Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the studies that have already been conducted in the field of faculty engagement in order to define the research gap, identify the variables, and develop the conceptual model for the relevant study. Variables used for the study are used as the base for this purpose. A review of relevant work relating to the topic under study is presented in the following sections:

2.2 Studies relating to employee engagement

To retain the employees in an organisation, keeping them engaged is a cost-effective task. Engagement is the level of commitment an employee has towards his job, organisation, and society in the long run. (Barman, 2011). An engaged employee will put his energy, effort, and mind towards achieving the organisation's goals and will also support his co-workers in their work, which leads to a better working environment. Human resources, the most precious factor that cannot be imitated by others if properly employed, yield more productivity. Making the employees engaged is the only process that could be used for this purpose. Employee engagement is the "psychological experiences of work and work contexts shape the process presenting and absenting their selves during task performance". Meaningfulness of the work, availability, and safety are the three

psychological conditions required for an engaged employee (Kahn, 1990). The employees in any organisation fall into one of the following three categories: engaged, not engaged, or actively disengaged. Engagement is not a static concept; it fluctuates depending upon the activities happening around the clock in the organisation. Engaged employees will be intellectually and emotionally bound to the organisation. The retention and dedication of an employee are the result of their commitment to the organisation. (Stairs, 2005) Engagement is positively related to job satisfaction, job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, organisational commitment, productivity, profitability, and safety, and relatively negatively related to turnover intentions and burnout. (Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010; Saks, 2006; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). Emotional, cognitive, and behavioural energies at the workplace aligned with organisational strategies and objectives evolve out of engagement. (Andrew & Sofian, 2012). An engaged employee remains focused, energetic, and fully engrossed in their jobs and directs all their efforts towards achieving organisational objectives. (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Barbera & Young, 2009). The efforts of engaged employees are reflected in the organization's performance and effectiveness. (Bakker, 2011). Highly engaged employees experience a greater attachment to their work and organisation, which leads to more outcomes. (Organ, 1994; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2008). Engaged employees are considered to be more dynamic, enthusiastic, and captivated than non-engaged employees. Engaged employees are much more creative, and it is necessary to channel their efforts so that they contribute to the well-being of an organisation and that greater control of work can be achieved. (Luthans, 2013). Employees prefer the jobs that keep them engaged, motivated, and assure flexibility, growth, and promotion. Positive psychology and mental well-being play a vital role in today's work environment; hence, employee engagement cannot be neglected in today's working space. To make employees content and stay within the organisation for a longer duration, they should be engaged, and employers should stress the strategies of employee engagement. Strategies such as financial reward, job enlargement, training and development opportunities, work-life balance, and a supportive work environment help to retain employees. (Ghosh et.al, 2013). For engaged employees, it is easy to have control over their work by job

enlargement and demanding more responsibilities from them. (Weigl, 2010). To live a high-quality life, engaged employees need to be psychologically stronger (Fredrickson, 2009) in terms of general wellbeing and control at work to attain personal and organisational goals. (Richman, 2006). According to the claims of consulting firms and researchers, employee engagement is a success factor in increasing organisational productivity and remaining competitive in the global marketplace. (Macey et al., 2009; Sak & Gruman, 2014). A high degree of involvement and commitment in the profession is reflected in engaged faculties rather than passive compliance.

Employee engagement has been focused on through the lens of three different backgrounds, and different viewpoints have been developed. The first concept was developed by Kahn and viewed engagement as work engagement. It covers the individual, physical, emotional, and cognitive aspects of an employee. (Truss et al., 2006; Shuck & Wollard, 2010). The second concept was influenced by the concept of job burnout. (Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Carwright & Holmes, 2006). The third concept was based on the JD-R model, or Job Demands- Resource model. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Sak & Gruman, 2014). The need-satisfaction framework, the burnout-antithesis framework, and the multi-dimensional framework are the concepts that underpin the employee engagement frameworks. The need-satisfaction framework is similar to Kahn's, the burnout antithesis is similar to Maslach & Letiter's concept; and the multi-dimensional framework reflects the personal and role performance of the employee in an organisation by including cognitive, emotional, and behavioural components.

