

## Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement: A Review Literature

*Naphat Wuttaphan*<sup>\*</sup>

### Abstract

This literature review aims to explore the factors affecting faculty engagement in higher education which lead to quality of faculty member's teaching, includes student in the long run and as a result, it increases university effectiveness as a whole. Five principle factors have been discovered by consisting of personal characteristics factors, management factors, organizational factors, job/task factors, and relationship factors. The utilization of this literature review can be used as a guideline and fundamental information to the top management both public and private universities in order to design suitable human resource development interventions. Moreover, consequences of faculty engagement, implications for human resource development and intensive discussion are also presented.

**Keywords:** Faculty Engagement, University

---

<sup>\*</sup> Faculty of Management Science, Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University, 66 Wangjan, Tambon Naimuang Muang District, Phitsanuloke 65000 E-mail:Naphat.wut@hotmail.com

## บททวนงานวิจัยปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อความผูกพันของอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัย

ณภัทร วุฒชะพันธ์\*

### บทคัดย่อ

งานบททวนงานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจและทบทวนปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อความผูกพันของอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยซึ่งจะส่งผลต่อคุณภาพในการเรียนการสอนของอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยและคุณภาพของนักศึกษาในระยะยาว และในท้ายที่สุดจะส่งผลต่อประสิทธิภาพของมหาวิทยาลัยแบบองค์รวม โดยปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อความผูกพันสามารถแบ่งออกเป็น 5 ปัจจัยหลักๆ ซึ่งประกอบไปด้วย ปัจจัยด้านคุณลักษณะส่วนบุคคล ปัจจัยด้านการบริหารจัดการ ปัจจัยด้านองค์กร ปัจจัยด้านงาน และปัจจัยด้านความสัมพันธ์ การทบทวนเอกสารและวรรณกรรมในครั้งนี้สามารถนำไปใช้เป็นข้อมูลพื้นฐานและแนวทางให้แก่ผู้บริหารมหาวิทยาลัยทั้งมหาวิทยาลัยของรัฐและเอกชนในการออกแบบการแทรกแซงด้านการพัฒนาทรัพยากรมนุษย์ได้อย่างเหมาะสม นอกจากนี้บทความยังนำเสนอผลลัพธ์ของการมีความผูกพันต่อมหาวิทยาลัย และนัยในการพัฒนาทรัพยากรมนุษย์รวมถึงการอภิปรายในประเด็นต่างๆ อีกด้วย

**คำสำคัญ:** ความผูกพันของอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัย, มหาวิทยาลัย

---

\* คณะวิทยาการจัดการ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏพิบูลสงคราม 66 วังจันทน์ ต.ในเมือง อ.เมือง จ.พิษณุโลก 65000

E-mail: Naphat.wut@hotmail.com

## Introduction

The past decade until nowadays, the topic of engagement has been emerged and studied in the field of human resource development (Sak & Gruman, 2014). Moreover both scholars and consulting companies claimed that employee engagement as a key success factor in order to enhance organizational productivity and being competitive (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2009; Sak & Gruman, 2014). Higher institution is expected to provide and develop an academics knowledge, skill and ability to public in order to enhance qualified labor forces for the country (Commission on higher education, 2008). Faculty members as a labor force working for higher institutions, the mains responsibilities are teaching, researching, and follow university's policies such as student development, academics service as well as supporting tradition and culture (The office of educational council of Thailand, 2010). It is not surprised why motivation theory is widely accepted and used in business including educational context, especially to convince faculty members to work and engage with such duties need to be explored. Like the factors affecting employee engagement, faculty engagement factors also play critical part to enhance university effectiveness (Rhoades, 2012). Moreover, higher education industry is an important sector and play roles as the key factors in order to improve national productivity by developing human resource as a horizontal dimension , so engaging academics staff, faculty members and students are worth to enhance national effectiveness (Tight, 2003; Humphreys & Hoque, 2007; Lew, 2009). The purpose of this literature review aims to discover the factors affecting faculty engagement by applying the concept of motivation theories, employee engagement as the fundamental concepts to explain the phenomena under investigation. The benefits of this study will be used as a guideline for higher institutions executives in order to understand the factors of faculty engagement and apply in each higher institutes, and moreover the concept of employee engagement in the context of higher institutions will be advanced.

