

# FACULTY ENGAGEMENT IN THEIR TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES: A HIERARCHY COMPARISON AMONG FACULTY MEMBERS

Ammara Syed<sup>\*1</sup>, Javed Iqbal<sup>2</sup>, Bibi Asia Naz<sup>3</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>PhD Scholar, Department of Education Hazara University Mansehra, Pakistan 21300

<sup>2,3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Education Hazara University Mansehra, Pakistan 21300

<sup>1</sup>ammarasyed158@yahoo.com, <sup>2</sup>zahidulhq\_73@yahoo.com, <sup>3</sup>asianaz@hu.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: \*

Ammara Syed

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19605960>

Received	Accepted	Published
21 February 2026	31 March 2026	16 April 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine faculty engagement in teaching, research, and institutional services, and to compare the level of engagement across different academic designations in public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. A quantitative approach was adopted using a descriptive survey design. Data were collected from a sample of 320 faculty members selected through multistage and stratified random sampling techniques from six public universities. A structured questionnaire was developed to assess faculty engagement across three domains teaching, research, and institutional services focusing on key dimensions of willingness, readiness, and pride. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean scores and percentages, as well as inferential techniques such as t-tests and ANOVA. The findings revealed that faculty members demonstrated a high level of engagement in all three domains, with relatively stronger engagement observed in teaching and institutional services. No significant differences were found among faculty members of different designations in teaching and service engagement. However, significant differences emerged in research engagement, particularly between lecturers and associate professors, indicating the influence of academic rank and access to research opportunities. The study highlights the existence of a hierarchical pattern in faculty engagement, especially in research activities, and emphasizes the need for institutional support to enhance balanced engagement across all academic roles. The study contributes to the understanding of faculty engagement in the context of higher education in Pakistan and provides insights for policymakers and academic administrators to improve faculty performance and institutional effectiveness.

**Keywords:** Faculty Engagement, Institutional Service, Academic Hierarchy

## Introduction

Faculty engagement in teaching, research, and service varies greatly by faculty rank, institution type, and departmental expectations. Faculty engagement is creating a distinct hierarchy in the allocation of time. Engaged faculty are those who give full discretionary effort at work, and are highly vigorous and dedicated to their job, while disengaged employees are those who are

motivationally disconnected from work, who do not have the energy to work hard and who are not enthusiastic at work (Bakker et al. 2008; Towers Perrin 2009). The balance can among institutional priorities and faculty career stages, significantly impacting job engagement. Faculty productivity is strongly correlated with workplace engagement and the culture created and maintained by academic administration, especially at the

departmental level (Fitzmaurice, & Monteiro et al., 2013). According to Demerouti (2008), there are at least four reasons why engaged faculty members perform better than non-engaged faculty members. First, engaged employees often experience positive emotions (e.g., happiness, joy and enthusiasm). Second, engaged employees experience better health. Third, engaged employees create their own job resources and personal resources. Fourth, engaged employees transfer their engagement to others. Similarly, engaged employees feel delightful about their job, and in this manner, the workplace becomes enjoyable for them. Mone and London (2018) clarified that highly engaged employees attach themselves with their jobs with vigor and enthusiasm. Faculty members with high engagement display enthusiasm for teaching, persistence in research, and dedication to administrative or departmental service. Teaching, research, and administrative services are three main tasks of faculty in universities which are closely related to each other and play an important role in promoting higher education. Ranking of universities all over the world mainly depend on the active engagement of their faculty in these three tasks teaching, research, and services. In the past teachings has remained the main function of universities and the priority of the faculty was teaching because teacher is a person who can encourage, guide and built the confidence level of their pupils through his/her teaching skills (Aguavil et al., 2019). The importance among three primary duties (teaching, research, and service) is often not equal among university teacher. The Higher Education Academy in England completed a survey of 2700 university professors about their thinking associated with teaching, research, and service in 2009. The results illustrate that all the professors' point of view was same about teaching and learning significance but their emphasis was different. They laid stress on research first, then and faculty services came in last (Vardi & Quin, 2018). But at university level the engagement of most of the university faculty towards research varies depending upon the factors associated with it. Thus teaching cannot be separated from research. The university teacher