2.3 Studies relating to Faculty Engagement

Faculty engagement is the commitment of faculty members to their activities relating to research, teaching, service, and other allied activities. An engaged faculty member will be passionate about their work and strive continuously to achieve their goals. Extrinsic rewards, along with intrinsic ones such as recognition, appraisals from authorities, personal growth, and advancement in their careers, do drive them to be more engaged. Instructors recognise their role beyond the delivery of content in order to facilitate learning and to inculcate

overall development among students. Livingston (2011) states, for validating the Faculty Engagement Survey (FES), that "it can be described as an intense and positive long-term relationship in which the person is absorbed in the experience and in aspects that the individual considers important and meaningful." A high-quality student experience predicts the level of engagement among faculty members. (Gallup, 2017). A high degree of commitment will be reflected in an engaged faculty's actions, and teaching is more about commitment than compliance with them (Barman & Ray, 2011). It incorporates enjoyment in the areas of research, teaching, and service and considers the tasks they have to perform in their roles while experiencing congruence between their values. (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005).

Faculty engagement is being considered a crucial strategic approach in the discipline of Human Resource Management (HRM) as it helps the educational institution to meet success. Institutions treat faculty members as a valuable asset in order to obtain a healthier outcome. Those institutions that engage their faculty members may see positive changes in productivity, student satisfaction, retention of faculty members, and passion for research-related activities, innovations, and performance. By making faculty members engaged, the institution benefits in the areas of competitive advantage, productivity, less burnout, and lower employee turnover. (Ameen & Babu, 2018).

The role of faculty members in creating a conducive environment for engaging students is a crucial one. It is the combined responsibility of faculty members and the effort of the students that results in student engagement. Faculty engagement in this context is the deliberate effort of the faculty members to positively impact student learning outcomes by keeping them lively in the classroom and always keeping them connected. (Chew & Chan 2008). Student-faculty interactions also play a pivotal role in retaining the students within the institutions and rely on the academic and social integration skills of students, which are the favourable outcomes of the faculty-student interactions. (Tinto, 1993). Moreover, to attain student success, faculty engagement is considered as a major ingredient and acts as a key to student engagement. (Beairsto, 2012). A

faculty member who is more passionate and highly involved in research-related activities is found to be more devoted to teaching due to their ability to attract and engage students. (Trowler & Wareham, 2008).

Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) can attract and retain faculty members who are more engaged, as engaged faculty members act as a source of competitive advantage in this era. (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). Engaged faculty also contribute to student success due to their ability to create interest, enthusiasm, and excitement among them and induce them to exhibit innovative behaviour. (Maheshwari & Mathur, 2020; Patrick, Hisley, & Kempler 2000; Bakker, 2005).

Spiritual, emotional, and intellectual aspects of the faculty members have been explored to measure the commitment. (Palmer, 1998). An attempt to measure the personal engagement in the work of faculty members has been made to know the level of passion. (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005). Internal motivation drives the members of an institution to be engaged. (Palmer, 1998). By finding out the factors that contribute to engagement and identifying engaged faculty members, a researcher can develop a set of faculty development programmes and professional growth initiatives that, in the long run, will contribute to student success. (O'Meara et al., 2009). Administrators could improve faculty morale and productivity and influence students' outcomes by quantifying engagement among faculty members. (Livingston, 2011). To exhibit higher levels of engagement, faculty members must be provided with a good working environment, proper recognition, sufficient rewards, the opportunity to grow, platforms to learn, and to attain overall development. It is the duty of administrators and authorities to assure that the faculty members are satisfied with the services provided by the Universities. (Bay et al. 2014) Engaging the faculty members forcefully is not possible; it should come from their hearts naturally to enjoy, serve the targeted audience, and strive for excellence at the institution.

2.4 Studies on Factors Affecting Faculty Engagement

To enhance University effectiveness, faculty engagement factors play a critical role, like factors affecting employee engagement. (Rhoades, 2012). Academic staff engagement mediates trust and group conflict. (Selmer et al., 2013).

Job engagement and organisational engagement mediate antecedents of faculty engagement such as job characteristics, perceived organisational support, recognition and rewards, and procedural and distributive justice (Saks, 2006). For convincing faculty members to work and engage with their duties of teaching, research and service motivation theories are widely accepted and used in educational contexts. There are several factors that affect the engagement level of faculty members in higher education. By reviewing the existing literature, it has been found that many authors have used different terms interchangeably to measure the factors that influence faculty engagement. The researcher has broadly categorised the factors that affect faculty engagement under six headings.