## **Employee engagement to faculty engagement**

Employee engagement has been in scholars and practitioners' spotlight for more than a decade (i.e., Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Saks & Gruman, 2014). It has been further studied and utilized in various fields in various countries across the world namely China, Finland, Greece, South Africa, Spain, Portugal, The Netherland including Thailand (Schaufeli, Martinez, Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002; Strom & Rothmann, 2003; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003; Yi-Wen & Yi-Qun, 2005; Rurkkhum, 2010; Xanthopoulos, Bakker, Kantas, & Demerouti, 2012). However, the definition of employee engagement still not has a consensus among scholars and practitioners yet. The originality of employee engagement's concept has begun by Kahn of work engagement in 1990 by saying that work engagement is "psychological experiences of work and work contexts shape the process presenting and absenting their selves during task performance" (p. 694). Moreover, he divided work engagement into three psychological conditions which are psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability (Kahn, 1990). Furthermore, work engagement later on was deeply studied and extended to employee engagement and job burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Macey & Schneider, 2008). Until at the present, employee engagement has been viewed into three different background of thoughts from different point of views (Sak & Gruman, 2014). First concept of engagement was influenced by Kahn (1990) that viewed engagement from work engagement in term of "psychology state of mind" (p. 694). It includes individual physical, emotional and cognitional engagement (Truss, Soane, Edwards, Wisdom, Croll, & Burnett, 2006; Shuck & Wollard, 2010). The second was influenced by the concept of job burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Carwright & Holmes, 2006). And the third was JD-R model or Job Demands-Resource (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachrener, & Schaufeli, 2001; Sak & Gruman, 2014). However, the concept of job burnout and JD-R model are closely related to each other (Sak & Gruman, 2014). However, Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2015) explored the philosophical underpinnings of employee engagement, and concluded that three employee engagement frameworks underpin an employee engagement concept which are, the need-satisfaction

framework, the burnout-antithesis framework, and the multidimensional framework. For the need-satisfaction framework similar to the Kahn, and burnout-antithesis similar to Maslach and Letiter's concept, and the multidimensional framework consisted of cognitive, emotional including behavioral components (May, Gilson, Harter, 2004 as cited in Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2015) which associated with personal and role performance of the employee in the organization (Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2015).

## **Research Methods**

In this study, literature review and documentary research are conducted. The publication data base such as ResearchGate, ScienceDirect, ProQuest, SpringLink and Emerald Management have been explored and searched by using the keywords of faculty engagement, employee engagement, student engagement, teacher and instructor commitment, faculty involvement. Establishing a date and publishing within past 10 to 15 years expect the critical classical and standard point of references supporting the concepts and theories. By the first round, 109 papers and articles have been identified by concepts, titles and related areas. Then scoped down to 54 papers remaining by eliminated irrelevant papers, finally 35 papers and articles have been acknowledged.

## **Faculty engagement**

Faculty engagement is an advanced a related study concepts of faculty job satisfaction, organizational commitment in higher education and faculty job involvement as well as employee engagement in higher institutions (Awang & Ahman, 2010; Wong & Heng, 2009; Yahaya, Chek, & Jizat, 2014). These closely relationships have been differentiated by scholars and practitioners in the field of both human resource development and psychology (Christian et al, 2011; Sak & Gruman, 2014). Job satisfaction means an attitude and job situation of employee. Faculty job satisfaction has applied motivation theory of both Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1966) to explain the phenomena under investigation of faculty satisfaction (Wong & Heng, 2009). Organizational

commitment, according to Mowday, Strees, & Porter (1979) refers to “a steering belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goal and value; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p. 225). However, its similar to Sak and Gruman (2014) by said that organizational commitment is “an emotional attachment to one’s organization” (p. 158). Finally, job involvement refers to the degree of employee’s identity matched with their job (Christian et al, 2011). So, in the other word, faculty engagement could be an outcome of the integration of faculty job satisfaction, organizational/university commitment, and faculty involvement somehow that involve faculty’s both physical behavior and mental mind in order to invest their energy to work enthusiastically for achieving university missions and goals.

Since there are no consensus of meaning of faculty engagement, employee engagement has been used to determine faculty engagement in many research in a higher educational context (Wong & Heng, 2009; Glass, Doberneck, Schweitzer, 2011; Demb & Wade, 2012; Friesen, 2012). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) said that “engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (p. 295) where vigor is a high level of energy to do the tasks, dedication is a high level of enthusiasm and challenging, finally is absorption, a fully engrossed and concentrated their works. On the other word, Gebauer, Lowman and Gordon (2008) stated that employee engagement refers to “a deep and broad connection that employee have with a company that results in a willingness to go above and beyond what’s expected of them to help company succeed” (p. 9). Similar to Bakker and Demerouti (2008) argued that “engaged employees have high levels of energy and are enthusiastic about their work. Moreover, they are often fully immersed in their work so that time flies” (p. 210). However, Barman and Saikat (2011) said that

“an engaged faculty will show a high degree of commitment and involvement in the profession. For him/her teaching is more of commitment than compliance. Important thing to be noticed here is where this commitment and involvement of a faculty upon?” (p. 143).

