

Bridging student affairs support and student development: A systematic review of how student affairs supports shape comprehensive qualities through student engagement

 Dong Zhao¹,  Sanmuga Nathan^{2*}

^{1,2}Management and Science University, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia; 472774430@qq.com (D.Z.)

sanmuga_nathan@msu.edu.my (S.N.).

Abstract: Student affairs have evolved from administrative functions to strategic mechanisms that promote holistic student development in higher education. However, existing studies remain fragmented, providing a limited understanding of how Student Affairs Supports (SAS) contribute to Student Comprehensive Qualities (SCQ) through Student Engagement (SE). This study conducted a systematic review in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 guidelines. Literature was retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, CNKI, and Wanfang, and 40 peer-reviewed empirical studies were included after rigorous screening and quality appraisal using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT). The findings indicate that SAS consists of two complementary dimensions: Digital Intelligence Service Support and Developmental Empowerment Support. Both dimensions enhance students' behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement, thereby fostering Psychological Capital, Career Adaptability, and Civic Literacy. Guided by Astin's Input–Environment–Outcome (I-E-O) Model and supported by Self-Determination Theory and Multidimensional Student Engagement Theory, this review integrates existing evidence into a coherent conceptual mechanism linking institutional support, student engagement, and comprehensive student development. The review also identifies key research gaps and provides implications for future research and the design of student affairs practices in digitally transformed higher education.

Keywords: Higher education, Student affairs supports, Student comprehensive qualities, Student engagement, Systematic review.

1. Introduction

The landscape of contemporary higher education is undergoing a profound paradigm shift, transitioning from physical expansion to quality-driven, intrinsic development. Within this transition, the strategic role of Student Affairs Supports (SAS) has evolved far beyond its historical origins as a mechanical, administrative mechanism for student management and crisis control. Historically, student affairs units functioned primarily as bureaucratic gatekeepers, enforcing standardized behavioral compliance policies and providing basic services. However, in the modern university ecosystem, particularly within the context of China's ongoing higher education modernization, such reactive frameworks fail to address the complex socio-psychological, vocational, and digital demands of contemporary students. Under the twin pressures of institutional digital transformation and rising psychosocial stressors, epitomized by the sociocultural phenomena of academic involution and academic "lying flat," the traditional model of administrative oversight is increasingly obsolete [1].

Modern student support must be re-envisioned as an integrated, proactive, and data-driven ecosystem. This research situates this paradigm shift at the intersection of institutional support and student developmental outcomes, exploring how modern SAS influences undergraduate growth. Specifically, this study conceptualizes SAS through two complementary, interactive dimensions: Digital

Intelligence Service Support and Developmental Empowerment Support [2]. While the former leverages advanced educational technologies to eliminate friction costs and streamline the administrative touchpoints of campus life, the latter focuses on cultivating social capital, self-determination, and psychological resources. Together, they form a holistic institutional environment designed to foster student agency rather than compliance.

Importantly, institutional resources and environments do not automatically translate into developmental outcomes. The effectiveness of SAS depends on how actively students engage with the opportunities provided. This study positions Student Engagement (SE), spanning behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions, as the critical process through which institutional inputs are transformed into developmental outcomes. Rather than viewing students as passive recipients of student affairs programming, this research conceptualizes them as active co-creators of educational value.

2. Method

This study was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 Statement for systematic reviews. A comprehensive literature search was performed across major international and Chinese academic databases, including Scopus and Web of Science. The search covered studies published within the most recent five-year period in order to capture contemporary empirical evidence on the digital transformation of higher education, student support services, post-pandemic psychological resilience, and emerging student psychosocial phenomena.

Bilingual search strings in English and Chinese were developed to reflect three core conceptual domains: (1) Student Affairs Supports, including digital intelligence service support and developmental empowerment support; (2) Student Engagement, including behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement; and (3) Student Comprehensive Qualities, including psychological capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy. The initial search yielded approximately 520 records. After removing duplicate entries, the remaining studies underwent a systematic screening process.

Eligibility criteria were established before screening. Studies were included if they were peer-reviewed empirical research articles published in academic journals, focused on higher education students, and examined at least one relationship among student affairs supports, student engagement, or student comprehensive qualities. Studies were excluded if they were dissertations, conference abstracts, book reviews, non-peer-reviewed reports, or studies that measured student outcomes solely through static GPA or academic achievement indicators without broader developmental constructs.

Two independent reviewers conducted a multi-stage screening process involving titles, abstracts, and full texts. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached. Following the eligibility assessment, approximately 40 studies were retained for the final review. These studies included research published in international Scopus/Web of Science-indexed journals as well as Chinese CSSCI-indexed journals, providing a balanced cross-cultural evidence base.

Data extraction focused on publication characteristics, research context, sample profiles, theoretical frameworks, methodological approaches, dimensions of student affairs support, dimensions of student engagement, outcome indicators, and key empirical findings. Particular attention was given to evidence related to digital student affairs platforms, developmental support practices, mediating mechanisms of student engagement, and indicators of psychological capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy.

To evaluate the methodological quality of the included studies, the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) was employed. The quality assessment was used to ensure that the empirical evidence synthesized in the subsequent analysis was methodologically sound and sufficiently rigorous to support the proposed mechanism-based discussion.