2.4.1 Personal Factors

2.4.2 Organisational Factors

2.4.3 Psychological Factors

2.4.4 Economic Factors

2.4.5 Social Factors

2.4.6 Management Factors

2.4.1 Personal Factors

Organisational commitment is determined by a set of personal factors. (Luthans, Baack, & Taylor, 1987). Individual characteristics play a crucial role in building capabilities to achieve the academic goals of faculty members. Many studies on faculty involvement reveal possible associations between demographic characteristics such as gender, age, race, rank, experience, and title of post with engagement. Women are more likely to be involved in engaging students as compared to men. (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress 2000; Hammond, 1994). The engagement levels of common faculty members and tenure-track faculty members differ as the latter spends more time on research. The experiences of the faculty members inside and outside the academic world also shape their beliefs regarding their capabilities and enhance their confidence. (Bandura, 1977; Boyte, 2004; Donahue, 2000).

Demographic variables such as gender, marital status, age, length of work experience, level of education, and grade of the employee are the most commonly studied personal factors. A positive relationship between commitment and both age and length of work experience has been reported. (Kumar & Giri, 2009). The relationship between age and commitment alone was indicated in some other studies. (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Cohen, 1993; Mayer & Schoorman, 1998; Abdulla & Shaw, 1999). Commitment was seen to be positively related to job tenure and negatively related to level of education. (Kassahun, 2005).

2.4.2 Organisational Factors

For organisational identification Locus of control, need for strength, and need for satisfaction act as important antecedents. (Shrivastava & Dolke, 1978). Characteristics of the job such as role clarity, autonomy, challenge, opportunities for career advancement, and participative management are related to organisational commitment in a positive manner. (Wright, 1990; Niehoff Enz, & Grover, 1990; Pallich, Hom, & Griffeth, 1995). Recognition and appreciation do have a positive role in creating organisational commitment. (Mishra, 1992). Job content and scope for advancement act as critical antecedents of organisational commitment. (Sharma & Sharma, 2003; Sharma & Joshi, 2001). To predict the work engagement among telecom managers, social support, autonomy, opportunities to learn, and feedback have been taken into account. (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Rhenen, 2009). A significant relationship between work redesign and organisational commitment has been reported in relation to state-owned enterprises. (Chen & Chen, 2008). Organisational climate, supervisory behaviour, organisational tenure, role clarity, and interpersonal relationships at the workplace act as determinants of organisational commitment. (Tao et al., 1998). Employee loyalty could be enhanced with the help of factors such as job variety, support from co-workers, and opportunities for promotion. (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999). Innovative HR practises and organisational commitment are positively related. (Agarwala, 2003). Career opportunities have a significant relationship with organisational commitment. (Blackhurst, Brandt, & Kalinkowski, 1998; Sturges et al., 2002). Justice, autonomy, and competence development are positively correlated with organisational

commitment. (Kassahun, 2005). A significant relationship between engagement and elements such as strong leadership, accountability, autonomy, a sense of control over one's environment, and opportunities for development is established. (Perrin, 2003). Individual characteristics, along with characteristics of the institutions and departments in which they work, shape the faculty member's motivation to participate in activities (Colbert, 2012).

2.4.3 Psychological Factors

Psychological conditions exhibit a significant positive relationship with engagement. Meaningfulness, which is a strong predictor of engagement, is positively linked with job enrichment and work-role fit. Some individuals immerse themselves while at work, while others become disengaged and alienated from their work. Along with cognitive elements, emotional and behavioural elements must also be duly considered to entail engagement. Meaningfulness is "the value of a work or purpose, judged in relation to an individual's own ideals or standards". A job that is considered meaningful contributes to personal growth and motivates workers. A work that is meaningless leads to detachment from one's own work and leads to apathy.

Treating employees with dignity and respecting and valuing their opinions and deeds helps create confidence among employees to outperform their tasks. It is always better not to treat the employees as occupants of roles and mere performers of tasks, but rather to give them due consideration for their acts and make them feel like they are part of the institution. Employees who are assigned challenging work are seen to be more active, tend to be more involved in work, and are less likely to leave the institution. (Idaszak & Drasgow, 1987). Authorities should take a practical as well as a humanistic approach when handling the work pressure of employees, as it will lead to burnout and the intention to quit. (Wang & Walumbwa, 2007; Rowley & Purcell, 2001).