basically more burdened either with teaching and research (Linna, 2017). Faculty engagement and satisfaction has strong relationship with work place especially at departmental level and academic administration has a primary responsibility to maintain the created culture (Fitzmaurice, 2016). High levels engagement are show by faculty members with their work that considered a loyalty and obligation towards their institutions (Hagedorn, 2017). Hence, the level of engagement given by the faculty members to these three tasks have not been simultaneously explore so far especially in Pakistani context. Therefore the basic purpose of the study was to explore and compare the faculty engagement and satisfaction in teaching, research, and services (within campus) in public and private sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

#### **Statement of the problem**

Faculty members in higher education institutions are typically engaged in three primary roles: teaching, research, and service. However, there exists a problematic hierarchy among these roles, heavily influenced by institutional type, departmental expectations, and individual career stages. Supportive work environment in institutions is very important factor for faculty members to be engaged in their work and achieve the goals. Support from the institution creates the more engaged employees in the institutions as compared to in an unsupportive environment (Dai & Qin, 2016). Unfortunately in Pakistani educational institutions teachers' work engagement is being affected due to lack of support from job demands. This problem possibly leads the teachers towards the disengagement behaviors from work. This study aims allows us to establish a comparison between teaching, research, and services (within campus) rendered by universities and to find the differences in their engagement level in public universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. There have been substantial researches on the two main tasks (teaching and research) of the faculty but very limited research is available on services of university faculty. In Pakistan it was a first attempt to explore simultaneously all three important tasks of the

university faculty in term their engagement level. Therefore researcher intended to explore faculty engagement in their teaching, research, and institutional services a Hierarchy comparison among faculty members the level in all three main tasks.

### Objectives of the study

1. To explore the faculty engagement towards teaching, research, and services in public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
2. Comparing the faculty engagement in teaching, research, and services in terms of designation in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

### Literature review

#### • Job engagement

Engagement is a psychological component and primarily it is intrinsic in nature as related to the inner self of a person (Kahn, 1990). Job engagement was first conceptualized by Kahn (1990), as harnessing and nurturing of organizational employees' selves so that they contribute physically, cognitively and emotionally towards their work roles. Faculty engagement is integrating along with their physical, cognitive, and emotional energies toward their responsibilities. Work engagement is a positive psychological mindset that enables an individual to showcase high energy, immersion, and focus towards the job (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Job engagement means that engaged employees bring their full selves to their work, showing enthusiasm and dedication. Demerouti (2008) engaged employees often experience greater job satisfaction and are more resilient against stress. By high level involvement in their work which enables faculty to tackle challenges more effective way. According to (Rich et al, 2010) stated engagement as individuals investing their hands, head, and hearts in their performance. The engage faculty emphasizes on task-based efforts to bring a deeper level of focus, mental investment, and emotional dedication to their work. Likewise, Christian et al. (2011) have defined engagement as the holistic involvement and investment of an individual self in terms of cognitive, emotional, and physical energies. The nature of engagement definition captures the

multi-dimensional viewing it as more than mere commitment. Essentially, work engagement is a healthy work state that puts an individual to perform with zeal, zest and resilience (Maslach and Leiter, 2008). Faculty member has high in resilience energy, absorption and giving their best towards the work.