Engaged faculty performs a better performance than non-engaged faculty because engaged faculty has a positive emotion, joy, happiness and high energy towards their duty and work, enjoying of being a good health and creating and handling their job well, yet transferring the engagement feeling to other faculty members as well (Bakker, Demerouti, 2008; Selmer, Jonasson, & Laruing, 2014).

### **Faculty Engagement Factors**

According to Smith (2005), in order to foster faculty engagement in higher education, university need to motivate a professional development by fostering effective leadership within department, and fostering a feedback loop, moreover, it needs to enhance faculty engagement by providing faculty empowerment in order to enrich faculty engagement. The similarity with Hakanen, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2006), they said that the factor of job control, communication, information, relationship and support from supervisor, and work environment such as innovative and social climate are positively influence on faculty engagement. Wong and Heng (2009) concluded that personal achievement and growth, organizational policy, management style, relationship with direct supervisor and peers, recognition, work itself, and job characteristics (job responsibility), and overall working condition promote faculty engagement. The conceptual faculty engagement model proposed by Wade and Demb (2009), they said that faculty engagement consisted of three connected dimensions which are first, personal dimension, it means a different in race/ethnicity, gender, values/belief, motivation, epistemology, previous experiences, family college, attainment status, and age lead to a different in faculty engagement level. Second, institutional dimension consisted of mission and priority, community involvement, leadership, type of institution, institutional policies, prestige, budget and funding, faculty involvement, and engagement structure. Final is professional dimension which are discipline of the profession, status and rank of teaching profession, length of time in academic, faculty support, professional community support and socialization that effect faculty engagement. From the dimension of faculty engagement, to be said that faculty members engaged because they are engaged with

teaching, providing instruction, doing research and autonomy to design program and activities, including servicing to public and community (Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2011). However, Barman and Saikat (2011) proposed faculty engagement factors which are institutional attachment, primary involvement, secondary involvement, recognition and networking, career orientation and guidance, and credibility including job clarity, clear goal, performance management and organizational culture that support engagement culture. It was confirmed faculty engagement factors by Barman and Saikat (2011) that the factors of faculty engagement consisted of institutional attachment, primary involvement, secondary involvement, recognition and networking, career orientation and guidance, and credibility. On the other words, Friesen (2012) said that in order to develop faculty engagement in university, four recommendations from qualitative research revealed that administrator in university needs to create institution's value by creating a clearly communication to faculty member, creating forum for dialogue and discussion between faculty members and institutional administrators, creating opportunities for intercultural and international learning experience for faculty members, and establishing an enabling environment that supports faculty engagement.

On the other hand, Rhoades (2012) — a professor at the center for higher national education attainment in USA, argued that because of the changing professional employment in higher education, patterns of students, attendance, and instruction including the challenging of pressures from stakeholders, and the policy that framed faculty members as the enemy. So higher institutions needs to prepare to improve faculty engagement by preparing future faculty and professional development including graduate student socialization, recruit new faculty member who has a suitable skill and ability including high qualified faculty member, professional development for current faculty because “faculty are central to quality and completion” (p.3), including professional performance management as well as reward system for faculty member. So higher institution has to adjust its policy according to the flexibility and facilitating initiatives and innovations within institution. Interestingly from Berg, Bakker and Cate (2013) said that to promote engaged faculty member, higher education top management need to provide the teaching

courses that match with faculty members expertise with their own special area, the notification from direct supervisor about the appreciation of teaching including the performance feedback of teaching, small size of the teaching class, autonomy and freedom to design and determine what to teach and how to teach, appreciation from peers and colleagues, teaching with faculty member in various fields and disciplines, get a good score from students' evaluation, more supporting staffs, recognition from public, suitable compensation, feedback from team and other faculty members. Another studies which based on equity and expectancy theory, human capital investment, intrinsic rewards (institutional support for teaching, fair treatment), extrinsic rewards (institutional finance, faculty union membership, institutional student to faculty ratio), and covariates (gender and race/ethnicity) are the factors affecting full-time faculty member engagement (Akroyd, Patton, & Bracken, 2013). Even the faculty engagement has a unique factors of employee engagement, there are an interconnected point between employee engagement and faculty engagement. The table 1 shows the factors affecting faculty engagement in conclusion from the reviewed literature of employee engagement, faculty engagement, academic staff engagement and employee engagement in higher education around the world.