Challenging work, Meaningful work, opportunities for advancement, empowerment, responsibility, managerial integrity, and quality act as factors that contribute to organisational commitment and retention. (Birt, Wallis, & Winternitz, 2004). Meaningfulness, safety, availability, rewarding co-workers, and supportive

supervisory relations have a positive relation towards employee engagement. (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). Objectivity and rationality are related to organisational commitment (Mishra, 1992). Enhancing engagement rests on meaningful work and an enriching work experience. (Perrin, 2003). Involvement and enthusiasm were linked with employee turnover, loyalty, productivity, safety, and profitability criteria. (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002).

2.4.4 Economic Factors

Compensation is an indispensable factor that motivates employees to focus on work and achieve more in terms of personal growth and development. It combines both financial and non-financial incentives such as pay, bonuses, other financial rewards, extra holidays, and voucher schemes. Recognition and rewards have a significant positive relationship with engagement. It has been noticed that when proper rewards and recognition are provided to employees, they are obliged to show higher levels of engagement in performing their tasks. (Saks & Rotman, 2006). The levels of engagement among employees vary with their perception of the benefits they receive. (Kahn, 1990). Hence, it is the employees' perception towards the benefits they receive that determines their level of engagement and has nothing to do with the quantity and type of rewards provided to them. In order to achieve a higher level of engagement, it is desirable for the management to provide acceptable standards of remuneration and benefits to the employees.

Compensation is the "most critical issue when it comes to attracting and keeping talent." (Willis, 2000). An organisation that invests in pay and benefits could be able to reduce voluntary turnover. (Shaw et al., 1998). By adopting skill-based pay systems, employee retention can be improved, and organisations that adopt group incentive plans are associated with high turnover. (Guthrie, 2000). A positive relationship between organisational commitment and employees' perceptions of various benefits provided by the organisation has been reported. (Goldberg et al., 1989; Rothausen et al., 1998; and Ngo & Wing-Ngar Tsang, 1998). Monetary benefits were found to have a positive relationship with organisational commitment. (Mishra, 1992). A positive relationship is established between the employee's perception of pay and their commitment to the organisation. (Sharma

& Singh, 1991). Money and incentives play a lesser role in engaging employees. (Perrin, 2003). A positive relationship between innovative HR practises and organisational practises has been established. (Agarwala, 2003).

2.4.5 Social Factors

Engagement occurs when leaders are inspiring and support from co-workers is assured. Social Exchange Theory (SET) explains the importance of interactions in creating engagement, "Obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence". Relationships, work-life balance, and values are the elements that have an impact on faculty engagement. (Saks, 2006). "The relationship evolves over time into trusting, loyal, and mutual commitments as long as the parties abide by certain rules of exchange". (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Effective leadership is a higher-order, multi-dimensional construct that comprises self-awareness, balanced processing of information, relational transparency, and internalised moral standards. (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

It would be more effective when the leaders communicate that the employees' efforts play a crucial role in achieving business success. Supportive leadership impacts employee engagement and increases their sense of involvement, satisfaction, and enthusiasm for work. (Schneider et al., 2009). To promote employee engagement, supportive interpersonal relationships and an efficient team are necessary. (Kahn, 1990).

Relationships in the workplace had a significant impact on meaningfulness, which is one of the important components of employee engagement. (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). Individuals who have positive interpersonal interactions with their co-workers will experience greater meaning in their work. (Locke & Taylor, 1990) Hence, high levels of work engagement could be expected from the employees if relationships with co-workers are ideal.

2.4.6 Management Factors

Management factors play a vital role in creating engagement among employees. To enhance the engagement level of employees and to gain

concentration and focus on their work, training and career development could be considered as an important dimension. It improves accuracy in the tasks they perform and thereby enhances performance. (Paradise, 2008). Confidence can be built in the areas of training, and it motivates them to get engaged in the job at a higher level. Providing employees with a chance to grow is considered to be equivalent to rewarding them. "Satisfaction of growth needs depends on a person finding the opportunity to be what he or she is most fully and become what he or she can". (Alderfer, 1972). Training and education contribute positively to organisational commitment. (Mishra, 1992). Effective training and opportunities to learn and develop were positively related to employee retention. (Arnold, 2005). So, to retain employees, sufficient attention could be provided by the authorities for the learning of employees.

