who, when, why and to what end? Students at risk of negative student–teacher relationships and their outcomes. *Educational Research Review*, *14*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.12.001

Muñoz-Hurtado, J. (2018). he role of teachers on students' peer groups relations: A review on their influence on school engagement and academic achievement. *Límite (Arica)*, *13*(42), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50652018000200030

Murphy, J., & Holste, L. (2016). Explaining the effects of communities of pastoral care for students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *109*(5), 531–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.993460

O'Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *25*, 85–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.02.002

Pedler, M., Yeigh, T., & Hudson, S. (2020). The Teachers' Role in Student Engagement: A Review. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*(3), 48–62. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2020v45n3.4

Pham, M. T., Rajić, A., Greig, J. D., Sargeant, J. M., Papadopoulos, A., & McEwen, S. A. (2014). A scoping review of scoping reviews: Advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Research Synthesis Methods*, *5*(4), 371–385. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1123

Quin, D. (2017). Longitudinal and contextual associations between teacher–student relationships and student engagement: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*, *87*(2), 345–387. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316669434

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. Em S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 3–20). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Rivas-Drake, D., Markstrom, C., Syed, M., Lee, R. M., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yip, T., Seaton, E. K., Quintana, S., Schwartz, S. J., & French, S. (2014). Ethnic and racial identity in adolescence: Implications for psychosocial, academic, and health outcomes. *Child Development*, *85*(1), 40–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12200

Roorda, D. L., Jak, S., Zee, M., Oort, F. J., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2017). Affective teacher–student relationships and students' engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic update and test of the mediating role of engagement. *School Psychology Review*, *46*(3), 239–261. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0035.V46-3

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(4), 493–529. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793

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

Tomasevisk, K. (2001). *Right to education primers no. 3: Human Rights obligations—Making education avaliable, accesible, aceptable and adaptable*. SIDA - Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. https://www.right-to-education.org/sites/right-to-education.org/files/resource-attachments/Tomasevski_Primer%203.pdf

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., … Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *169*(7), 467. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850

UNESCO. (2019). *Right to education handbook*. Unesco Education Sector.

UNICEF. (2018). *UNICEF programme guidance for the second decade: Programming with and for adolescents*. UNICEF.

Vallee, D. (2017). Student engagement and inclusive education: Reframing student engagement. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *21*(9), 920–937. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1296033

Veiga, F. H., Burden, R., Appleton, J. J., & Galvão, D. (2014). Student's engagement in school: Conceptualization and relations with personal variables and academic performance. *Revista de Psicología y Educación*, *9*(1), 29–47.

Veiga, F. H., Festas, I., Taveira, C., Galvão, D., Janeiro, I., Conboy, J., Carvalho, C., Caldeira, S., Melo, M., Pereira, T., Almeida, A., Bahía, S., & Nogueira, J. (2014). Envolvimento dos alunos na escola—Conceito e relação com o desempenho académico: Sua importância na formação de professores [Student engagement in school - concept and relation with school performance: Importance in teachers training]. *Revista Portuguesa de Pedagogia*, 31–47. https://doi.org/10.14195/1647-8614_46-2_2

Veiga, F. H., Robu, V., Conboy, J., Ortiz, A., Carvalho, C., & Galvão, D. (2016). Students' engagement in school and family variables: A literature review. *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas)*, *33*(2), 187–197. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-02752016000200002

Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. (2014). Staying Engaged: Knowledge and Research Needs in Student Engagement. *Child Development Perspectives*, *8*(3), 137–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12073

Wang, M.-T., & Hofkens, T. L. (2020). Beyond classroom academics: A school-wide and multi-contextual perspective on student engagement in school. *Adolescent Research Review*, *5*(4), 419–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-019-00115-z