**Table 1** Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	<b>Authors</b>
Perceived organizational support	Whitener (2001); Sak (2006); Fornes, Rocco & Willard (2008)
Trust	Whitener (2001); Walker (2001); Dutta (2004); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Ugwu, Onyishi & Rodríguez-Sánchez (2013)

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	<b>Authors</b>
Organization commitment	Whitener (2001); Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Andrew & Sofian (2012); Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi & Shadman (2013); Agyemang & Ofei (2013); Chambel, Castanheira & Sobral (2014)
Skill variety	Bakker (2011); Remo (2012); Ajgaonkar, Baul & Phadke (2012)
Task identity	Whittington & Galpin (2010); Ajgaonkar, Baul & Phadke (2012); Remo (2012)
Task significant	Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008); Ajgaonkar, Baul & Phadke (2012); Remo (2012)
Autonomy	Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008); Bakker (2011); Ajgaonkar, Baul & Phadke (2012); Kumar & Sia (2012); Remo (2012); Bethencourt (2012)
Feedback	Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008); Bakker (2011); Ajgaonkar, Baul & Phadke (2012); Remo, 2012
Leadership and/or supervisor support	Whittington & Galpin (2010); Bakker (2011); Gruman & Saks (2011); Reoi & Sanders-Rerio (2011); Bethencourt (2012); Kumar & Sia (2012); Remo (2012); Anitha (2014)
Performance management	Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Bakker (2011); Gruman & Saks (2011); Remo (2012); Chambel, Castanheira & Sobral (2014)
Task variety	Hackman & Oldham (1976); Whittington & Galpin (2010)

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	<b>Authors</b>
Organizational citizenship behavior	Sak (2006); Whittington & Galpin (2010); CIPD (2010); Bakker (2011); Wollard & Shuck (2011); Andrew & Sofian (2012); Rurkkhum & Bartlett (2012)
Training, development and learning	Dutta (2004); Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Gruman & Saks (2011); Andrew & Sofian (2012); Anitha (2014); Chambel, Castanheira & Sobral (2014)
Rewards	May, Gilson & Harter (2004); Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Chambel, Castanheira & Sobral (2014)
Compensation	Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Bethencourt (2012); Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi & Shadman (2013); Anitha (2014); Chambel, Castanheira & Sobral (2014)
Relatedness	Bethencourt (2012)
Benefit	Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Bethencourt, 2012
Creativity and innovation	Bakker (2011); Remo (2012)
Relationship with peers	Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Bakker (2011); Reoi& Sanders-Rerio (2011); Andrew & Sofian (2012); Kumar & Sia (2012); Remo (2012); Anitha (2014)

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	<b>Authors</b>
Meaningful work/job and value	Birt, Wallis & Winternitz (2004); May, Gilson & Harter (2004); Sak (2006); Reoi & Sanders-Rerio (2011)
Safety	May, Gilson & Harter (2004); Reoi & Sanders-Rerio (2011)
Challenging work/job	Birt, Wallis & Winternitz (2004); Fornes, Rocco & Willard (2008); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi & Shadman (2013)
Job satisfaction	Igbaria, Meredith, & Smith (1994); Lee (2000); Andrew & Sofian (2012)
Talent management	Dutta (2004); Raju (2004); Bhatnagar (2007); Hughes & Rog (2008)
Work environment	Dutta (2004); Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi & Shadman (2013); Anitha, 2014
Work life balance	Walker (2001); Dutta (2004); Sak (2006); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Wang & Walumbwa (2007)
Organizational culture	Ramlall (2003); Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi & Shadman (2013)
Recognition	Walker (2001); Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010)
Career advancement	Birt, Wallis & Winternitz (2004); Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010)
Job opportunity	Ramlall (2003); Birt, Wallis & Winternitz (2004)
Communication	Walker (2001); Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Andrew & Sofian (2012); Kumar & Sia (2012)

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	<b>Authors</b>
Empowerment	Birt, Wallis & Winternitz (2004); Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008); Ugwu, Onyishi & Rodríguez-Sánchez (2013)
Coaching	Gruman & Saks, 2011
Clarity	Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008); Kumar & Sia, 2012
Physical comfort	Kumar & Sia (2012)
Job content	Sharma & Joshi (2001); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010)
Senior management	Gitanjali, Sharma & Sharma (2010)
Participative management	Mohapatra & Sharma (2010)
Organizational justice	Sak (2006); Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Gruman & Sak (2011)
Congruency	Fornes, Rocco & Wollard (2008)
Organizational policy	Anitha (2014)
Workplace well-being	Anitha (2014)
Team performance	Song, Lim, Kang & Kim (2014)
Learning organization	Song, Lim, Kang & Kim (2014)