3. Theoretical Foundations

To systematically map the pathways of undergraduate growth within contemporary higher education, this study adopts Astin's Input-Environment-Outcome (I-E-O) model as its macro framework [3]. This model establishes that student development is a function of the continuous

interaction between a student's baseline characteristics and their institutional context. In this study, inputs encompass baseline controls such as gender, socioeconomic status, and grade level. The environment is operationalized as Student Affairs Supports, bifurcated into digital intelligence service support and developmental empowerment support. Outcomes transcend narrow grade point average metrics, focusing instead on Student Comprehensive Qualities measured via psychological capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy [4]. By utilizing this paradigm, the study isolates the net variance explained by the institutional environment while controlling for entry-level student characteristics.

Yet, institutional environments alone cannot guarantee developmental outcomes. To explain the motivational mechanisms underlying this conversion, the study draws on Self-Determination Theory [5]. Central to this framework is Basic Psychological Needs Theory, which posits that human motivation and persistence depend on satisfying three universal needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. When student affairs units provide high-quality counseling, career mentoring, and frictionless digital services, they foster an autonomy-supportive climate rather than a compliance-driven bureaucracy. This resource delivery system mitigates contemporary campus stressors, thereby unlocking the voluntary psychological energy required for individual capability construction.

Building on this motivational foundation, the study employs Multidimensional Student Engagement Theory [6] to clarify how psychological energy is mobilized and expressed in practice. Engagement is treated as a meta-construct comprising behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions, ensuring that institutional affordances are not merely accessed but actively transformed by students into lasting developmental assets [7]. This framework highlights that authentic growth requires more than participation; it demands sustained effort, emotional connection, and deep cognitive investment.

Taken together, these three frameworks form a coherent analytical model.

Astin's I-E-O model provides the macrostructure, mapping how institutional environments interact with student characteristics to shape outcomes.

Self-Determination Theory explains the micro-level motivational logic, showing how supports satisfy basic psychological needs and fuel autonomous energy.

Multidimensional Student Engagement Theory specifies how this energy is enacted through behavioral, emotional, and cognitive channels, ultimately constructing the sociopsychological capacities that define students' comprehensive qualities.

This layered integration shifts higher education assessment away from a reductive focus on static inputs toward a dynamic, process-oriented understanding of holistic student empowerment.

4. Conceptualizing the Core Constructs

To build a rigorous analytical model, this section systematically reconstructs the three core constructs under study. Rather than offering mere lexical definitions, we ground each variable in established sociological, psychological, and organizational literature, aligning them with the current Scopus-indexed empirical consensus.

Table 1.
Reconceptualization matrix of core variables.

Core Variable	Theoretical Dimensions	Scopus-Aligned Academic Reconceptualization
Student Affairs Supports (SAS)	1. Digital Intelligence Service Support 2. Developmental Empowerment Support	Reconceptualized from an administrative control and reactive response mechanism into an active, data-driven, and supportive ecosystem. Digital intelligence removes friction and transaction costs, while developmental empowerment builds social capital and psychological resources.
Student Engagement (SE)	1. Behavioral Engagement 2. Emotional Engagement 3. Cognitive Engagement	Shifted from a measure of passive resource consumption to a mechanism of educational value co-creation. SE acts as the dynamic “black box” and energy converter mediating institutional resources (inputs) and individual growth (outputs).
Student Comprehensive Qualities (SCQ)	1. Psychological Capital (PsyCap) 2. Career Adaptability (CA) 3. Civic Literacy (CL)	Redefined away from GPA-dominated academic metrics toward core sociopsychological adaptability. It measures an individual's capability to navigate societal uncertainty, labor market volatility, and democratic civic life.

4.1. Student Affairs Supports (SAS)

Traditionally operationalized through enterprise service quality instruments like SERVQUAL [8], Student Affairs Supports (SAS) has historically been evaluated using indicators such as administrative efficiency, tangibility, and staff responsiveness. In contrast, this study aligns with contemporary higher education literature by conceptualizing SAS as an integrated, proactive, and data-driven supportive ecosystem rather than a collection of fragmented administrative offices. Under this ecological framework, SAS is split into two distinct yet highly complementary dimensions: Digital Intelligence Service Support and Developmental Empowerment Support.

4.1.1. Digital Intelligence Service Support

Rather than merely representing the computerization of paper-based workflows (e.g., online forms and basic database queries), Digital Intelligence Service Support represents the deployment of intelligent, frictionless systems designed to minimize cognitive load and administrative friction for students [9]. Grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and system trust paradigms [10], this dimension measures the university's capacity for:

Data-driven precision delivery: proactively identifying student needs, such as financial aid eligibility or academic warnings, using predictive analytics rather than waiting for student applications.

Frictionless administrative interactions: Eliminating bureaucratic barriers through integrated one-stop digital halls, thereby freeing up students' temporal and cognitive resources for core academic and developmental activities.

User-centric system trust: Ensuring transparent data governance, algorithmic fairness, and robust privacy protections, which altogether build institutional trust [11].

4.1.2. Developmental Empowerment Support

If digital intelligence serves to remove friction, developmental empowerment serves to add capital. Guided by Self-Determination Theory (SDT) [12], this dimension captures the quality of non-administrative, growth-oriented institutional resources. It focuses on satisfying students' basic psychological needs:

Autonomy: Providing supportive academic guidance and career mentoring that empowers students to make self-directed choices rather than imposing standardized paths.

