



Психологический анализ и систематизация «вовлеченности» и «вовлечения» как ресурсов развития субъектов образования: обзор источников

Л. М. МИТИНА, Г. В., МИТИН, О. А. АНИСИМОВА

АННОТАЦИЯ

Введение. Изучение категорий "вовлеченность" и "вовлечение" в педагогической психологии особенно важно в контексте ускоряющихся преобразований общества во всем мире, связанных с управлением человеческими ресурсами. Несмотря на их очевидную практическую значимость и высокий исследовательский интерес, феномены вовлеченность и вовлечение остаются методологически сложными и теоретически неоднородными.

Цель исследования: провести критический анализ и систематизацию основных теоретических подходов к пониманию феноменов вовлеченности и вовлечения и разработать концептуальную модель «тройного потенциала» ресурсного комплекса «вовлеченность – вовлечение» личностного и профессионального развития субъектов образования.

Методы и материалы. Материалом послужили научные публикации, описывающие ключевые аспекты этих феноменов, компоненты, уровни, контекст как детерминанты современных тенденций в изучении вовлеченности и вовлечения в процесс и перспективные направления для их дальнейшего теоретического и эмпирического исследования.

Результаты. Научная значимость статьи заключается в структурировании исследовательского поля и разработке концептуальной модели «тройного потенциала»: вовлеченность педагога – эмоционально-ценностное состояние; вовлечение – процесс, система конкретных действий педагога по вовлечению учащихся в образовательный процесс и полисубъектную общность; вовлеченность учащихся – положительное эмоционально-ценностное состояние учащихся в образовательном процессе.

Выводы. Было установлено, что термины «вовлеченность» и «вовлечение» имеют независимые психологические и функциональные значения, что делает их синонимичное толкование некорректным. В рамках концептуальной модели «тройного потенциала» впервые обоснован ресурсный комплекс «вовлеченность – вовлечение – вовлеченность», который представляет собой три взаимосвязанных и взаимоопределяемых потенциала.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

личностное и профессиональное развитие, концептуальная модель «тройного потенциала», вовлеченность, вовлечение, ресурсный комплекс, субъекты непрерывного образования

Для цитирования: Митина Л. М., Митин Г. В., Анисимова О. А. Психологический анализ и систематизация «вовлеченности» и «вовлечения» как ресурсов развития субъектов образования: обзор источников // Перспективы науки и образования. 2026. № 4. С. 480–494. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2026.4.31>

Поступила: 26.02.2026 | Одобрена: 12.05.2026 | Опубликована: 31.08.2026



Лицензия «С указанием авторства — С сохранением условий». Позволяет перерабатывать, исправлять и развивать произведения при условии указания авторства и лицензирования производных работ на аналогичных условиях.



Psychological Analysis and Systematization on "Engagement" and "Involvement" as Resources for the Development of Educational Subjects: Sources Review

L. M. MITINA, G. V., MITIN, O. A. ANISIMOVA

ABSTRACT

Introduction. The study of the categories of "engagement" and "involvement" in educational psychology is particularly important in the context of the accelerating transformation of society around the world related to human resource management. Despite their obvious practical significance and high research interest, the phenomena of engagement and involvement remain methodologically complex and theoretically heterogeneous.

Research objective. To carry out a critical analysis and systematization of the main theoretical approaches to understanding the phenomena of engagement and involvement and to develop a conceptual model of the "triple potential" of the resource complex "engagement – involvement" of personal and professional development of education subjects.

Methods and materials. The material was scientific publications describing the key aspects of these phenomena, components, levels, context as determinants of modern trends in the study of engagement and involvement and promising directions for their further theoretical and empirical research.

Results. The scientific significance of the article lies in the structuring of the research field and the development of a conceptual model of the "triple potential".

Teacher involvement is an emotional and value-based state; involvement is a process and a system of specific actions taken by a teacher to involve students in the educational process and a multi-subject community; student involvement is a positive emotional and value-based state of students in the educational process.

Conclusion. It has been established that the terms "engagement" and "involvement" have independent psychological and functional meanings, which makes their synonymous interpretation incorrect. Within the framework of the conceptual model of the "triple potential", the resource complex "engagement – involvement – engagement" is substantiated for the first time, which represents three interconnected and mutually determined potentials.

KEYWORDS

personal and professional development, conceptual model of "triple potential", involvement, engagement, resource complex, subjects of continuous education

For Citation: Mitina, L. M., Mitin, G. V., & Anisimova, O. A. (2026). Psychological Analysis and Systematization on "Engagement" and "Involvement" as Resources for the Development of Educational Subjects: Sources Review. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovaniya = Perspectives of Science and Education*, (4), 480–494. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2026.4.31>

Received: 26 February 2026 | Approved: 12 May 2026 | Published: 31 August 2026



This is an open access article distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike International License (CC-BY-SA 4.0) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal

INTRODUCTION

In modern educational discourse, the concepts of "engagement" and "involvement" have become not just pedagogical categories, but strategic resources for personal and professional development. Their conceptualization in the context of education transformation requires reference to fundamental international initiatives that set the vectors of development at the global level. The United Nations, primarily UNESCO as a specialized agency for education, as well as the Council of Europe and the International Association of Universities (IAU), have been shaping the regulatory and conceptual framework for decades, in which the ideas of participation and activity of the subjects of the educational process are becoming increasingly clear.

From the declaration of education as a key factor in sustainable development and the civic mission of higher education to specific strategies such as "Learners First - Education for Today's and Tomorrow's Democratic Societies" (2023) or UNESCO's initiative to recognize young people as "co-creators of education" (2026), international organizations are consistently shifting the focus from passive knowledge acquisition to active participation. In this context, the phenomenological analysis of engagement as a multidimensional construct (behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and agentic) and engagement as a managed process of creating conditions for this participation becomes particularly important. This requires not only clarifying the terminological boundaries between these concepts, but also identifying their resource potential for personal and professional development [1].