### **Consequences of Faculty Engagement**

The consequence of faculty engagement could be categorized into two states of consequences which are consequences of faculty engagement to university and to individual

benefit. For faculty engagement consequences to university, four dimensions have been discovered which are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit and organizational citizenship behavior (Sak, 2006). However, Bhatnagar (2007) said that the output of engagement could enhance the performance and overall productivity includes the organization could utilize the engagement in term of managing talent and use as a key to retain high performers with the organization. In term of individual benefit of being engaged, according to Harvard Business Review by Baldomi (2013) said that engaged employee not only enhance performance and productivity but also improves the quality of their work-life and health. They feel that they are a part of organization that bring a sense of ownership to institutions. Moreover they can feel their self-complacent of being engaged. Moreover, faculty engagement could plays as mediators' variables as well. The mediation effects of employee engagement in higher education by Saks (2006) divided engagement in two levels which are job engagement and organizational engagement as a main mediator that mediates antecedent of engagement (job characteristics, perceived organizational and supervisory support, recognition and rewards, procedural and distributive justices) and consequences (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB). However, Selmer, Jonasson, and Luring (2013) found that academic staff engagement mediates trust, and group conflict.

## **Discussion**

Employee engagement in higher institution, academic staff engagement are the term represents faculty engagement in different contexts. In higher institution, all faculty members are expected to teach, research, and services (Rhoades, 2012). Since psychology theory, system theory and economics theory are the main theory of human resource development by ethics situated as the ground (Swanson, 1995). Furthermore, the university is seeking to the qualified faculty members to be the part of its success. For sure that faculty members are the invaluable asset to enhance the quality of students to be a good citizen in the future in order to drive the national and the world economy (Rhoades, 2012). Developing engaged faculty member to work efficiency is

not an easy task because there are some different factors depend on the context and nature of each university including its culture. However, from the reviewed of factors affecting faculty engagement. It can be categorized into five main faculty engagement factors which are personal characteristics, job, organization, management and relationship factor as shown in table 2.

Comparing with other point of views, Wollard and Shuck (2011) categorized employee engagement antecedent into two which are individual antecedent and organizational antecedent by saying that

“individual antecedents were defined as constructs, strategies, and conditions that were applied directly to or by individual employee and that were believed to be fundamental to development of employee engagement, organizational-level antecedents were defined as constructs, strategies, and conditions that were applied across an organization as fundamental to development of employee engagement and the structural or systematic level” (p.433).

**Table 2** Five Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	
<b>Personal Characteristics Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Personal trust</li> <li>- Personal value</li> <li>- Education</li> <li>- Skill variety</li> <li>- Age</li> <li>- Experiences of teaching</li> </ul>
<b>Management Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Performance management</li> <li>- Talent management</li> <li>- Empowerment</li> <li>- Participative management</li> <li>- Training, development, learning and coaching</li> <li>- Congruency</li> <li>- Communication</li> <li>- Senior management</li> </ul>
<b>Organization Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Autonomy</li> <li>- Creativity and innovation</li> <li>- Work life balance</li> <li>- Recognition</li> <li>- Feedback</li> <li>- Work environment</li> <li>- Organizational culture</li> <li>- Career advancement</li> </ul>

<b>Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work pressure</li> <li>- Organizational justice</li> <li>- Workplace well-being</li> <li>- Perceived organizational support</li> <li>- Compensation, rewards and benefit</li> <li>- Physical comfort</li> <li>- Organizational policy</li> <li>- Learning organization</li> </ul>
<b>Job /task Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Task identity</li> <li>- Task variety</li> <li>- Job Safety</li> <li>- Job opportunity</li> <li>- Job content</li> <li>- Meaningful work/job and value</li> <li>- Task significant</li> <li>- Task orientation</li> <li>- Challenging work/job</li> <li>- Job security</li> </ul>
<b>Relationship Factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leadership and</li> <li>- Relationship with peer</li> <li>- Supervisor support</li> <li>- Relationship with supervisor</li> </ul>

On the other hand, Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt and Diehl (2013) from The Ken Blanchard company grouped the factors of engagement into three main factors which are job factors (meaningful work, autonomy, workload balance, feedback and task variety), organization factors (collaboration, distributive justice, procedural justice, growth and performance expectation) and relationship factors (connectedness with colleagues and connectedness with leader), however they call these factors “employee work passion” instead of employee engagement, and they said that employee work passion goes beyond employee engagement. However, there are an argument scholars whether engagement causes work passion or work passion create employee engagement (Zigarmi et al, 2013; Alvi & Abbasi, 2012; Ghosh, Rai & Sinha, 2014). Moreover, from the empirical studies found that job satisfaction, involvement, and organizational commitment factors play and share some factors that affect faculty engagement or academics staff engagement e.g., personal factors and values, achievement, growth or promotional

opportunity, relationship in organization, management style, organizational culture, working condition, work itself, workload and work-life balance, perceived organization support, and organizational justices (Lew, 2009; Wong & Heng, 2009; Awang & Ahmad, 2010; O'Meara, Sandmann Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2011; Yahaya, Chek, Samsudin, & Jizat, 2014).