Competence: Facilitating high-impact educational practices, one-on-one professional mentoring, and target-driven psychological support to build self-efficacy [13].

Relatedness: Cultivating a strong sense of campus belonging, mental well-being, and community support to buffer against systemic anxieties, such as academic involution [14].

4.2. Student Engagement (SE)

Student Engagement (SE) has long been recognized as a primary predictor of student success, but early formulations often reduced it to a simple measure of time on task or passive participation in university-sponsored activities. This study reconceptualizes SE as an active process of educational value co-creation. Students are not empty vessels to be filled with institutional support; they must actively mobilize their own agency to transform institutional inputs into developmental assets [15]. Under this framework, SE serves as the primary "black box" and energy converter in the learning process, consisting of three deeply intertwined dimensions: institutional input, student engagement, and developmental output [16].

Behavioral Engagement: This represents the observable exertion of effort and active participation in both academic and non-academic activities. It encompasses class attendance, study time, interaction with faculty, and involvement in peer collaborations and extracurricular organizations.

Emotional Engagement: This captures students' affective states within the university environment. It refers to their sense of belonging to the institution, their emotional safety, their connection to peers and academic advisers, and their overall enthusiasm for learning. High emotional engagement acts as an intrinsic motivator that sustains academic persistence.

Cognitive Engagement: This denotes the internal, strategic investment of intellectual energy. It goes beyond memorization to encompass deep-level learning strategies, self-regulation, critical thinking, and the willingness to exert the mental effort necessary to master complex skills and solve ill-defined problems.

Through these three dimensions, SE functions as a mediator. Institutional initiatives (SAS) can only stimulate development (SCQ) when they successfully trigger behavioral action, foster emotional safety, and demand deep cognitive processing from the student.

4.3. Student Comprehensive Qualities (SCQ)

For decades, higher education research heavily relied on Grade Point Average (GPA) and academic achievement metrics as the ultimate indicators of institutional effectiveness. However, in an era characterized by labor market instability, rapid technological disruption, and intense social competition, GPA is an insufficient measure of lifelong success [17]. This study academicizes and operationalizes Student Comprehensive Qualities (SCQ) as core psychological-social adaptability. Rather than testing rote knowledge, SCQ evaluates a student's capacity to cope with systemic uncertainty, navigate volatile career landscapes, and engage meaningfully as a modern citizen [18]. This construct is measured through three core pillars:

4.3.1. Psychological Capital

Rooted in Positive Organizational Behavior [19], PsyCap is a state-like developmental capacity consisting of four psychological resources, collectively known as the HERO framework:

Hope (H): Having the willpower and pathway-planning capacity to pursue developmental goals.

Efficacy (E): Believing in one's capability to execute tasks and overcome challenging obstacles.

Resilience (R): Sustaining effort and bouncing back when faced with systemic stress, failure, or academic setbacks.

Optimism (O): Making positive attributions about current and future success.

4.3.2. Career Adaptability (CA)

Drawing from Savickas [20] Career Construction Theory, Career Adaptability is conceptualized as the psychological resource pack required to manage current and anticipated career transitions, work traumas, and professional tasks [21]. It is evaluated across four critical self-regulation strengths:

Concern: Thinking about and preparing for one's vocational future.

Control: Taking personal responsibility for shaping one's career trajectory.

Curiosity: Actively exploring potential professional selves and workplace environments.

Confidence: Believing in one's capacity to solve problems and execute career decisions successfully.

4.3.3. Civic Literacy (CL)

Civic Literacy extends SCQ beyond individual-centric psychological coping strategies to encompass social and collective responsibility [22]. It evaluates a student's readiness to contribute constructively to public life. This dimension measures:

Civic Responsibility: An internalized sense of obligation toward the welfare of campus, local, and national communities.

Societal Problem-Solving: The capacity to apply critical thinking to social issues and collaborate across diverse sociodemographic boundaries to solve public problems.

Ethical Agency: Navigating complex ethical landscapes with integrity, particularly in digital environments and public spaces.

5. Literature Review and Mechanism Synthesis

5.1. The Direct Impact of Student Affairs Supports on Student Comprehensive Qualities

Within the Input-Environment-Outcome framework, student affairs support functions as a decisive environmental input that directly drives students' comprehensive qualities. Developmental empowerment support, delivered through counseling and mentoring, serves as an emotional cushion that buffers academic anxiety, directly enhancing psychological capital by replenishing students' hope and resilience [23, 24]. Additionally, systematic career mentoring helps students clarify long-term goals and expand their social capital, which directly elevates post-graduation career adaptability [25]. Concurrently, structured community practices and service-learning modules accelerate the internalization of civic virtues, thereby boosting civic literacy [26].

In tandem, digital intelligence service support optimizes student growth by reducing operational friction. Digitized mental health resources lower barriers to help-seeking behavior [27] while AI-enabled career diagnostics stimulate career curiosity and ease labor market anxieties. By streamlining administrative bottlenecks and providing proactive, equity-driven interventions, modern student affairs systems conserve students' cognitive resources, directly empowering their self-efficacy, emotional well-being, and adaptive capacities [28, 29].