The socio-economic and cultural progress of a country is directly dependent on the ability of society to identify and maximize the potential of its members. This is primarily determined by the level of education development. As President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin emphasized in his greeting to the participants, organizers, and guests of the All-Russian Pedagogical Congress (August 19, 2025): "Education, its accessibility, and quality are the key factors and the foundation for Russia's long-term success" [2].

In solving this strategic task, a key role is assigned to advanced education, which is focused on preparing the younger generation for the current challenges of the time. This goal can be achieved through the use of teaching staff who possess not only the necessary competencies and professional experience, but also a well-developed potential (including reserves, resources, and meta-resources).

The phenomena of "engagement" and "involvement" are understood in psychological literature as a positive, meaningful, energetic, and active state of a person's connection with their activities, which has become a central construct in explaining the effectiveness, well-being, and personal development in the 21st century. Their scientific relevance extends from improving productivity and innovation in organizations to ensuring the quality of educational processes and mental health in clinical practice. Despite the exponential growth in research, the processes of engagement and involvement remain conceptually vague and methodologically complex, requiring systematization.

Currently, there are many definitions of the terms "engagement" and "involvement," which makes it difficult to describe not only their "inner workings" but also their place in the conceptual field of science, as confirmed by foreign (engagement as a labor resource [3], involvement as a characteristic of meaningful work [4], goals of patient involvement in research [5]) and domestic (involvement as a tool for assessing the quality of education [6], resource of student engagement in the educational space [7]) studies.

The diversity of approaches gives rise to both a wealth of interpretations and a problem of conceptualization and operationalization. The lack of a unified definition makes it difficult to compare results and build a comprehensive theory.

The theoretical-empirical studies face a number of challenges: the need to distinguish or identify the terms "engagement" and "involvement", their distinction from related constructs (motivation, commitment, satisfaction), the definition of their situational and personal determinants, as well as the development of valid and reliable diagnostic methods applicable in various cultural and professional contexts. Terminological issues are particularly relevant: whether the concepts of "engagement" and "involvement" can be interpreted synonymously, identically, or each of them has its own independent meaning.

In this regard, researchers are faced with the need to conduct a psychological analysis of individual (different) areas of study of the phenomena of "engagement" and "involvement," which differ in

their terminological heterogeneity and theoretical foundations. Therefore, a conceptual framework is necessary to provide a meaningful interpretation of the concepts of "engagement" and "involvement," their relationships, and to generate new knowledge and technological solutions L.M. Mitina [8].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Key theoretical paradigms of the "engagement" phenomenon in foreign research

The historical roots of the concept of "engagement" can be traced back to the philosophy of existentialism and humanistic psychology, where the most important concepts, according to A.O. Ojo et al. [9], are the works of A. Maslow [10] and C. Rogers [11] on the active, conscious, and responsible attitude of individuals towards their lives. However, as an independent scientific construct, engagement emerged at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries as a response to the dominance of research on negative states (burnout, distress) in the field of positive psychology.

The first detailed psychological theory of engagement, the Theory of Personal Engagement and Detachment, was proposed by W. Kahn [12], who defined personal engagement as the sharing of employees' personal capabilities (cognitive, emotional, and physical) in the performance of work tasks. His resource theory postulated that engagement is the result of the dynamic interaction of three conditions: psychological security (the ability to be oneself without fear of consequences), psychological accessibility (the availability of resources for investment) and psychological meaningfulness.

An alternative but complementary model, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), was developed by the group of E. Demerouti et al. [13] under the leadership of W. Schaufeli [14], in which engagement was defined as a positive, emotionally intense, motivational–cognitive state characterized by a high level of energy, vitality and sustained mental activity (vigor), full concentration and dedication to work (absorption), immersion in activity with enthusiasm, in which time flies quickly (dedication)). Unlike W. Kahn's model, the UWES model focuses on describing the phenomenological experience itself rather than its prerequisites, and conceptualizes engagement as the opposite pole of burnout syndrome (vigor as exhaustion, dedication as cynicism, and absorption as ineffectiveness).

Later, A.B. Bakker and E. Demerouti [3] transformed the UWES model by adding new elements to it – exhaustion (exhaustion/burnout) and work engagement (motivational engagement) and renaming it the JD-R (Job Demands-Resources) model. G. Mazzetti et al. [15] conducted a large-scale meta-analysis of resources (JD-R) in relation to work engagement, where its key prerequisites were work resources (autonomy, support) and personal (self-efficacy).

W. Kahn's empirical ideas were supplemented by the variable theory of "Psychological (Personal) Engagement" with a two-component structure (Attention and Absorption) in a collaborative work by two authors: A. Sack and N. Rothbard [16]. Various aspects of engagement continue to be developed in the field of collective and volatile states that require active management at all levels of the organization A.B. Bakker, and J. Wingerden [17].

The theory of Flow ("flow") by M. Csikszentmihalyi [18], is based on the description of a psychological state of complete absorption and concentrated motivation in the process of activity, characterized by full engagement, energy and pleasure from the process itself. In a state of flow, a person is maximally engagement in the process of activity, but everything else becomes less important, an autotelic experience occurs, an activity whose purpose is itself.

S. Hobfoll [19] formulated the principle of resource conservation in the theory of Conservation of Resources Theory (COR). He interprets engagement as a state associated with the acquisition and preservation of valuable resources (energy, status, knowledge). The threat of losing them leads to burnout, and the increase leads to engagement and engagement behavior.