#### • Faculty engagement in their trifocal tasks

Faculty members' dedication to effective teaching practices, student-centered learning, and instructional innovation support faculty engagement. Hutchings (2019) engaged faculties demonstrate an engagement to creating engaging learning environments, fostering critical thinking, and adapting teaching methodologies to meet diverse student needs. Teaching practices are essential for improving students learning and enhance level of faculty engagement. Faculty members' have active participation in scholarly activities including research, publication, and grant acquisition. Hutchings, (2019) engaged faculty contribute to the advancement of knowledge in their respective fields, collaborate with peers, and seek opportunities for interdisciplinary research. Research engagement involves faculty participation in writing academic activities. According to Smit and Taylor (2024) faculty who are actively engaged in research bring fresh insights into their teaching, thereby bridging the gap between theory and practice. Faculty engagement in service involves their participation in institutional governance, committee work, and community outreach initiatives. Engaged faculty play leadership roles within their departments and contribute to the broader academic and local communities through service activities Kezar, (2014). Services activities can strengthen the social aspects in high education. Recent work by Williams and Garcia (2024) argues that service engagement not only benefits the institution but also enhances faculty development, providing opportunities for leadership and professional growth. Faculty members often exist within a hierarchical structure, influenced by factors such as rank (assistant, associate, full professor), tenure status, and departmental leadership roles. This hierarchy can impact opportunities for

engagement in teaching, research, and service (Williams, 2024). Research indicates that junior faculty may face challenges in engaging fully due to perceived barriers related to hierarchy. In contrast, senior faculty members typically have more influence and recognition in governance and decision-making processes, which can lead to differences in satisfaction and engagement levels (Johnson, 2024). Faculty engagement in teaching, research, and service is vital for enhancing institutional effectiveness and fostering a supportive academic culture.

### Research Methodology

This study was descriptive in nature for which quantitative research design was adopted. Educational researcher use quantitative methodologies to examine generalizable correlation trends or causal mechanism in phenomena and behaviors. This study aimed to

explore the faculty engagement in their teaching, research, and institutional services a Hierarchy comparison among faculty members within university campuses in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The population for this study was 1858 teacher of five universities from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The questionnaire was prepared in the light of research objectives and handed over to the expert to judge the face content validity of the item and review process. To check the reliability of the scale, the questionnaire was pilot tested on the teachers not included in the study sample. Cranach's alpha was used to measure the reliability and inter-consistency among the item of the questionnaires. The Cranach's alpha value for the whole scale was 0.897. The researcher personally visited the universities and collects the data from 320 teachers through stratified random sampling technique. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS-22.

### Results

Table -1

*Faculty Engagement in their Teaching Research, Institutional Services*

Variables	Factors	Number of Items	Mean score
Teaching	Willingness	5	4.24
	Readiness	5	3.95
	Pride	5	4.33
Research	Willingness	5	4.18
	Readiness	5	3.96
	Pride	5	4.19
Institutional services	Willingness	5	4.20
	Readiness	5	4.39
	Pride	5	4.43

The above table illustrates the faculty engagement in their teaching, research and institutional services align with faculty readiness, willingness and pride in these tasks. Firstly, teaching link with three factors i.e. readiness, willingness and pride consist on (5+5+4= 14) items, Mean score of willingness =4.24, readiness=3.95 and pride=4.33 respectively while pride in teaching engagement Mean score was 4.33 respectively high more than faculty willingness and readiness in teaching engagement tasks. Secondly, faculty research engagement consists of three factors as well willingness,

readiness, and pride in research engagement. Mean score of willingness in research =4.18, readiness= 3.96 and pride=4.19 whereas faculty pride in research engagement Mean score =4.19 willingness in research engagement Mean score =4.18 respectively equal from pride. Furthermore, institutional services also categories into three factors, faculty readiness in institutional services engagement Mean score 4.39, while faculty pride for institutional services engagement Mean score =4.43 both were high more than Mean score =

4.20, faculty willingness for institutional services engagement.

**Table -2**

Variable	Group	SS	Df	Mean Square	F	P.value
Readiness in Teaching	Between Group	5.506	03	1.835	3.612	.014
	Within Groups	159.528	314	.508		
	Total	165.033	317			
Willingness in teaching	Between Group	5.529	03	1.843	4.248	.006
	Within Groups	137.089	316	.434		
	Total	142.618	319			
Pride in Teaching	Between Group	2.966	03	.989	2.200	.088
	Within Groups	141.113	314	.449		
	Total	144.079	317			

The above table reveals that  $F(3, 314) = 3.612$  with  $p = .014 \geq \alpha = 0.05$ , indicating that no significant difference was found among the views of faculty members regarding readiness in teaching engagement. Thus, this means that faculty members share the same opinion about readiness in teaching engagement. The above table indicates that  $F(3, 316) = 4.248$  with  $p = .006 \geq \alpha = 0.05$ , showing that no significant difference was observed among the views of faculty members

regarding willingness in teaching engagement. Hence, this means that faculty members share similar views on willingness in teaching engagement tasks. The above table shows that  $F(3, 314) = 2.200$  with  $p = .088 \geq \alpha = 0.05$ , indicating that no significant difference was found among the views of faculty members regarding pride in teaching engagement. However, this means that faculty members share the same opinions about pride in teaching engagement.