5.2. The Activating Role of Student Affairs Supports on Student Engagement

Student engagement depends not only on individual learning motivation but also deeply on the supportive environment provided by higher education institutions. Within this context, digital intelligence service support has emerged as a crucial engine for enhancing multidimensional engagement. By integrating artificial intelligence and big data, early warning systems and adaptive platforms proactively identify low-engagement students, thereby reducing academic friction and boosting behavioral compliance. Intelligent systems act as a digital gravity that anchors student attention and decodes behavioral patterns in real time to shift university operations from reactive troubleshooting to proactive support [30]. However, this technological integration is not entirely linear, as a lack of humanized interactive design can induce technological alienation and diminish emotional belonging [31]. To maximize cognitive investment, digital services must deliver personalized feedback tailored to individual learning paces, with student digital literacy serving as a critical moderating factor in this interactive loop [32, 33].

Complementing technical systems, development empowerment support directly drives student engagement by targeting students' core psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Supportive relational environments created by university mentors fundamentally alter students' internal motivational states by satisfying their need for relatedness and community integration [34]. When

students feel holistically cared for, their institutional belonging and emotional engagement increase. Rather than directly triggering participation, institutional emotional support operates through a sequential psychological chain, first igniting academic self-efficacy and strengthening academic resilience, which then compels students to exhibit intense behavioral, emotional, and cognitive involvement in deep learning [13]. Ultimately, both digital and developmental support mechanisms must work in unison to satisfy students' basic needs and successfully translate external institutional resources into active, sustained student engagement.

5.3. The Constructive Influence of Student Engagement on Comprehensive Qualities

Student engagement stands as the strongest predictor of long-term undergraduate development outcomes, operating as the primary psychological process that translates academic experiences into personal resources. Active emotional and behavioral engagement broadens cognitive horizons, effectively building positive psychological capital and shielding students from scholastic burnout [35]. Empirical evidence confirms that deep immersion in campus activities functions as a defensive wall, continuously fueling student optimism, hope, and resilience under intense academic stress [36]. While state-like psychological capital acts as an internal motivational asset driving subsequent campus participation [37], it is the active operationalization of learning strategies that enables students to utilize Student Affairs Supports effectively during times of systemic crisis [38].

Beyond psychological resources, active engagement dynamically constructs long-term career adaptability. A student's immediate academic effort expands future coping mechanisms, providing a crucial developmental escalator for navigating volatile labor market transitions [39]. Highly engaged students demonstrate superior vocational curiosity, future concern, and confidence [25]. This developmental link proves that administrative career programs do not automatically generate vocational readiness. Instead, institutional inputs must first ignite behavioral and cognitive engagement, which subsequently sharpens transferable career meta-competencies and self-efficacy [40].

Furthermore, student engagement is the essential vehicle for internalizing civic literacy, as public values cannot be acquired through passive instruction alone. Active participation in social studies, civic spaces, and heritage programs serves as the vital mechanism that converts external educational content into intrinsic community responsibility and political awareness [41, 42]. When curriculum designs successfully stimulate emotional identification and critical thinking, students can internalize social responsibility and look past narrow economic self-interest [43].

From a dialectical perspective, the relationship between engagement and comprehensive qualities is neither unidirectional nor purely linear. While engagement constructs personal resources, these psychological and social assets simultaneously dictate a student's capacity to engage in the first place, creating a complex, self-reinforcing developmental loop. However, university administrators must recognize that excessive, unguided engagement, particularly when driven by hyper-competitive campus environments, can lead to cognitive exhaustion and eventual burnout rather than positive quality development. Consequently, the educational efficacy of engagement remains highly contextual, requiring balanced institutional scaffolding to ensure that active student participation serves as a source of genuine growth rather than an exhausting academic burden.

5.4. The Mediating Mechanism of Student Engagement

Under the Input-Environment-Outcome paradigm, external university resources and student affairs supports exert both direct and indirect effects on students' comprehensive qualities. On the one hand, developmental empowerment support and digital intelligence service support can directly enhance psychological capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy by reducing friction, providing mentoring, and fostering resilience. On the other hand, these institutional assets remain largely inert unless they successfully trigger an active investment of energy from the students themselves.

Student engagement operates as the primary mediating pipeline and psychological crucible through which macro-organizational investments are digested, reconfigured, and internalized into individual

qualities. This framework establishes that simply increasing support provision is insufficient; rather, activating student agency is the decisive lever for enhancing student development. Rather than being passive beneficiaries of university programming, students must act as active co-creators of their educational value, transforming structural environmental inputs into comprehensive competencies through distinct engagement pathways.

This transformative transmission operates through three highly specialized mediating pathways. Emotional engagement serves as the vital prerequisite for internalizing external supports into psychological resources, where positive affective experiences translate relational care from university mentors into stable resilience assets and enhanced psychological capital [44]. Behavioral engagement acts as the most direct action mechanism, converting institutional resources into professional competencies. When students actively utilize career services and participate in developmental activities, this sustained physical investment directly enhances their vocational self-efficacy and career adaptability [45]. Meanwhile, cognitive engagement serves as the core psychological mechanism for internalizing higher-order civic literacy. Mere behavioral participation without deep cognitive processing is insufficient; instead, high-level cognitive engagement, such as structured reflection and deep problem-solving, is what fully mediates the growth of durable public values and social responsibility [46, 47].