Over the past decade, research discourse has shifted from theoretical models of engagement to the study of its practical aspects and applied mechanisms.

B.M. Booth et al. [20] view engagement as a multi-component, dynamic construct that is context-dependent and time-limited, serving as a link between interest, attention, and effort investment in an

individual's activities. This approach is based on identifying a person's state based on their behavioral and physiological signals, allowing for a shift from theoretical discussions to practical measurement and management of engagement in real-time digital educational environments.

N. Littman-Ovadia et al. [21] describe how the meaning of work mediated the relationship between work resources and engagement during a crisis. The focus of the study is not classical engagement (work engagement), but meaningfulness and engagement in life in general (life engagement), measured through the prism of Sense of Coherence (SOC) — feelings of meaningfulness and manageability.

M.F. Steger, B.J. Dik [4] argue that meaningful work is not just a concomitant factor, and the fundamental driver and, perhaps, the essential core of sustainable engagement, since it transforms external motivation into an internal sense of purpose, which leads to a deep emotional and cognitive engagement of the employee in the tasks of the organization.

To operationalize the concept of engagement, D.R. May et al. [22] proposed a scale that assesses its physical, intellectual, and emotional components. Their work empirically demonstrated that the key conditions of engagement identified by W. Kahn [12] (meaningfulness, safety, and accessibility) are indeed associated with it.

Engagement in the educational environment

In the scientific literature, the concept of "student engagement" was first operationalized by A. Astin [23], who defined it as the amount of physical and mental energy invested by a student in acquiring academic experience.

M. Bond et al. [24] Student engagement is understood as a complex multidimensional meta-structure – a fusion of energy and efforts that students invest in their learning community through a variety of behavioral, cognitive, or affective indicators.

The interrelated aspects of student engagement were systematized by E.R. Kahu [25]. In his model, he identified four interrelated blocks: antecedents (prerequisites), the engagement manifestatio (manifestations of engagement), immediate consequences (immediate results), long-term consequences (long-term results). The key contribution of the E.R. Kahu model is that it presents engagement not as a static property of a student, but as a dynamic process that occurs at the junction of personality and educational context.

Independently, E.Y. Mercier [26] and S.M. Brookhart [27] conclude that effective student assessment is not an endpoint, but a key tool for increasing student engagement and intrinsic motivation.

Engagement is not a static trait or just components, it is a complex, dynamic profile (pattern) that is formed from a combination of behavioral, emotional and cognitive aspects. These profiles are relatively stable, but they may change when students transition from middle school to high school M.T. Wang et al. [28].

The model of engagement in school education (K-12) was developed by J.A. Fredricks [29], using the term "student engagement" in its broad, well-established academic meaning, focusing on the engagement of a student (student, student) as a subject of the educational process and defining it not as a single state, but as a complex multidimensional meta-construct. (meta-construct), consisting of three interrelated and complementary components: behavioral (behavioral); emotional/affective (emotional-affective); cognitive (cognitive). According to the author, engagement is dynamic (it can change depending on the task, day, and context) and situational (it is influenced by the specific learning environment, relationships, and pedagogical practices).

In the work of N. Abdulganie et al. [30], it is argued that the availability of digital tools and materials is a significant predictor of increased student engagement.

The research ideas of Z. Xu et al. [31] and Z. Ouyang [32] suggest that adaptive digital technologies not only directly improve academic outcomes, but also indirectly enhance engagement through the development of self-regulated learning skills, which in turn plays a crucial role in positive educational outcomes.

C.M. Amerstorfer et al. [33], summarize that the research field concerning the engagement of students in the educational process at the primary and secondary levels is represented by a more significant segment of scientific publications.

The study of the phenomenon of "engagement" in domestic works

Unlike the Western tradition, where the term "engagement" has become dominant, the concept of "engagement" has not been central in Russian science for a long time, but related and often broader constructs have been studied. There are several main lines of research: the activity approach, the concept of "absorption in activity," and the personal and semantic approach.

The fundamental theoretical basis for many modern works is the activity approach and the concept of "absorption in activity" (L.S. Vygotsky [34], A.N. Leontiev [35], S.L. Rubinstein [36]).

Within the framework of the theory of activity A.N. Leontiev [35], the key to engagement is the process of meaning-making, where the goal of an action takes on a personal meaning, merging with the motive. It is this "fusion" that generates internal energy and absorption in the process. Engagement here is a psychological reflection of the fact that the activity has become an actual activity (guided by an internal motive) rather than just a formal action.

A state very close to "flow" in the context of M. Csikszentmihályi's theory [18] was studied as absorption in activity or a state of productive inclusion V.A. Petrovsky [37]. The emphasis was not just on the experience, but on structural changes in activity: the reduction of operations, the growth of efficiency, and the removal of reflection.

The most direct and developed theory of engagement in modern Russian psychology is associated with the personal and semantic approach of D.A. Leontiev [38]. The author understood semantic engagement as the degree to which a person feels included in what they are doing and experiences this activity as meaningful and valuable for themselves, through an attitude rather than just a state. In other words, engagement is a stable connection between an individual and the world through specific activities.

Engagement occurs when an activity is in contact with the value-semantic sphere of the individual. It serves as a "conductor" of meaning into everyday life. Based on this theory, a questionnaire on semantic engagement (semantic engagement, meaningfulness of life, satisfaction, and psychological well-being in the professional (doctors, teachers) and educational environment) has been developed.

Engagement is not a general characteristic of the attitude towards learning, but a situational and dynamic state of deep cognitive and emotional absorption in a learning task, which can be quickly assessed through the automatic analysis of external manifestations of a specific set of "academic emotions" at a given moment in time.