### **Implication for HRD practices**

The emerging implication of HRD practices from knowing faculty engagement level and its factors could help the top management understand the nature of faculty members in the higher education context. Moreover, knowing an implication for practices is a paramount in order to leveraging engagement construct for human resource development (Shuck & Rose, 2013). A deeper understanding of faculty engagement leads to a university's broad members could design and launch human resource development interventions accurately. To implement any HRD intervention, it needs to be wise and not only focus on the outcome of performance but also focus on the employee knowledge, skill, attitude, experiences as well as university's culture in order to gain trust and encourage faculty members to work effectively. In support, Saks (2006) highlighted to beware of "engagement-gap" (p.614) for example, training and development interventions lead to a sense of improving of organizational support, job design intervention could leads to autonomy of working.

Second, engagement is a long-term process, it might increase or decrease according to time, and it requires a long-term mutual relationship among faculty member and top management. This also can be explained by social exchange theory. Moreover, Shuck and Rose (2013) stated that implication for HRD practices has emerged and consisted of three areas — emerging mission, emerging purpose, and emerging boundaries. Shuck and Rose (2013) also said that engagement as a condition, and as an outcome at the same time. So understand engagement, it need to understand the psychological well-being of employee as well. However, faculty engagement factors itself have a particular engagement factors deviate from employee engagement in term of self-engagement, they engaged not only the university provided them a well-being working life, but

they engagement because they feel proud with this honored profession to develop the youth and student to grow up or call “self-actualization”. This conditions can be confirmed Shuck and Rose (2013) by saying that engagement is a condition and outcome at the same time depending on which dimension of engagement and the worldview of university’s executives through engagement concept. In order to utilize engagement factors, top management need to concern and realize about its organizational culture as well as its nature as a baseline before launching any HRD interventions, some issues are sensitive such as personal value, justices, and trust. On the other hand, some organization might implement only a few engagement factors, and organization turns fruitful, but some have to use other intervention to help. Moreover, even many research found that engagement brought about productivity, top management has to make sure that the reason of increased in productivity is because of engagement or other exogenous factors.

## **Conclusion**

Higher educational industry has been played the critical role to develop human resource to be a qualified labor force of the whole nation up to the humanity. From employee engagement to faculty engagement has its own history, however, engaged faculty member tend to put extra an effort to enhance the quality of students as well as the competitiveness of the institution. Factors affecting faculty engagement from this literature review have been categorized into five factors which are personal factors, management factors, organizational factors, job/task factors, and relationship factors. Each factors have its own unique story behind, the implementer has to look deeply in each factors however this literature review concluded the factors affecting faculty engagement around the world to take a horizontal perspective and be a gateway to open higher institute and faculty members’ perception to the academic’s profession including other disciplines as well as the field of human resource development will be advanced and expanded to the educational context.

## References

- Agyemang, C. B., & Ofei, S. B. (2013). Employee work engagement and organizational commitment: A comparative study of private and public sector organizations in Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research, 1*(4), 20-33.
- Ajgaonkar, M., Baul, U., & Phadke, S. M. (2012). Relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and job characteristics model of motivation: An empirical study. *NMIMS Management Review*, April-May, 51-72. Retrieved May 21, 2012, from <http://www.nmims.edu/NMIMSmanagementreview/pdf/april-may-2012/04-relationship-organizational-citizenship-behavior.pdf>
- Akroyd, D., Patton, B., & Bracken, S. (2013). Factors that predict full-time community college faculty engagement in online instruction. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37*(3), 185-195.
- Alvi, A. K. & Abbasi, A. S. (2012). Impact of organizational justice on employee engagement in banking sector of Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 12*(5), 643-649.
- Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 40*(2012), 498-508. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.222
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63*(3), 308-323. Doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008
- Awang, Z., & Ahmad, J. H. (2010). Modeling job satisfaction and work commitment among lecturers: A case of UiTM Kelantan. *Proceedings of the Regional Conference on Statistical Sciences (RCSS'10)*, 241-255.
- Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(4), 265-269. Doi: 10.1177/0963721411414534