The integrated transmission of these multi-dimensional engagement tracks demonstrates that student engagement is the definitive mechanism connecting structural institutional frameworks to holistic student well-being and competencies [34, 48]. This pathway shifts students away from passive systemic compliance and toward meaningful institutional co-creation [49]. However, pathway modeling reveals that structural interventions can yield an uneven distribution of holistic competencies depending on the specific engagement track activated [50]. Furthermore, a critical analysis of current literature highlights a persistent geographic blind spot. While advanced structural equation modeling and longitudinal designs have validated the mediating power of engagement, these studies are heavily clustered in affluent Western educational markets. In resource-constrained developing countries and rapidly transforming Southeast Asian ecosystems, students face unique socio-economic pressures and digital landscapes that can fundamentally alter how emotional, behavioral, and cognitive investments operate as mediators. Validating these pathways within a developing higher education matrix is therefore critical to replace universalized assumptions with empirical realities specific to the global South.

5.5. Student Engagement as the Missing Mechanism

Current evidence consistently indicates that student engagement functions as the principal mediating mechanism and the central "black box" that bridges institutional resources at the input stage and holistic student growth at the outcome stage. In traditional higher education assessments, researchers frequently succumb to a reductionist fallacy, assuming that merely increasing the supply of student affairs supports, such as constructing advanced digital student portals or increasing counselor-to-student ratios, will automatically lead to an elevation in students' comprehensive qualities. This linear input-output logic, however, completely overlooks the critical psychological transformation phase that occurs within the educational process.

The reason for student engagement is that it represents the active internalization process through which external resources are converted into individual psychological resources. Regardless of how sophisticated the digital intelligence services are or how robust the developmental empowerment programs may be, they remain, in essence, structural "environmental affordances" provided by the institution. If students do not exert physical effort (behavioral engagement), experience a deep affective attachment to the campus community (emotional engagement), or apply critical reflection and self-regulated learning strategies (cognitive engagement), these external resources will simply remain dormant.

Therefore, student engagement serves as the irreplaceable energy converter that activates, digests, and reconstructs objective institutional inputs into stable, subjective qualities such as psychological

capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy. This black box is unlocked only when students transition from passive recipients of administrative management to active co-creators of their educational value. Through the multidimensional mediating pathways of engagement, external material and relational supports transcend the objective-subjective boundary, ultimately solidifying into the comprehensive, adaptive competencies required to navigate societal uncertainty.

6. Critical Discussion: Contextual Differences between Western and Chinese Student Affairs Systems

6.1. Epistemological Paradigms: Contractual Development vs. Ideological Preventive Governance

To fully comprehend how Student Affairs Supports (SAS) translate into Student Comprehensive Qualities (SCQ) through Student Engagement (SE), researchers must move beyond universalist assumptions and interrogate the distinct sociopolitical landscapes that shape higher education. The operationalization of SAS is fundamentally governed by two divergent institutional philosophies: the Western Contractual Development Model and the Chinese Hybrid Ideological-Preventive Model.

In most Western higher education systems, the relationship between the student and the institution is anchored in a contractual and service-oriented developmental logic. Rooted in classical student development theories, this model conceptualizes student affairs as a voluntary, decentralized support system. The university provides environmental affordances that students navigate as independent, self-directing agents possessing absolute volition. Under this framework, there is a clear boundary between academic life and private life, reflecting a dualistic separation of classroom education and student management. The contractual model assumes that students must initiate help-seeking behaviors themselves, meaning that student engagement is driven primarily by individual agency and choice within a marketized university ecosystem.

Conversely, the Chinese model operates on an ideological and preventive governance logic, synthesizing Marxist ideological-political education with modern service delivery. Rather than viewing student affairs merely as an administrative service or a crisis-response desk, Chinese universities conceptualize SAS as a holistic system of moral, political, and socio-emotional cultivation. Within this paternalistic structure, student affairs is not decentralized but highly integrated, utilizing a centralized network of college counselors and class mentors. This configuration rejects the academic-life dualism of Western institutions, positioning student affairs as an active, omnipresent participant in the student's entire educational journey. The Chinese system prioritizes preventive governance, seeking to identify and eliminate academic, mental health, and security crises before they arise.

6.2. The Evolution of the Counselor Role: From "Family-like Guardianship" to "Smart Precision Irrigation"

The core agent of this contextual divergence is the Chinese counselor, who historically occupies a role characterized by unlimited custodial responsibility or "family-like guardianship." Unlike Western professional specialists, who function strictly within designated boundaries, such as licensed psychological counselors or career advisors, the Chinese FudaoYuan acts as an administrative manager, political mentor, psychological first responder, career counselor, and surrogate parent simultaneously. While this high-touch, enveloping care creates a powerful institutional safety net, it has historically risked fostering student dependency, occasionally stifling the development of autonomy and active self-determination, the very psychological nutrients identified by Self-Determination Theory as necessary for genuine capability construction.

However, the rapid digital transformation of higher education is fundamentally resolving this tension by enabling a structural transition from reactive crisis management to proactive "smart precision irrigation." When student affairs units transition toward digital intelligence systems, they do not simply automate administrative workflows; they fundamentally alter the nature of institutional support.