It is characterized by intensive cognitive processes and accompanying affective (emotional) experiences D.A. Kasatkina et al. [39]. The authors refer to "academic affects" as positive (contributing to engagement: interest, focus, and excitement/joy); complex (significant for the process: confusion, frustration); and negative (signaling a decrease in engagement: boredom, anxiety, and fatigue). The intensity of an experience (regardless of its positivity) may indicate high involvement.

Engagement in the educational environment is considered not as a general characteristic of the attitude to study, but a situational-dynamic state of deep cognitive-emotional absorption in the learning task, which can be promptly assessed through the automatic analysis of external manifestations of a specific set of "academic emotions": intensive cognitive processes and their accompanying affective (emotional) experiences.

N.G. Maloshonok [6] conceptualized the concept of "academic engagement" and its measurement as an integrative characteristic, promoting the idea of shifting the focus of education quality assessment from formal indicators to the depth of student interaction with the learning process.

The resource of engagement is a state that is formed as a result of the interaction between a person and the environment in the space of life fulfillment and is related to the psychological

dimensionality, in which the relationship between the structure of psychological dimensions and the typological features of the "resource of engagement" has been identified by E.V. Pavlova [7]. The most effective dimensions in terms of ensuring the compatibility of a person and the engagement are formed when the instrumental and semantic components of the "engagement resource" are high.

O.Yu. Gorchakova et al. [40] explore the mechanisms of managing students' engagement in blended, hybrid, and fully online formats.

Thus, one of the dynamic areas of research on involvement is the educational environment, where researchers offer a deeper explanatory basis for the phenomenon, going beyond the description of its components to the analysis of the mechanisms that generate this phenomenon (meaning formation, motivational and semantic connections).

This allows us to shift the focus from externally observable forms of activity (behavioural, emotional, and cognitive) to the internal, intentional processes of the subject, where engagement is not a temporary state, but a dynamic system of the individual's relationship with the content and context of their activities.

In the logic of this approach, the key question is: how and under what conditions does the learning situation acquire personal meaning for the student, triggering the mechanisms of voluntary attention, intellectual initiative, and value-based response? Consequently, the promising research direction is not so much the measurement of the "level" of engagement, but rather the reconstruction of its semantic architecture — the relationship between goals, opportunities for self-realization, the dialogical nature of educational communication, and the student's subjective position. This shift in perspective opens the door to designing educational engagement where engagement is a natural consequence of meaning-making, rather than an externally driven "inclusion" in a prescribed activity.

Research on the phenomenon of "Involvement" in foreign psychology

Along with engagement, scientists also consider the processes of engagement as the actions of a person involved in an active process that can initiate and direct one subject in relation to another.

The conceptual roots and the basic definition of Involvement are an older and broader term than engagement. Its roots lie in social psychology and personality psychology. The classical definition goes back to the works of N. Sherif, C.I. Hovland [41], where involvement (ego-involvement) was understood by the authors as the degree to which a person's beliefs or attitudes are related to their self-esteem and self-concept, and engagement was understood as a state or quality of connection, relationship, and personal significance of an object/activity for a person. This is primarily an evaluative and affective-semantic relationship.

The most important empirical consequence of the ego-involvement theory is the position that a high level of involvement increases the "latitude of rejection" – the range of positions that an individual is not ready to accept. People with high ego involvement show great selectivity in the perception of information, emphasizing some aspects and ignoring others in order to protect or strengthen their "I". This leads to the fact that persuasive messages are less effective when the recipient is highly engaged.

In parallel with the tradition of ego-involvement research, an approach has developed in which involvement is considered as personal relevance, modulating the depth of information processing. The theory of probability of conscious information processing (ELM) has become the most influential in this area, developed R.E. Petty, J.T. Cacioppo [42].

According to this model, high involvement occurs when the topics of a message are personally important to someone or when one's own opinion to these topics is perceived as having important consequences for oneself or others

Involvement in work "involvement" was also identified with the term "organisational citizenship behavior" (organisational civil behaviour (OCB)) and was considered by D.W. Organ [43] as a set of employee actions that go beyond the formal job requirements and are not provided by the system of mandatory labor functions. This behavior contributes to the improvement of overall

organizational efficiency. Typical manifestations of OGP include: providing assistance to colleagues in the working group, voluntarily accepting additional responsibilities, proactively preventing destructive conflicts, and making constructive suggestions aimed at optimizing the activities of both the specific department and the organization as a whole.

Involvement is the result of specific management practices and working conditions that can be measured and improved K.J. Harter et al. [44]. Based on the empirical results of their own research, the authors conclude that the likelihood of involvement behavior varies significantly depending on the situational context. The nature of the work performed and the characteristics of the direct supervisor play a key role in determining individuals' choices to be focused on work, give it subjective significance, and support career growth and professional development. Involvement always has a time frame and a specific trigger (an incentive, instruction, threat, or reward), so it is reversible: a person can easily "fall out" of an activity as soon as external pressure or interest wanes. Moreover, involvement can remain purely behavioral (a person formally participates and performs actions) without affecting deep personal meanings, unlike engagement, which requires emotional and cognitive resonance.

Engagement is what an employee feels.

Involvement is what the company does to create these feelings in the employee (the process and tools).

Therefore, the difference between involvement (process, action) and engagement (state, attitude) lies in the vector of causality and temporal duration.

Involvement is an external or internal act of "entering" an activity, and the psychological essence is that a dynamic process is "activated" and a person begins to participate, pay attention, and perform an action. However, involvement is often situational and can be initiated from the outside (someone has involved) or from the inside (I became interested and involved).

Modern researchers W.H Macey, B. Schneider [45] propose an integrative model where both constructs are related:

Involvement (as Job Involvement – trait involvement) is a stable precursor (predictor) of the state of Engagement.