- Baldoni, J. (2013). Employee engagement does more than boost productivity. *Harvard Business Review*, July, 2013, Retrieved June 15, 2015, from <https://hbr.org/2013/07/employee-engagement-does-more/>
- Barman, A., & Saikat, R. (2011). Faculty engagement in higher educational institution: A proposed model. *Journal for Multidimensional Education*, April issue, 1-15. Retrieved June 20, 2015, from <http://ssm.com/abstract=1844432>
- Berg, B. A., Bakker, A. B., & Cate, T. J. (2013). Key factors in work engagement and job motivation of teaching faculty at a university medical center. *Perspective Medical Education*, 2(5-6), 264-75. Doi: 10.1007/s40037-013-0080-1
- Bethencourt, A. L. (2012). *Employee engagement and self-determination theory* (Doctoral dissertation). Northern Illinois University,LI.
- Bhatnagar, J. (2008). Managing capabilities for talent engagement and pipeline development. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 40(1), 19-28. Doi: 10.1108/0019785081084602
- Birt, M., Wallis, T., & Winternitz, G. (2004). Talent retention in a changing workplace: An investigation of variables considered important to South Africa talent. *South Africa Journal of Business Management*, 35(2), 25-31.
- Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The Challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 199-208. Doi:10.1016/j.hrmmr.2006.03.012
- Chambel, M. J., Castanheira, F., & Sobral, F. (2014). Temporary agency versus permanent worker: A multigroup analysis of human resource management, work engagement and organizational commitment. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, October(1), 1-25. Doi: 10.1177/0143831X14550695
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2010). *Podcast 43: Distribute leadership*. CIPD: London. Retrieved June 15, 2015, from [www.cipd.co.uk/resource/podcasts](http://www.cipd.co.uk/resource/podcasts)

- 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*, 89-136.
- Commission on higher education (2008). *Executive Report: Framework of the second 15-year long range plan on higher education of Thailand*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn Publishing.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., de Jonge, J., Janssen, P. M., & Schaufeli (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a functions of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Environment Health, 27*(4), 279-286.
- Dutta, A. (2004). Strategies for retaining employees. *Human Resource Management Review, August*, 31-35.
- Fornes, S. L., Rocco, T. R., & Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace commitment: A conceptual model developed from integrative review of the research. *Human Resource Development Review, 7*, 339-357.
- Friesen, R. (2012). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: A consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(3), 209-227. Doi: 10.1177/102831532451132
- Gebauer, J., Lowman, D., & Gordon, J. (2008). *Closing the gap: How great companies unlock employee potential for superior results*. NY: Penguin.
- Gitanjali, R., Sharma, Y., & Sharma, B. R. (2010). Search for the drivers of employee engagement among executives of a manufacturing organization. *Management and Labor Studies, 35*(2), 189-207.
- Ghosh, P., Rai, A., & Sinha, A. (2014). Organizational justice and employee engagement: Exploring the linkage in public sector banks in India. *Personnel Review, 43*(4), 628-652.
- Ghosh, P., Satyawadi, R., Joshi, J. P., & Shadman, M. (2013). Who stay with you? Factors predicting employees' intention to stay. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 21*(3), 288-312. Doi 10.1108/IJOA-sep-2011-0511

- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty member report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*(1), 7-30.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*, 123-136. Doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279.
- Hakanen J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among Teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*, 495–513.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man (eds)*. NY: The Word Publishing Company.
- Hughes, J. C. & Rog, E. (2008). Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20*(7), 743-757.
- Humphreys, M. & Hoque, K. (2007). Have the lecturers lost their voice? Involvement and participation in the devolved further education sector. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(7), 1199-1213.
- Igbaria, M., Meredith, G., & Smith, D. C. (1994). Predictors of intention of IS professionals to stay with the organization in South Africa. *Information & Management, 26*(5), 245-256.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692-724.
- Kumar, R., & Sia, S. K. (2012). Employee engagement: Explicating the contribution of work engagement. *Management and Labor Studies, 37*(1), 31-43. Doi: 10.1177/0258042X1103700104
- Lee, P. C. (2000). Turnover of information technology professionals: A contextual model. *Accounting Management and Information Technologies, 10*(2), 101-124.

- Lew, T. Y. (2009). The relationships between perceived organizational support, felt obligation, affective organizational commitment and turnover intention of academics working with private higher educational institutions in Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 72-87.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3-30.
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). *Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P., (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations causes personal stress and what to do about it*. CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-96.
- 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.
- Mohapatra, M., & Sharma, B. R. (2010). Study of employee engagement and its predictor in an Indian public sector undertaking. *Global Business Review*, 11(2), 281-301. Doi: 10.1177/097215091001100210
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-227.
- O'Meara, K. A., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, 36, 83-36. Doi: 10.1007/s10755-010-9159-3
- Raju, P. L. (2004). Talent magnet: How to attract and retain star employee. *Human Resource Management Review*, August, 11-13.
- Ramlall, S. (2003). Managing employee retention as a strategy for increasing organizational competitiveness. *Applied HRM Research*, 8(2), 63-72.