Minimizing custodial friction: big-data predictive analytics, automated early-warning portals, and integrated digital halls automatically execute administrative policing and track student compliance. This digital delegation successfully liberates counselors from routine administrative monitoring.

Enabling proactive, target-driven support: Armed with real-time diagnostic indicators, counselors can transition from a "firefighter" posture (responding to crises post hoc) to "precision irrigation" (proactively deploying specific, personalized developmental resources to highly targeted cohorts).

Empowering student autonomy: Rather than imposing a standard path, the efficiency of smart student affairs platforms allows counselors to shift their focus from behavioral compliance toward developmental mentoring.

This digital shift transforms "preventive governance" from a mechanism of behavioral control into an institutional facilitator of student agency. By utilizing automated systems to handle baseline compliance, student affairs practitioners can dedicate their interpersonal energy to deep psychological counseling, personalized career guidance, and civic engagement projects. Consequently, the Chinese hybrid model demonstrates that when structured ideological and preventive priorities are supported by smart technology, they can move beyond mere risk reduction to actively nurture positive psychological capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy in a highly competitive societal landscape.

7. Future Research Agenda

While the synthesized literature provides a robust foundation for understanding the "Support-Engagement-Quality" pathway, several critical empirical, methodological, and contextual gaps remain.

7.1. Methodological and Research Design Advancements

Longitudinal Studies: The vast majority of current empirical evidence relies on cross-sectional survey data, which limits the ability to establish clear temporal ordering and causal relationships. Future studies should deploy longitudinal panel designs tracking students from university entry to post-graduation. This approach is essential to capture the long-term, dynamic developmental trajectories of psychological capital and career adaptability as they evolve through sustained student engagement.

Mixed-Methods Research: To fully unpack the operational realities of modern campus ecosystems, future designs must move beyond purely quantitative structural equation modeling. Integrating qualitative phenomenological inquiries, case studies, and student diaries with quantitative metrics will provide deeper contextual insights into how students subjectively experience digital and developmental support systems.

Mechanism Studies: Future research must conduct finer-grained mediation and moderation analyses to explore the structural boundaries of the engagement "black box." Specifically, studies should investigate the interactive feedback loops between individual baseline resources (inputs) and institutional affordances, mapping whether specific dimensions of student affairs supports selectively activate behavioral, emotional, or cognitive engagement pathways under varying levels of student digital literacy and academic stress.

7.2. Technology and Digital Transformation Pathways

AI-Enabled Student Affairs: As universities undergo rapid digital modernization, research must systematically evaluate the educational efficacy and psychological impact of artificial intelligence-enabled student services. Future inquiries should investigate how AI-driven early-warning systems, automated resume diagnostics, and virtual psychological counseling assistants alter student support perceptions. Crucially, studies must examine the ethical boundaries of automated intervention, focusing on user-centric system trust, data privacy, and algorithmic fairness.

Digital Engagement: The decoupling of physical presence from academic compliance in smart campus settings requires a paradigm shift in how student involvement is measured. Future studies must define and operationalize "digital engagement" as a distinct construct. This involves distinguishing

between routine administrative compliance and deep, collaborative digital learning investment, identifying how smart systems can foster authentic emotional and cognitive community integration online.

7.3. Contextual and Variable-Specific Innovations

Cross-Country Comparison: There is a critical shortage of comparative research examining student affairs across different sociopolitical and cultural paradigms. Future studies should execute cross-country comparative designs, particularly comparing the Western contractual developmental model with the East Asian/Chinese ideological-preventive governance model. This research will clarify how institutional configurations of authority, pastoral care, and student responsibility shape the mediating power of student engagement.

Civic Literacy Measurement: Unlike highly standardized scales for psychological capital and career adaptability, civic literacy is frequently evaluated using fragmented, self-reported behavioral indicators. Future research must develop, validate, and standardize multidimensional civic literacy scales tailored to the contemporary digital era. These instruments should capture not only traditional civic responsibility but also digital citizenship, ethical agency in virtual public spheres, and collaborative, cross-demographic societal problem-solving.

8. Conclusion and Implications

Theoretically, this study modernizes Astin's classical Input-Environment-Outcome (I-E-O) model by integrating it with Self-Determination Theory and Multidimensional Student Engagement Theory. By dividing the institutional environment into digital intelligence and developmental empowerment support, we move higher education assessment away from static, physical metrics toward a dynamic, process-oriented model. This synthesis establishes student engagement as the definitive, multidimensional converter within the newly conceptualized "Support-Engagement-Quality" pathway. It explains how external administrative inputs are actively internalized to construct durable psychological capital, career adaptability, and civic literacy, thereby resolving the historical "black box" of student development and showing that institutional resources rely heavily on student agency to yield meaningful outcomes.

Practically, these findings offer two strategic directives for higher education administrators navigating contemporary campus environments. First, institutions must avoid building cold, automated digital networks; instead, they should implement a dual-track strategy that utilizes digital intelligence to streamline administrative burdens while reinvesting freed counselor energy into high-touch, relational developmental empowerment that satisfies students' basic needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Second, the evaluation of student affairs performance must undergo a fundamental paradigm shift, moving away from tracking input-driven metrics such as the quantity of events hosted toward measuring process-driven, deep student engagement. Institutional success should be judged not by passive resource consumption but by the university's capacity to inspire active student value co-creation and deep, self-regulated learning.