Trait Engagement (propensity to engagement as a personality trait) → State Engagement (actual state of engagement) → Behavioral Engagement (observable behavior).

According to the authors, Involvement is considered part of a broader dispositional framework, along with proactive personality and optimism.

Thus, certain foreign studies highlight the dual nature of engagement: internally, it represents the employee's psychological state, and externally, it reflects the company's deliberate efforts to foster and sustain it.

However, analysis reveals conceptual ambiguity in how foreign psychology defines engagement. Two main interpretive traditions exist:

- ego-involvement as a stable personality trait linked to the value structures of the self-concept;
- personal significance as a situational factor influencing the depth of information processing.

However, there is no unified approach to defining this phenomenon, and no generally accepted theoretical model has been developed, which leads to terminological confusion, especially between the closely related constructs of "involvement" and "engagement".

Research on the phenomenon of "involvement" in Russian psychology

In Russian psychology, the phenomenon of "involvement" has been studied under various terms, but most systematically within the framework of the psychology of relations and the psychology of meaning.

The fundamental researcher of the phenomenon of "involvement" was V.N. Myasishchev [46], who considered the core of personality, which is a system of its selective conscious relations. The author defined involvement as the degree of expression and significance of a specific conscious relation in the general system of personality relations, which is formed from cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. He laid the theoretical foundation for understanding involvement not as a situational state, but as a stable personality disposition.

The key to understanding the mechanism of involvement is described by A.N. Leontiev [35], who explained that involvement is not an arbitrary decision, but a natural result of integrating activity into the meaningful structure of the individual. Activity becomes personally significant when its goal takes on a personal meaning. This happens in the process of meaning formation, when activity is linked to a motive that meets a real need.

The process of "motivational shift to goal" is an ideal mechanism for creating involvement. What was originally a means to an end (studying for a degree) becomes a goal in itself (studying for knowledge). When this happens, the activity takes on a deeper meaning, and the individual becomes truly engaged.

In the study of human attitudes towards work, the phenomenon of "involvement" was identified with the term "engagement in work" as a value orientation in work (what a person seeks in work: only a salary or also self-realization, communication, and creativity); professional identity (to what extent a profession has become part of the self-concept); and the meaningfulness of work, which is a key indicator directly reflecting the level of involvement E.A. Klimov [47].

In the systemic approach, the inclusion of an individual in the system of social relations was studied B.F. Lomov [48]. The author emphasized that a person is always in the position of a subject of various social communities (a work team, a family, or a nation). Involvement is a measure of the activity and awareness of this position, the extent to which a person accepts and implements personally significant norms, values, and goals of a group.

Russian psychology provided the phenomenon of "involvement" with not just a description, but a deep theoretical justification, placing it in the context of more general patterns: This is not a random variable, but a systemic property of the individual, derived from their relationship structure V.N. Myasishchev [46]. The mechanism of its formation is the formation of meaning in activity A.N. Leontiev [35], and its manifestation is always the individual's bias, selectivity, and activity towards the world E.A. Klimov [47]. It is a fundamental quality of the individual, characterizing the extent of their connection with the world through stable, meaningful relationships.

Thus, the study of the term involvement shows the evolution from a broad concept of personal significance to a narrower, operational construct that has taken its place in the complex system of motivational, activity, and relational variables alongside the more dynamic and popular term "engagement." Russian psychology has provided the phenomenon of "involvement" with more than just a description; it has provided it with a deep theoretical foundation, placing it in the context of more general patterns.

The essence and differences between the phenomena of "Engagement" and "Involvement"

Foreign and Russian researchers record various indicators of the components of engagement and involvement, while the methodological complexity and theoretical heterogeneity of the phenomena of engagement and involvement remain.

To clarify their similarities and differences, we structure the key aspects in a comparative table 1.

The difference between these concepts lies in the transition from "being involved in the process" to "being indissoluble in meaning."

Involvement answers the question, "Is a person participating in the action?" (Yes/No, intensity now).

Engagement answers the question, "Has the activity become a part of their identity and meaning during this period?" (Depth, amplitude, emotional intelligence).

Thus, a terminological separation has occurred: Involvement and Engagement are not synonyms, but rather different, albeit hierarchically related, constructs. Confusion between them leads to methodological errors.

Engagement is an actual state of energy and absorption that creates a favorable psychological foundation for Involvement.

Thus, we have established that the concepts of involvement and engagement have distinct meanings and cannot be interpreted as synonyms.

Table 1 Comparative table of the phenomena "Engagemen" and "Involvement"

Criteria	Engagement (absorption, enthusiasm)	Involvement (inclusion, participation)
Entity	State, experience, behavior.	Process, action, tactics.
Time dynamics	A stable, long-term state or a dynamic, changing state.	Constant practice or a specific, point-based event. A relatively stable disposition or trait. Slowly changing.
Stunt	Energy and absorption ("I am full of energy and absorbed in my work right now").	Significance and identification ("Work and relationships are important to me").
The main component	Affective-motivational and behavioral (vigor, enthusiasm, perseverance).	Cognitive-evaluative (importance, relevance).
Initiative	It arises from a person (teacher, student, employee, or client).	It originates from an organizer (teacher, manager, or project leader).
A typical question	"How energetic and dedicated are you to your work?"	"How important is your work to your identity?"
Measurement	More often through qualitative and behavioral indicators: loyalty, energy level, surveys on emotional attachment.	Often through quantitative metrics of participation in the educational process, programs, the number of ideas, and activity in learning.