Performance appraisal critically determines the commitment level of employees. (Sharma & Joshi, 2001). Measuring the actual performance of the employees is considered to be a challenging task in developing an appraisal system. When the organization's performance appraisal system is properly aligned with the objectives of the institution, the result is always positive. The positive results include high-performing employees, increased job satisfaction, low turnover, and an increase in the level of engagement. (Shin et al., 2016). There is a direct positive relationship between training, awareness of rules and supervision, and organisational commitment. (Rochi & Swardlow, 1999).

Talent management can be defined as "the implementation of integrated human resource strategies to attract, develop, retain, and productively utilise employees with the required skills and abilities to meet current and future business needs". (Kontoghirges & Frangou, 2009). Talent management policies and practises that are effective to demonstrate a commitment to the human resources of the organisation, which leads to an enhancement in engagement levels. Hence, many implement talent management practises for enhancing employee engagement and decreasing turnover. (Bhatnagar, 2007; Roper, 2009).

After considering the Kerala context, the researcher has categorised the factors under six major headings and incorporated all elements into them. Table 2.1 shows the summary of the review done.

Table 2.1

Summary of the Review of Literature: Factors that affect faculty engagement

Sl. No	Constructs	Description	References
1.	Personal	Age, Gender, Years of experience, type of institution, designation.	Abes, Jackson, & Jones.(2002); Abdulla & Shaw, (1999); Antonio et al., (2000); Bandura, (1977); Boyte, (2004); Cohen, (1993); Donahue, (2000); Hammond, (1994); Kassahun, (2005); Kumar & Giri, (2009); Luthans, Baack, & Taylor, (1987); Mathieu & Zajac, (1990); Mayer & Schoorman, (1998).
2.	Organisational	Organisational culture and policy, departmental culture, autonomy, innovation, accountability, and recognition	Ajgaonkar, Baul, & Phadke,(2012); Anitha (2014); Bakker (2011); Bethencourt (2012); Dutta (2004); Fornes, Rocco, & Wollard. (2008); Gitanjali, Sharma, & Sharma, (2010); Ghosh et al. (2013); Kumar & Sia (2012); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Ramlall (2003); Sak (2006); Walker (2001); Whitener (2001).
3.	Psychological	Meaningfulness, involvement, personal trust, and value Challenging work and work pressure	Birt et al. (2004); Csikszentmihalyi (1990); Dutta (2004); Fornes, Rocco, & Wollard. (2008); Ghosh et al. (2013); Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, (2002); May, Gilson, & Harter(2004); Mishra (1992); Perrin, 2003; Reoi & Sanders (2011); Rousseau et al. (1998); Sak (2006); Ugwu et al. (2013); Whitener (2001); Walker (2001); Whittington & Galpin (2010).
4.	Economical	Rewards and Benefits; External Funding and Funders' Requirements	Agarwala (2003); Anitha (2014); Bethencourt (2012); Chambel, Castanheira, & Sobral (2014); Ghosh et al. (2013); Gitanjali, Sharma &Sharma,(2010);Goldberg et al. (1989); Kahn (1990); May, Gilson, & Harter (2004); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Rothausen et al.,

Sl. No	Constructs	Description	References
			(1998); Saks (2006); Sharma & Singh (1991); Shaw et al. (1998); Whittington & Galpin (2010); Willis (2000);
5.	Social	Leadership, relationship with peers and other authorities, and personal networks	Ajgaonkar et al. (2012); Andrew & Sofian (2012); Anitha (2014); Bakker (2011); Bethencourt (2012); Cropanzano & Mitchell (2005); Fornes, Rocco, & Wollard. (2008); Gitanjali, Sharma, & Sharma, (2010);Gruman & Saks (2012); Iverson & Buttigeig; Kahn (1990); Kumar & Sia (2012); Locke & Taylor (1990); May, Gilson, & Harter (2004); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Remo (2012); Reoi & Sanders (2011); Saks (2006); Schneider et.al (2009); Tao et.al (1998); Walker (2001); Walumbwa et.al (2008); Whittington & Galpin (2010).
6.	Management	Talent management, performance appraisal, and T&D programmes	Andrew & Sofian (2012); Anitha (2014); Arnold (2005); Bhatnagar (2007); Chambel et al. (2014); Dutta (2004); Gitanjali, Sharma, & Sharma, (2010); Gruman & Saks (2011); Hughes & Rog (2008); Kontoghiorges & Frangou (2009); Mohapatra & Sharma (2010); Raju (2004); Rooper (2009); Shin et al. (2016); Whittington & Galpin (2010)