**Table -3**

Variable	Group	SS	Df	Mean Square	F	P.value
Readiness in research	Between Group	11.906	03	3.969	5.927	.001
	Within Groups	210.226	314	.670		
	Total	222.132	317			
Willingness in research	Between Group	10.336	03	3.445	6.011	.001
	Within Groups	180.559	315	.573		
	Total	190.895	318			
Pride in research	Between Group	10.453	03	3.484	6.275	.000
	Within Groups	174.911	315	.555		
	Total	185.364	318			

The above table reveals that  $F(3, 314) = 5.927$  with  $p = .001 \leq \alpha = 0.05$ , showing that a significant

difference was observed among the views of faculty members regarding readiness in research

engagement. Thus, this means that faculty members do not share similar views about readiness in research engagement. The above table illustrates the multiple comparisons among faculty members with different designations regarding their readiness in research engagement. The results show that no significant difference was observed among professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers regarding their level of readiness in research engagement. However, a significant difference was found between the opinions of associate professors and lecturers. Similarly, no significant difference was found between the opinions of professors, assistant professors, and associate professors regarding readiness in research engagement. The above table reveals that  $F(3, 315) = 6.011$ , since  $p = .001 \leq \alpha = 0.05$ , indicating that a significant difference was found among the views of faculty members regarding willingness in research engagement. Thus, this means that faculty members do not share similar opinions about willingness in research engagement. The above table presents the multiple comparisons among faculty members with different designations regarding their level of willingness in research engagement. The table shows that no significant difference was observed among professors,

associate professors, and assistant professors in their willingness toward research engagement, whereas a significant difference was found between the opinions of associate professors and lecturers. The table further indicates that no significant difference was observed between professors, associate professors, and assistant professors regarding willingness in research engagement. The above table illustrates that  $F(3, 315) = 6.275$ , since  $p = .000 \leq \alpha = 0.05$ , indicating that a significant difference was observed among the views of faculty regarding pride in research engagement. Thus, this means that faculty members do not share the same opinions about pride in research engagement. The above table presents multiple comparisons among faculty members with different designations regarding their level of pride in research engagement. The table shows that no significant difference was observed among professors, associate professors, and assistant professors in their level of pride in research. However, a significant difference was found between the opinions of associate professors and lecturers. Overall, the table indicates that no significant difference was observed among professors, assistant professors, and lecturers regarding pride in research.

**Table -4**

Variable	Group	SS	Df	Mean Square	F	P.value
Readiness in institutional services	Between Group	4.145	03	1.382	2.740	.043
	Within Groups	158.839	315	.504		
	Total	162.984	318			
Willingness for institutional services	Between Group	3.481	03	1.160	2.281	.079
	Within Groups	160.755	3166	.509		
	Total	164.236	319			
Pride in institutional Services	Between Group	4.610	03	1.537	2.181	.090
	Within Groups	221.896	315	.704		
	Total	226.506	318			

The above table illustrates that  $F(3, 315) = 2.740$ , with  $p = .043 \geq \alpha = 0.05$ , indicating that no

significant difference was observed among the views of faculty regarding readiness for

institutional services engagement. Thus, this means that faculty members hold similar opinions about readiness for institutional services engagement. The above table indicates that  $F(3, 316) = 2.281$ , with  $p = .079 \geq \alpha = 0.05$ , revealing that no significant difference was found between the opinions of faculty regarding willingness for institutional services engagement. This means that faculty members share similar views about willingness for institutional services engagement. The above table illustrates that  $F(3, 315) = 2.181$ , with  $p = .090 \geq \alpha = 0.05$ , showing that no significant difference was found among the opinions of faculty regarding pride in institutional services engagement. Thus, this means that faculty members share similar views regarding pride in institutional services engagement.