Involvement is a situational, often externally determined process of involving a person in an activity, while engagement is a stable, internally motivated psychological state of complete absorption in a task. Ignoring this distinction in practical psychology and management leads to erroneous strategies: by stimulating external involvement (for example, through control, incentives, or deadlines), professionals mistakenly believe that they are fostering deep engagement, but in reality, a person may exhibit activity while remaining emotionally detached and prone to burnout. Therefore, the true development of engagement requires not so much the management of actions, but rather the creation of conditions for autonomy, meaning, and psychological safety — factors that allow involvement to evolve into a sustainable state.

Thus, the psychological analysis of the phenomena of engagement and involvement has shown that in-depth and meaningful studies of these constructs tend to belong to separate (divergent) scientific fields. These studies are characterized by insufficient integration between these fields and do not reflect the multiple nature of the real connections that exist between the components of engagement and involvement as subjects of study. However, it is the methodological and conceptual frameworks that are essential for understanding the concepts of engagement and involvement, as well as for generating new knowledge and developing innovative technological solutions.

RESULTS

The results of this analysis allow us to structure the research field and contribute to the scientifically grounded development of a model of the "triple potential" of the "Engagement – Involvement – Engagement" resource complex for the personal and professional development of teachers and students.

The conceptual model of the "triple potential" of the "Engagement – Involvement – Engagement" resource complex for the personal and professional development of education subjects

In our opinion, the methodological complexity and terminological heterogeneity of the concepts of engagement and involvement can be mitigated by introducing the idea of various psychological potentials, which are described in the "triple potential" model of personal and professional development of teachers and students.

The model allows us to expand and deepen the meta-theoretical framework of the concept of resource-prognostic determination of the personal and professional development of subjects of continuous education L.M. Mitina [8].

Within this concept, the professional development of a teacher's personality is interpreted as a continuous process of self-projection by the subject, characterized by a high level of self-awareness and integral personal formations that include direction, competence, and flexibility.

In the process of transition between the stages of psychological personality reorganization (self-determination, self-expression, self-realization), the teacher's personal characteristics are combined into professionally significant constellations defined as resources: constructive coping, reflective design, and involvement.

Each of the resource formations was studied as a conceptual construct. The study of the resource complex "involvement – engagement" required a more in-depth, comprehensive study L.M. Mitina et al. [49]; L.M. Mitina et al. [50] and the development of a conceptual model of "triple potential".

In the "triple potential" model, it is theoretically substantiated that the main function of the "engagement-involvement" complex's resourcefulness is determined not so much by the development of its individual components' potentials, but rather by the degree of structural and functional organization and the sequence of the components of this system: "teacher engagement, emotional and value-based involvement, and student engagement." In this paper, for the first time, we propose to consider the resource construct "engagement-involvement" of a teacher in two complementary aspects: as a state (engagement) and as a procedural characteristic (involvement), understood as the teacher's constructive actions aimed at including students in educational activities and forming a multi-subject community with them in order to achieve a state of engagement among students.

Three potentials (three interrelated components)

1. Professional engagement of a teacher is an integrative emotional-value state characterized by a stable passion for professional activity, a high degree of absorption in it, a subjective experience of satisfaction from its implementation and a sense of meaningfulness of one's own professional life, due to a value position, a high level of pedagogical orientation, recognition of the child as the main value, an equal subject of the educational process, having unique resources for its own development.

2. Involvement is a multifaceted process that includes a system of purposeful pedagogical actions, a set of professional competencies, and a range of relevant strategies that ensure the integration of students into collaborative activities (educational process and extracurricular interactions) taking into account their individual and age-related characteristics. This component includes the possession of diversified communication tools, methods of joint goal-setting, and technologies for facilitating the participation of each child in the educational process based on a system of deep and contextualized knowledge and understanding of the differential impact on a child's academic trajectory and personal development.

3. Student engagement is an emotional and value-based state characterized by a stable positive attitude towards learning activities. In this state, students demonstrate cognitive and behavioral engagement in the educational process, showing enthusiasm and energy activation. They are capable of purposeful willpower, overcoming difficulties, and maintaining focus on their activities, despite external and internal obstacles. They interact with the teacher and other students with enthusiasm and desire, contributing to the creation of a multi-subject community aimed at joint and simultaneous development. The teacher's awareness of the institutional and structural conditions necessary for fostering and supporting students' engagement in the educational process encourages them to use innovative (interactive) technologies to create a developmental educational environment.

It has been proven by theoretical and empirical methods L.M. Mitina et al. [49], L.M. Mitina et al. [50] that only a holistic system of three potentials (its degree of organization and consistency) ensures the actualization of the development resources of educational subjects, and a breakdown in the system leads to problems, barriers, and risks of personal and professional development, personality deformations of teachers, and various forms of deviant behavior among students.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The data we have obtained are comparable to the theoretical concepts of both foreign authors [13], who define engagement as a positive, consistently emotional, motivational and cognitive state, and domestic scientists [39], who understand engagement as a high degree of semantic and emotional involvement of a person in a meaningful and valuable activity, and a resource involvement as a state that is formed as a result of interaction between a person and the environment [7]. However, this does not agree with the opinion of the developer of the "Theory of personal Engagement and Detachment" [12], who define personal involvement as the sharing of employees' capabilities in the performance of work tasks.

We agree with the authors [45] who propose an integrative model where both constructs are related: involvement is a precursor (predictor) of the state of engagement. However, in our opinion, two components in the model are not enough. That is why we have developed a model of "triple potential", in which the psychological content of the resource complex "engagement- involvement- engagement" includes: the emotional and value state of the teacher - involvement in the profession, involvement – process, a system of specific actions of the teacher to actively involve students in joint activities, student involvement – the emotional and value state of students in the learning process.

The research results enrich and detail scientific knowledge about teachers' resource capabilities and psychological means of overcoming barriers in their personal and professional development.