Source: Secondary Data

2.5 Studies on the Outcomes of Faculty Engagement

The outcomes of the faculty engagement could be related to two states: outcomes relating to Universities or institutions, and the second one relating to individual benefit. (Wuttaphan, 2016). Four dimensions have been identified relating to the consequences of faculty engagement towards institutions and consist of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit, and organisational citizenship behaviour. (Saks, 2006). Engaged employees help in the enhancement of performance and greater productivity. However, the engagement could be

utilised by the institutions to manage their talent and retain the top performers and high achievers within the institution. (Bhatnagar, 2007). While moving to personal benefits, it is possible for an engaged employee to maintain a work-life balance and assure the quality of their work life. It is possible to instil a sense of ownership in them, increasing their commitment. (Baldomi, 2013). Commitment can be classified as rational or emotional, where rational specifies that the acts are self-driven, demand extrinsic rewards, and demand professional development. Whereas, emotional commitment refers to a deeper level of involvement with the job, other employees, and the organisation as a whole. (Barman, 2014).

The outcomes of commitment comprise lower absenteeism, increased work effort (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), improved production (Randal & Cote, 1994), and overall performance on the job (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Those employees with strong organizational commitment have an emotional attachment to the organization and a stronger desire to contribute meaningfully to the achievement of organizational goals. The employees will be willing to go beyond their role and duty, such as providing extra help to co-workers, voluntarily taking part in special assignments, being considerate towards co-workers, showing loyalty towards customers, being willing to work for additional hours, and providing suggestions when a problem arises (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organisational commitment results in lower turnover, which results in improved organisational effectiveness.

2.6 Studies on Regulatory Bodies of Higher Education in India

The higher education sector is the most important sector and plays a pivotal role in improving national productivity by developing human resources in a horizontal dimension. To improve national effectiveness, academic staff, faculty members, and students should be involved. (Tight, 2003; Humphreys & Hoque, 2007; Lew, 2009). Faculty members are the talented working group for higher educational institutions who are bound to perform teaching, research, and service-oriented activities as stated in university policies. Universities are confronted with the task of becoming centres of excellence in both teaching and research. As the number of students with various specialisations and disciplines increases, so does the importance of teaching quality. (Smbey, 2003; Roberts, 2009). The higher

education sector adopts a learner-centred approach and keeps keen attention on the learning experience of students, through which institutions could strive for excellence in designing curriculum and syllabus. (Brusoni et al., 2014). In order to remain prominent in the knowledge economy, an educational institution should be effective disseminators of knowledge and create innovative and self-directed individuals who become assets to society. (Candy, 2000).

By 2030, the Indian higher education system, in terms of quality and affordability, will become a role model for the world. It will improve the socio-economic fabric of the country and help it attain quality and excellence. The prevailing challenges faced by the educational system, such as lack of equal access, obsolete curriculum and pedagogy, scarcity of qualified staff, and a relative lack of collaboration between industries, research, and academia, will be successfully resolved by 2030. (FICCI-EY Report). The critical issue that is getting in the way of the educational system is the lack of governance. The weak social and institutional foundation led to the vast entry of private players in the education sector of India, which made a transition like "from half-baked socialism to half-baked capitalism". (Kapur& Mehta, 2007). Low investment in libraries, ICT, laboratories, and classrooms acts as a hurdle for providing quality teaching and taking part in research activities. (Altbach, 2005). The existing higher education system does not incentivize the best performing, most productive, and most efficient faculty; rather, it rewards longevity and conformity. "If India is to succeed as a great technological power with a knowledge-based economy, world-class universities are required". To govern and manage universities effectively, deep structural and cultural changes are needed. (Altbach & Jayaram, 2015). To enhance the quality of higher education and equip it with infrastructure, the government would take steps to source Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and External Commercial Borrowing (ECB). (Jayakumar, 2020).