- Remo, N. (2012). *Comparing two models of employee engagement: An examination of antecedents and outcome variables* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada
- Reoi, T. J., & Sanders-Rerio, J. (2011). Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility really matter? *Advances in Developing Human Resource, 13*(4), 462-478. Doi: 10.11771/1523422311430784
- Rhoads, G. (2012). *Faculty Engagement to enhance student attainment. National Commission on Higher Education Attainment*. University of Arizona. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Faculty-Engagement-to-Enhance-Student-Attainment--Rhoades.pdf>
- Rurkkhum, S. (2010). *The relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior in Thai organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minnesota.
- Rurkkhum, S., & Bartlett, K. R. (2012). The relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior in Thailand. *Human Resource Development International, 15*(2), 157-174.
- Sak, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.
- Sak, A. M. & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25*(2), 155-182. Doi: 10.1002/hrdq.21187
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *UWES – Utrecht work engagement scale: test manual*. Department of Psychology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, available at: [www.schaufeli.com](http://www.schaufeli.com)
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 293-315.

- Schaufeli, W. B., Martinez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-National study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(5), 464-481.
- Selmer, J., Jonasson, C., & Luring, J. (2013). Group conflict and faculty engagement: Is there a moderating effect of group trust? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1), 95-109. Doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2013.748477
- Selmer, J., Jonasson, C., & Luring, J. (2014). Knowledge processing and faculty engagement in multicultural university settings: A social learning perspective. *Journal of further and higher Education*, 38(2), 211-229. Doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2012.706808
- Shuck, B., Nimon, K., & Zigarmi, D. (2015). *Employee engagement and HRD: Exploring the philosophical underpins, measurement, and interventions. Handbook of Human Resource Development (eds)*. NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shuck, B., & Rose, K. (2013). Reframing employee engagement within the context of meaning and purpose: Implications for HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 15(4), 341-355. Doi: 10.1177/1523422313503235
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
- Smith, J. S. (2005). Fostering faculty engagement in departmental assessment in higher education. *Assessment Update*, 17(4), 7-9.
- Song, L. H., Lim, D. H., Kang, I. G., & Kim, W. (2014). Team performance in learning organizations: Mediating effect of employee engagement. *The learning Organization*, 21(5), 290-309. Doi 10.1108/TLO-07-2012-0049
- Storm, K., & Rothmann, I. (2003). A psychometric analysis of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale in the South African police service. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29, 62-70.
- Swanson, R. A. (1995). Human resource development: Performance is the key. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(2), 207-213.

- The office of educational council in Thailand. (2010). *5 years trend in higher educational management*. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <http://www.taa.or.th/index.php>. (November, 12, 2014).
- Tight, M. (2003). *Researching higher education (eds)*. Glasgow: The society for research into Higher Education and Open University press.
- Truss, K., Soane, E., Edwards, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A., & Burnett, J. (2006). *Working life: Employee attitudes and engagement 2006*. London, England: Chartered Institute of Personal and Development.
- Ugwu, F. O., Onyishi, I. E., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M. (2013). Linking organizational trust with employee engagement: The role of psychological empowerment. *Personnel Review*, 43(3), 377-400. Doi: 10.1108/PR-11-2012-0198
- Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Spring, 5-16.
- Walker, J. W. (2001). Perspectives. *Human Resource Planning*, 24, 6-10.
- Wang, P., & Walumbwa, F. (2007). Family-friendly programs, organizational commitment, and work withdrawal: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 397-427
- Whitener, E. M. (2001). Do “high commitment” human resource practices affect employee commitment?: A cross-level analysis using hierarchical linear modeling. *Journal of Management*, 27(5), 515-535. Doi: 10.1177/014920630102700502
- Whittington, J. L., & Galpin, T. J. (2010). The engagement factor: Building a high-commitment organization in a low-commitment world. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 31(5), 14-24. Doi: 10.1108/02756661011076282
- Wollard, K. K. & Shuck, B. (2011). Antecedents to employee engagement: A structured review of the literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 429-446. Doi: 10.1177/1523422311431220

- Wong, E. S., & Heng, T. N. (2009). Case study of factors influencing jobs satisfaction in two Malaysia Universities. *International Business Research*, 2(2), 86-98.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Kantas, A., & Demerouti, E. (2012). Measuring burnout and work engagement: Factor structure, invariance, and latent mean difference across Greece and the Netherlands. *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, 7(2), 40-52
- Yi-Wen, Z., & Yi-Qun, C. (2005). The Chinese version of the Utrecht work engagement scale: An examination of reliability and validity. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 13, 268-70.
- Yahaya, R., Chek, I. T., & Jizat, J. E. (2014). Organizational commitment at a higher education institution. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(11), 309-318.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2013). *Employee work passion. Perspective (3)*. UK: The Ken Blanchard Company.