### Findings of the study

1. No. significant difference was found ( $p = .016 \geq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about readiness in teaching engagement. However, this shows faculty have same opinions about faculty readiness in teaching (see table 4.85)
2. No. significant difference was found ( $p = .006 \geq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about willingness in teaching engagement. However, this shows faculty have same opinions about faculty willingness in teaching (see table 4.86)
3. No. significant difference was found ( $p = .088 \geq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about pride in teaching engagement. However, this shows faculty has same opinions about faculty pride in teaching (see table 4.87)
4. Significant difference was found ( $p = .001 \leq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about readiness in research engagement. However, this shows faculty does not have same opinions about faculty readiness in research (see table 4.88)
5. Significant difference was found ( $p = .005$ ) among views of two groups of faculty members by their designation associate professor with lecturer, whereas no. significant difference was found in opinion of professor with associate professor and

assistant professor about readiness in research (see table 4.88.1)

6. Significant difference was found ( $p = .001 \leq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about willingness in research engagement. However, this shows faculty does not have same opinions about faculty willingness in research (see table 4.89)

7. Significant difference was found ( $p = .005$ ) among views of two groups of faculty members by their designation associate professor with lecturer, whereas no. significant difference was found among opinion of professor, associate professor and assistant professor willingness in research. (see table 4.89.1)

8. Significant difference was found ( $p = .000 \leq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about pride in research engagement. However, this shows faculty does not have same opinions about faculty pride in research (see table 4.90)

9. Significant difference was found ( $p = .005$ ) among views of two groups of faculty members by their designation associate professor with lecturer, whereas no. significant difference was found in opinion of professor, associate professor and assistant professor about pride in research (see table 4.90.1)

10. No. significant difference was found ( $p = .043 \geq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members by their designation about readiness in institutional services engagement. However, this shows faculty has same opinions about readiness in institutional services (see table 4.91)

11. No. significant difference was found ( $p = .079 \geq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members with different designation about the willingness in institutional services engagement (see table 4.92)

12. No. significant difference was found ( $p = .090 \geq 0.05$ ) among opinion of faculty members with different designation about pride in engagement of institutional services (see table 4.93).

### Discussion

The present study examined faculty engagement in teaching, research, and institutional services, with a particular focus on differences across academic

designations in public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The findings indicate that faculty members generally exhibit a high level of engagement across all three domains, though the nature and intensity of engagement vary depending on the specific role and hierarchical position.

In the domain of teaching, the results revealed no significant differences among faculty members across designations in terms of readiness, willingness, and pride. This suggests a shared commitment toward teaching responsibilities irrespective of academic rank. These findings align with previous research indicating that teaching remains a core and universally valued responsibility among faculty members (Hutchings, 2019). The consistency in teaching engagement may also reflect institutional expectations and standardized teaching responsibilities that apply equally to all faculty members, regardless of seniority.

Similarly, in the area of institutional services, no significant differences were observed across faculty ranks. This indicates that faculty members, irrespective of designation, demonstrate comparable levels of involvement in administrative and service-related activities. Such findings support the argument that service engagement is often shaped by institutional culture and shared governance structures rather than individual hierarchy (Kezar, 2014). The uniformity in service engagement may also be attributed to equitable distribution of departmental responsibilities and organizational expectations.

In contrast, the findings related to research engagement revealed significant differences among faculty members based on designation. Notably, differences were observed between lecturers and associate professors in terms of readiness, willingness, and pride in research activities. These results suggest that academic rank plays a critical role in shaping research engagement, likely due to variations in access to resources, research experience, and professional networks. Senior faculty members, particularly associate professors, are more likely to benefit from greater institutional support, funding

opportunities, and reduced teaching loads, which enhance their research productivity. This finding is consistent with the literature indicating that hierarchical structures in academia influence research participation and output (Johnson, 2024; Williams, 2024).