CONCLUSION

Foreign and domestic research has transformed engagement and involvement from intuitive concepts into scientific constructs with proven practical value. A solid empirical base has been established to support their role as a central link between environmental quality and individual performance. However, the field has entered a stage of mature reflection, shifting the focus from proving the existence of phenomena and their correlates to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms, boundaries, cultural and contextual specifics, and potential risks of the "engagement-involvement" resource complex for the personal and professional development of educators and students.

The conceptual model of the "triple potential" of the resource complex "engagement-involvement- engagement" is the most comprehensive theoretical model that can enrich both global scientific discourse and educational practice. The prospects for further research lie in the integration of this theoretical foundation and the empirical evidence base obtained in our experimental studies with modern methods of digital transformation of the contexts of a developing educational environment.

This synthesis will allow us to move from static measurements of engagement to dynamic monitoring and personalized design of engagement trajectories that take into account individual motivation profiles, cognitive styles, and the current areas of proximal development of educational participants. It is important to emphasize that the digital transformation of contexts carries not only expanding opportunities (adaptive platforms, gamification, and learning analytics), but also hidden risks: the simulation of engagement through behavioral markers, hyperstimulation leading to satiety, and the substitution of deep personal engagement with external, technologically mediated engagement, which requires the development of ethical and methodological barriers.

Further research should focus on verifying the triple-potentials model in longitudinal and cross-cultural designs, as well as creating practice-oriented tools for diagnosing and fostering genuine engagement that is resilient to environmental fluctuations and retains its developmental potential in the context of digital hybridization in education.

REFERENCES

1. Leadership in education. Lead for learning (2024). Global Education Monitoring Report 2024/2025 / UNESCO. Paris: UNESCO, 2024. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391406> (accessed 13 February 2025)
2. Putin, V.V. (2025). Telegram to the participants, organizers and guests of the All-Russian Pedagogical Congress (August 19, 2025). Moscow. (In Russ.). URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/letters/77815/print> (viewed: 12.01.2025).
3. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. (2023). Job Demands–Resources Theory: Ten Years Later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
4. Steger, M.F., Dik, B.J. (2024). Meaningful work: A review of its history, contemporary scholarship, and future directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11, 201–226.
5. Price, H., Dhanda, N., Strauss, J. (2025). Exploring the goals and stages of patient and public involvement (PPIE) in audiology research: a case-based approach. *Research Participation*, 11(1):4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-025-00672-9>
6. Maloshonok, N.G. (2023). Student Engagement as an Instrument of Assessing the Quality of Education in Russian Universities. *University Management: Practice and Analysis*, 27(2), 45–58. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.15826/umpa.2023.02.012>
7. Pavlova, E.V. (2024) On the Issue of the Relationship between Typological Features and Psychological Dimensions of the “Resource of Involvement” of Students in the Space of Life Fulfillment. *Society: Sociology, Psychology, Pedagogics*, (8), 20–28. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.24158/spp.2024.8.2>
8. Mitina, L.M. (2026) The Concept of Three-Component Resourcefulness of a Teacher's Personal and Professional Development: The Principle of Continuity and the Emergent Effect. *Psychological Sciences*, 1, 111–126. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.18384/3033-6414-2026-1-111-126>
9. Ojo, A.O., Favehinmi, O., Yusliza, M.Y. (2021). Study of Factors Affecting Sustainability and Work Engagement During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Sustainable Development*, 13, Article 2902. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052902>
10. Maslow, A. (1967). Self-actualizing and beyond. In: Challenges of Humanistic Psychology. New York
11. Rogers, C. (1965) Client-centered therapy: its current practice, implications and theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
12. Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>
13. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
14. Schaufeli, W.B. (2013). What is engagement? In: C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, E. Soane (Eds.) Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice. Chapter 1. London: Routledge
15. Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., Schaufeli, W.B. (2023). Work Engagement: A Meta-Analysis Using the Job Demands-Resources Model. *Psychological Reports*, 126(3), 1069–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988>
16. Sack, A.M., Rothbard, N.P. (2019). The “Attention–Absorption” Model of Work Engagement: A Closer Look at the Phenomenological Experience of Engagement. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 37, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120190000037005>
17. Bakker, A.B., van Wingerden, J. (2024). The Job Demands–Resources theory of work engagement: A multilevel and dynamic perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 33(4), 294–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214241253117>
18. Csikszentmihalyi, M., Abuhamdeh, S., Nakamura, J. (2005). Flow. In A.J. Elliot, C.S. Dweck (Eds.). Handbook of Competence and Motivation (pp. 598–608). Guilford Publ
19. Hobfoll, S.E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(3), 337–421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>
20. Booth, B.M., Bosch, N., D’Mello, K.S. (2023). Engagement detection and its applications in learning: A tutorial & selective review. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 111(10), 1398–1422. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2023.3309560>
21. Littman-Ovadia, H., Steger, M.F., Chan, C.Y. (2022). Engagement and meaning during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multi-national study of the sense of coherence. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 14(3), 938–962. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12360>
22. May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
23. Astin, A.W. (1984). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297–308
24. Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019->