Transparency:

The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Copyright:

© 2026 by the authors. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

References

- [1] Z. Lin, "Why and how to embrace AI such as ChatGPT in your academic life," *Royal Society Open Science*, vol. 10, no. 8, p. 230658, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.230658>
- [2] Z. Cao and T. Siththada, "The performance assessment for student affairs management under university student unions in Guangdong province," *Journal of Roi Kaensarn Academi*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 428-442, 2024.
- [3] A. W. Astin, *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York: Macmillan, 1991.
- [4] F. Ibrahim, J.-C. Münscher, M. Daseking, and N.-T. Telle, "The technology acceptance model and adopter type analysis in the context of artificial intelligence," *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 7, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1496518>
- [5] C. Antonietti, A. Cattaneo, and F. Amenduni, "Can teachers' digital competence influence technology acceptance in vocational education?," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 132, p. 107266, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107266>
- [6] J. A. Fredricks, P. C. Blumenfeld, and A. H. Paris, "School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 59-109, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- [7] G. R. Slemm, J. G. Field, R. M. Ryan, V. W. Forner, A. Van den Broeck, and K. J. Lewis, "Interpersonal supports for basic psychological needs and their relations with motivation, well-being, and performance: A meta-analysis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1012-1037, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000459>
- [8] R. B. Ludeman, K. J. Osfield, E. I. Hidalgo, D. Oste, and H. S. Wang, *Student affairs and services in higher education: Global foundations, issues, and best practices*, 3rd ed. Berlin, Germany: Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW), 2020.
- [9] F. Deriba, A. Kassahun, and B. Tekinerdogan, "Enhancing digitalization in Ethiopian higher education: A technology acceptance model approach," *Available at SSRN 5197923*, 2025.
- [10] I. K. Mensah and C. Luo, "Exploring factors determining Chinese college students' satisfaction with E-government services: the technology acceptance model (TAM) approach," *Information Resources Management Journal*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 1-20, 2021.
- [11] International Association of Universities, *Digitalisation of administrative services in universities*. Paris, France: International Association of Universities, 2025.
- [12] T. K. F. Chiu, "Applying the self-determination theory (SDT) to explain student engagement in online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic," *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, vol. 54, no. sup1, pp. S14-S30, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2021.1891998>
- [13] F. Guo, L. Zhang, and W. Xie, "In what environment can female college students excel? An analysis of gender differences in learning of Chinese college students," *International Journal of Chinese Education*, vol. 13, no. 3, p. 2212585X241282727, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2212585X241282727>
- [14] Y. He and X. Liu, "Development and validation of academic involution scale for college students," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 20876, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-04850-3>
- [15] S. Gomes, L. Costa, C. Martinho, J. Dias, G. Xexéo, and A. Moura Santos, "Modeling students' behavioral engagement through different in-class behavior styles," *International Journal of STEM Education*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 21, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00407-w>
- [16] Z. Y. Wong, G. A. D. Liem, M. Chan, and J. A. D. Datu, "Student engagement and its association with academic achievement and subjective well-being: A systematic review and meta-analysis," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 116, no. 1, pp. 48-75, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000833>
- [17] C. Chen, Y. Shen, Y. Zhu, F. Xiao, J. Zhang, and J. Ni, "The effect of academic adaptability on learning burnout among college students: The mediating effect of self-esteem and the moderating effect of self-efficacy," *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, vol. 16, no. null, pp. 1615-1629, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S408591>
- [18] Y. Liu, S. Ma, and Y. Chen, "The impacts of learning motivation, emotional engagement and psychological capital on academic performance in a blended learning university course," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 15, p. 1357936, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1357936>
- [19] D. Kumar, Y. Upadhyay, R. Yadav, and A. K. Goyal, "Psychological capital and innovative work behaviour: The role of mastery orientation and creative self-efficacy," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 102, p. 103157, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103157>
- [20] M. L. Savickas, "Career construction theory and practice," *Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 144-180, 2013.
- [21] D. Spurk, J. Volmer, M. Orth, and A. S. Göritz, "How do career adaptability and proactive career behaviours interrelate over time? An inter-and intraindividual investigation," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 93, no. 1, pp. 158-186, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12288>
- [22] N. Alfrević, M. Arslanagić-Kalajdžić, and Ž. Lep, "The role of higher education and civic involvement in converting young adults' social responsibility to prosocial behavior," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 2559, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-29562-4>