Furthermore, the comparatively lower research engagement among junior faculty may be attributed to multiple challenges, including limited research training, lack of mentorship, heavy teaching workloads, and insufficient access to funding and academic resources. These constraints hinder their ability to actively participate in scholarly activities and contribute to knowledge production. Prior studies have similarly highlighted that early-career academics often face structural and institutional barriers that restrict their research engagement (Demerouti, 2008; Bakker, 2008).

The study highlights a clear hierarchical imbalance in research engagement, while teaching and service domains remain relatively uniform across faculty ranks. This imbalance underscores the need for institutional interventions aimed at supporting junior faculty through mentoring programs, research funding opportunities, reduced teaching loads, and capacity-building initiatives. Enhancing equitable access to resources and professional development opportunities can help bridge the gap in research engagement and promote a more balanced academic environment.

### Conclusion

This study aimed to explore and compare faculty engagement in teaching, research, and institutional services among faculty members of public sector universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The findings reveal that faculty members demonstrate a generally high level of engagement across all three domains, particularly in terms of pride and willingness. However, the degree and nature of engagement vary depending on the specific task and faculty designation.

The results indicate that teaching and institutional services show relatively consistent perceptions across different faculty ranks, suggesting a shared understanding and similar level of commitment in

these areas. In contrast, research engagement exhibits significant differences, particularly between lecturers and associate professors. This highlights the influence of academic rank, access to resources, and professional opportunities on research involvement.

Moreover, the study underscores that institutional support, access to research facilities, mentoring opportunities, and workload distribution play a crucial role in shaping faculty engagement. Senior faculty members tend to be more engaged in research due to greater experience, resources, and academic exposure, while junior faculty face challenges such as limited opportunities, lack of guidance, and workload pressures.

The study concludes that while faculty members are actively engaged in their trifocal roles, a hierarchical imbalance exists, especially in research engagement. Addressing this imbalance requires institutional efforts to provide equitable support, enhance research opportunities for junior faculty, and promote a balanced distribution of responsibilities. These findings contribute to a better understanding of faculty engagement in the Pakistani higher education context and provide a foundation for improving academic productivity, institutional effectiveness, and faculty development.

## References

- Aguavil, J., Andino, M., & Ruiz, M. (2019). *Teaching practices and student engagement in higher education*. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(3), 45-55.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Dai, K., & Qin, X. (2016). Perceived organizational support and employee engagement: Based on the research of organizational identification and organizational justice. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(12), 46-57. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.412005>
- Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
- Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
- Fitzmaurice, M. (2016). Supporting faculty engagement in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21(3), 1-15.
- Fitzmaurice, M., & Monteiro, S. (2013). The role of academic leadership in faculty engagement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(6), 1-12.
- Godwin, K. (2021). *Research methodology in education: Quantitative approaches*. Academic Press.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2017). Faculty engagement and institutional commitment. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39(2), 1-14.
- Hutchings, P. (2019). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Theory, practice, and impact. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 51(5), 22-29.
- Johnson, L. (2024). Faculty hierarchy and engagement in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Review*, 56(1), 78-95.
- 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>

- Kezar, A. (2014). Faculty engagement in service and institutional governance. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(3), 135-160.
- Kezar, A. (2014). Faculty engagement in service and institutional governance. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(3), 135-160.
- Linna, A. (2017). Balancing teaching and research in academia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(5), 1-12.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 498-512.
- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2018). *Employee engagement through effective performance management*. Routledge.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Smit, R., & Taylor, J. (2024). Research engagement and teaching integration in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(2), 210-225.
- Towers Perrin. (2009). *Employee engagement: Global workforce study*. Towers Perrin.
- Vardi, I., & Quin, R. (2018). The role of research and teaching in academic identity. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(2), 365-378.
- Williams, J., & Garcia, M. (2024). Faculty service engagement and professional development. *Journal of Higher Education Studies*, 14(1), 55-70.
- Williams, R. (2024). Academic hierarchy and faculty engagement. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 13(1), 102-115.