2.7 Research Gap

Faculty engagement is not a novel concept, but it is an area that is less focused as compared to other sectors where engagement is continuously measured. The paucity of research in the areas of faculty engagement leads other sectors to

thrive heavily on the development of their human resources and to inculcate skills. The study intends to develop a model in order to promote engagement levels among faculty members in higher education.

More foreign studies were done in the area of faculty engagement in order to understand the antecedents and outcomes. The concept is underdeveloped in a country like India, where much effort should be made as it helps in achieving academic excellence and success at HEIs. The research study exploring the antecedents and consequences of faculty engagement is totally absent in the context of Kerala. Few studies that were done in the area of faculty engagement focused on Universities, ignoring arts and science colleges, which differ in functioning. The researcher tries to identify the factors that contribute to faculty engagement, the outcomes associated with faculty engagement, and their level of engagement in teaching, research, and service activities. A comparison of engagement levels among Government, Aided and Autonomous college teachers was made in the study to provide institutional wise suggestions.

The study tries to develop a model comprising factors that lead to faculty engagement and attainment of outcomes that are beneficial to individuals and the institution as a whole. The model will be validated and tested empirically so it can be adopted by the HEIs of the state to foster commitment levels and reduce burnout.

2.8 Conclusion

The chapter headed Review of Literature covers various studies that have been conducted relating to the topic 'Faculty Engagement'. The areas covered were engagement, faculty engagement, factors affecting faculty engagement, outcomes associated with faculty engagement, and the regulatory bodies of higher education in India. This helps the researcher to conceive of the idea regarding the topic, to develop the research gap, to formulate the research questions, objectives along with hypotheses, and to frame out a conceptual model.

REFERENCES

Abdulla, M.H., & J.D. Shaw. (1999). Personal factors and organisational commitment: Main and interactive effects in the united arab emirates. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 11,* 77-93.

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 5–17.

Agarwala, T. (2003). Innovative human resources practices and organisational commitment: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*(2), 175-197.

Ajgaonkar, M., Baul, U., & Phadke, S. M. (2012). Relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and job characteristics model of motivation: An empirical study. *NMIMS Management Review*, *April-May,* 51-72.

Alderfer, C.P. (1972). *Human needs in organisational settings*. Free Press

Altbach, P. G. (2005, April 12). A world-class country without world-class higher education: India's 21st century dilemma. *International Higher Education, 40*(Summer), 18-20.

Altbach, P., & Jayaram, N. (2015). India's effort to join 21st-century higher education. *International Higher Education*, *54,* 17-19.

Ameen, N., & Babu, G. (2018). Parameters inducing faculty engagement in private education institutions: A conceptual study. *Journal of Management*, *5*(4) 343-348.

Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,40*(2012), 498-508.

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63*(3), 308-323.

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 23*(4), 373–398.

Arnold, E. (2005), Managing human resources to improve employee retention. *The Health Care Manager, 24*(2), 132-140.

Bakker, A. B. (2005). Flow among music teachers and their students: The crossover of peak experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66,* 26-44.

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(4), 265-269. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0963721411414534

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22,* 309–328.

Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, *13*, 209–223.

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/

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* Freeman.

Barman, A., & Saikat, R. (2011). Faculty engagement in higher educational institution: A proposed model. *Journal for Multidimensional Education*, 3(6), 7-17. http://ssm.com/abstract=1844432

Barman, L., Laksov, K. B., & Silén, C. (2014). Policy enacted teachers' approaches to an outcome-based framework for course design*. Teaching in Higher Education, 19*(7), 735-746. 10.1080/13562517.2014.934346

Bay, A. B., An, I. L., & Laguador, J. M. (2014). Organizational satisfaction and work engagement of filipino teachers in an asian university. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic Research, 2*(4), 32- 41.

Beairsto, B. (2012, March). *Teacher engagement is the key to student engagement.* Retrieved July 2021, from https://www.edcan.ca/articles/teacher-engagement-is-the-key-to-student-engagement/

Bethencourt, A. L. (2012). *Employee engagement and self-determination theory* [Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University].

Bhatnagar, J. (2008). Managing capabilities for talent engagement and pipeline development. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 40*(1), 19-28. 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.