- [23] Y. Jia, S. Xue, R. Wang, and M. Song, "Teaching reform and practice of three-wide education under blended teaching mode," *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 76–82, 2024.
- [24] A. Khan, I. Zeb, Y. Zhang, S. Fazal, and J. Ding, "Relationship between psychological capital and mental health at higher education: Role of perceived social support as a mediator," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 8, p. e29472, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29472>
- [25] Í. M. Oliveira and C. Marques, "The role of career adaptability and academic engagement in college student's life satisfaction," *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 21, no. 5, p. 596, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21050596>
- [26] M. Bratko and L. Khoruzha, "Features of the activities of student services in U.S. universities," *Continuing Professional Education: Theory and Practice*, vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 7–18, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.28925/1609-8595.2025.1.1>
- [27] A. J. Bingham, "From data management to actionable findings: A five-phase process of qualitative data analysis," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 22, p. 16094069231183620, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620>
- [28] R. A. Mead, "Student affairs assessment: Measuring the effectiveness of assessment plans designed to shrink the academic equity gap," Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 2022.
- [29] A. R. Alcopra *et al.*, "Cultivating success: The student affairs leadership as a catalyst for student achievement and well-being," *Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología*, vol. 5, p. 2656, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.56294/saludcyt20252656>
- [30] Z. Zhou, "Artificial intelligence and student engagement in online learning: A literature review," *American Journal of Distance Education*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 8–30, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2025.2594282>
- [31] A. Uzorka and O. A. Odebiyi, "Impact of digital learning tools on student engagement and achievement," *Journal of Digital Learning and Distance Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1436–1445, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v4i1.511>
- [32] H. Yaseen, A. S. Mohammad, N. Ashal, H. Abusaimh, A. Ali, and A.-A. A. Sharabati, "The impact of adaptive learning technologies, personalized feedback, and interactive AI tools on student engagement: The moderating role of digital literacy," *Sustainability*, vol. 17, no. 3, p. 1133, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031133>
- [33] M. Parveen, L. Naz, S. Yasmin, and S. Malik, "Integrating artificial intelligence into higher education: Strategies for advancing student engagement and learning outcomes in digital contexts," *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 5253–5264, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.63056/ACAD.004.04.1347>
- [34] K. Prananto, S. Cahyadi, F. Y. Lubis, and Z. R. Hinduan, "Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students: A systematic literature review," *BMC Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 112, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02412-w>
- [35] X. Wang, X. Deng, W. M. Wan Jaafar, R. M. Sulong, Z. N. B. Zainudin, and W. N. Wan Othman, "Fostering academic engagement through soft skills and positive emotions: A sustainable development perspective on university education," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 16, p. 1622327, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1622327>
- [36] A. R. Nabais, M. J. Chambel, and V. S. Carvalho, "Unravelling time in higher education: Exploring the mediating role of psychological capital in burnout and academic engagement," *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 6, p. 663, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060663>
- [37] X. Fan, P. Srisawat, and S. Voracharoensri, "The influence of psychological capital on academic engagement among Chinese college students," *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 307–315, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v20i1.23063>
- [38] X.-y. Hao, Y. He, D.-x. Zhang, and X.-y. Li, "Teacher-focused approach to foster student engagement — a hierarchical linear model based on Chinese college students' psychological capital," *BMC Psychology*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 2, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03683-z>
- [39] X. Su, P. Li, and Z. Dong, "Bridging academic and career development: A longitudinal examination of engagement, achievement, and career adaptability," *Journal of Career Assessment*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10690727251381736>
- [40] C. Pang, R. Xie, N. Kang, and Z. Hu, "The impact of career education participation on academic self-efficacy: The sequential mediating role of career adaptability and learning engagement," *Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 174, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15020174>
- [41] S. J. Pacatan, K. A. Macalinao, K. Juhailie, C. J. Amora, and J. Seclot, "Agents of change: Exploring how social studies promotes civic engagement among senior high school students," *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 1548–1563, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025/v51i82339>
- [42] S. Jebarus and S. Sunarso, "The role of civic education in strengthening political literacy, political awareness, and political participation among university students: A case study at PGRI University Yogyakarta," *International Journal of Applied Research and Innovation*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 49–57, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.63310/kwh62432>
- [43] J. C. Van Matre, A. De Wit, and F. A. Demeijer, "Motivating business students for civic education: Design principles for aligning civic engagement programs with student motivation," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 203, pp. 751–768, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-06059-w>
- [44] X. Oriol-Granado, M. Mendoza-Lira, C. Covarrubias-Apablaza, and V. Molina-López, "How study-related positive emotions and academic psychological capital mediate between teacher–student relationship and academic performance," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 15, p. 1419045, 2024.

- [45] Y. Xiong *et al.*, "The role of social support and psychological capital in college students' physical exercise behavior: A mediation analysis," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 16, p. 1601079, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1601079>
- [46] R. P. Guanlao, J. Pax, Y. Wei, and W. Zhang, "A meta-analysis of community engaged learning and thriving in higher education," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 10, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1525176>
- [47] R. Zuzovsky, A. Guberman, and M. Amasha, "Citizenship education to promote civic engagement among Arabic-speaking student teachers," *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 58–76, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979221114552>
- [48] S. Chaudhry, A. Tandon, S. Shinde, and A. Bhattacharya, "Student psychological well-being in higher education: The role of internal team environment, institutional, friends and family support and academic engagement," *Plos One*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. e0297508, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297508>
- [49] Y. Owusu-Agyeman and E. M. Moroeroe, "Relationality and student engagement in higher education: Towards enhanced students' learning experiences," *International Journal of Emotional Education*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 37–53, 2023.
- [50] H. Yan, H. Xiao, and J. Yuan, "Rethinking out-of-school tutoring: Engagement pathways and the uneven impact on students' holistic competencies," *Journal of Intelligence*, vol. 14, no. 4, p. 61, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence14040061>