0176-8

25. Kahu, E.R. (2013). Framing Student Engagement in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 758–773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505>
26. Mercier, E.Y. (2023). The role of assessment in student engagement and motivation. In: *International Encyclopedia of Education* (4th ed., pp. 630-639). Oxford: Elsevier
27. Brookhart, S.M. (2023). Classroom Assessment Essentials. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
28. Wang, M.-T., Hofkens, T., Fredricks, J.A. (2024). The Longitudinal Interplay of Behavioral, Emotional, and Cognitive Engagement from Middle to High School: A Latent Transition Analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 116(2), 267–284.
29. Fredricks, J.A. (2022). The measurement of student engagement: Methodological advances and comparison of new self-report instruments. In J.A. Fredricks et al. (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 597–616). Cham: Springer International Publ. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-07853-8_29
30. Abdulganie N., Alingig C., Balatero L., Bande M., Bantillo N., Berdin J., Pangantapan S., Pondang K. (2025) The Relationship of Technological Resources and Student Engagement Among Senior High School Students // *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, IX, (II), 3378-3393. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9020263>
31. Xu, Z., Zhou, X., Watts, J., Kogut, A. (2023). The effect of student engagement strategies in online instruction for data management skills. *Education and information technologies*, 1(18). Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11572-w>
32. Ouyang, Z. (2025). Self-regulated learning and engagement as serial mediators between AI-driven adaptive learning platform characteristics and educational quality: a psychological mechanism analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1646469>
33. Amerstorfer, C. M., Freiin von Münster-Kistner, C. (2021) Student Perceptions of Academic Engagement and Student-Teacher Relationships in Problem-Based Learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713057>
34. Vygotsky, L.S. (2024). Lectures on psychology. Thinking and speech. Moscow, Yurait Publ. (In Russ.).
35. Leontiev, A.N. (2004). Activity. Conscience. Personality. Moscow, Sense; Academy Publ. (In Russ.).
36. Rubinstein, S.L. (2012). Being and consciousness. St. Petersburg, Piter Publ. (In Russ.).
37. Petrovsky, V.A. (2021). A man above the situation. Moscow, Sense Publ. (In Russ.).
38. Leontiev, D.A. (2019). The psychology of meaning. The nature, structure and dynamics of semantic reality. Moscow, Sense Publ. (In Russ.).
39. Kasatkina, D.A., Kravchenko, A.M., Kupriyanov, R.B., Nekhorosheva, E.V. (2020). Automatic Engagement Detection in Education: Critical Review. *Journal of Modern Foreign Psychology*, 9(3), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.17759/jmfp.2020090305>
40. Gorchakova, O.Yu., Filkina, A.V., Larionova, A.V., Tolstova, M.A. (2025). Involvement in the Online Learning Process: Results of a Psychophysiological Study. *Psychological Science and Education*, 30(4), 56–68. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2025300404>
41. Sherif, M., Hovland, C.I. (1980). Social judgment: Assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change. Greenwood Press
42. Petty, R. E., and Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 123–205. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60214-2
43. Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
44. Harter, K.J., Schmidt, L.F., Hayes, T.L. (2019). Business-Unit-Level Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.268>
45. Macey, W.H., Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(1), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x>
46. Myasishchev, V.N. (1960). Personality and neurosis. Leningrad, Publ. House of Leningrad University. (In Russ.)
47. Klimov, E.A. (1996). Professional psychology. Moscow, Voronezh: Institute of Practical Psychology; NGO "MODEK" Publ. (In Russ.).
48. Lomov, B.F. (1989). Systems Approach and the Problem of Determinism in Psychology. *Psychological Journal*, 10(4), 19–33. (In Russ.)
49. Mitina, L.M., Anisimova, O.A., Mitin, G.V. (2025). Prevention and Correction of Students' Inclination to Addictions and Offenses: the Role of the Teacher's Psychological Resources. *Psychology and Law*, 15(4), 128–146. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/psylaw.2025150407>
50. Mitina, L.M., Mitin, G.V., Anisimova, O.A. (2025). Psychological Resource "Engagement – Involvement" of a Teacher's Personal and Professional Development as a Means of Preventing Addictive Behavior of Students. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania = Perspectives of Science and Education*, 2, 528–543. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2025.2.33>

Авторы

Митина Лариса Максимовна
(Россия, Москва)

Доктор психологических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Лаборатории экпсихологии развития и психодидактики

Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований (ФНПР)

E-mail: mitinalm@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8407-0978

Митин Георгий Валерьевич
(Россия, Москва)

Кандидат психологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Лаборатории экпсихологии развития и психодидактики

Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований (ФНПР)

E-mail: jorik_76@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3124-0352

Анисимова Оксана Анатольевна
(Россия, Москва)

Кандидат психологических наук, старший научный сотрудник Лаборатории Экпсихология развития и психодидактика

Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований (ФННИП)

E-mail: anisimov-am@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2500-4783

Authors

Larisa M. Mitina
(Russia, Moscow)

Dr. Sci. (Psychol.), Professor, Chief Researcher, Laboratory of Ecopsychology of Development and Psychodidactics

Federal Scientific Center for Psychological and Interdisciplinary Research

E-mail: mitinalm@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8407-0978

Georgy V. Mitin
(Russia, Moscow)

Cand. Sci. (Psychol.), Leading Researcher, Laboratory of Ecopsychology of Development and Psychodidactics

Federal Scientific Center for Psychological and Interdisciplinary Research

E-mail: jorik_76@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3124-0352

Oksana A. Anisimova
(Russia, Moscow)

Dr. Sci. (Psychol.), Senior Researcher, Laboratory of Ecopsychology of Development and Psychodidactics

Federal Scientific Center for Psychological and Interdisciplinary Research

E-mail: anisimov-am@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2500-4783

Вклад авторов

Митина Л. М.: концептуализация, методология, создание рукописи и ее редактирование, руководство исследованием

Митин Г. В.: проведение исследования, создание черновика рукописи

Анисимова О. А.: формальный анализ, создание черновика рукописи

© Митина Л. М., Митин Г. В.,
Анисимова О. А., 2026

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов

Authors contribution

Larisa M. Mitina: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision

Georgy V. Mitin: Investigation, Writing - Original Draft

Oksana A. Anisimova: Formal analysis, Writing - Original Draft

© Larisa M. Mitina, Georgy V. Mitin,
Oksana A. Anisimova, 2026

The authors declared no conflicts of interest