Blackhurst, A. E., Brandt, J.E., & Kalinkowski, J. (1998). Effects of career development on the organisational commitment and life satisfaction of women students affairs administrators. *The NASPA Journal*, 36(1), 19-34.

Boyte, H. C. (2004). *Going public: Academics and public life.* Kettering Foundation.

Brusoni, M., Damian, R., Sauri, J. G., Jackson, S., Kömürcügil, H., Malmedy, M., Matveeva, O., Motova, G., Pisarz, S., Pol, P., Rostlund, A., Soboleva, E., Tavares, O., & Zobel, L. (2014). *The concept of excellence in higher education* (ENQA Occasional Papers 20). European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

Candy, P. C. (2000). Reaffirming a proud tradition: Universities and lifelong learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 1*(2), 101-125.

Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 199-208. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1053482206000246

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, 37*(4), 1-25. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0143831X14550695

Chew, J., & Chan, C.C.A. (2008). Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. *International Journal of Manpower, 29*(6), 503-522.

Cohen, A. and Hudecek, N. (1993). Organizational commitment-turnover relationship across occupational groups. *Group & Organization Management, 18*(2), 188-213.

Colbert, E. M. (2012). *The impact of leadership on employee engagement at a chemical manufacturing company in the United States* [Dissertation] ProQuest. AAI3537415.

Cropanzano, R. and Mitchell, M.S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 874-900.

Donahue, D. (2000). Charity basket or revolution: Beliefs, experiences and context in preservice teachers' service learning. *Curriculum Inquiry, 30*(4), 429-450.

Dutta, A. (2004). Strategies for retaining employees. *Human Resource Management Review, August,* 31-35.

FICCI- E&Y (2012). Higher education in India: Vision 2047. file:///C:/Users/URMILA%20R%20MENON/Downloads/ey-higher-education-in-india-vision-2047.pdf

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.

Fredrickson, B.L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden and build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 218–226.

Gallup. (2017). Higher education employee engagement. The Engaged University.

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. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJOA-Sep-2011-0511/full/html

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.

Goldberg, W.A., Greenberger, E., Koch-Jones, J., O'Neil, R., & Hamill, S. (1989). Attractiveness of Child Care and Related Employer Supported Benefits and Policies to Married and Single Parents. *Child and Youth Care Quarterly, 18*, 23-37.

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review, 21,* 123-136. 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004

Guthrie, J. (2000). Alternative pay practices and employee turnover. *Group & Organization Management, 25*(4), 419-439.

Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 21–28.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279.

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.

Idaszak, J.R., & Drasgow, F. (1987). A revision of the job diagnostic survey: Elimination of a measurement artefact. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 69-74.

Iverson, R. D., & Donna, M. (1999). Affective normative and continuance commitment: Can the right kind of commitment be managed. *Journal of Management Studies, 36*(3), 307-333.

Jayakumar, P. B. (2020, July 23). *Budget 2020: Education gets front seat in Sitharaman's aspiring India*. Business Today. Retrieved August, 2021, from https://www.businesstoday.in/union-budget-2020/decoding-thebudget/budget-2020-education-gets-front-seat-sitharaman-aspiringindia/story/395249.html

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 692-724.

Kang, M., Shin, D. H., & Gong, T. (2016). The role of personalization, engagement, and trust in online communities. *Information Technology & People, 29*(3), 580-596.

Kapur, D., & Mehta, P. B. (2007*). Indian higher education reform: From half-baked socialism to half-baked capitalism.* Brookings NCAER India Policy Forum.

Kassahun, T. (2005). Level of organisational commitment: Its correlates and predictors. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 41*(1), 29-63.

Kontoghiorghes, C., & Frangou, K. (2009). The association between talent retention, antecedent factors, and consequent organizational performance. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, *74*(1), 29.

Kumar, B., Pavan., & Giri, V. N. (2009). Effect of age and experience on job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *The ICFAI University Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 8*(1), 28-36.

Kumar, R., & Sia, S. K. (2012). Employee engagement: Explicating the contribution of work engagement. *Management and Labor Studies, 37*(1), 31-43. 10.1177/0258042X1103700104

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.

Livingston,J. (2011). Defining and measuring faculty engagement: Validation of the faculty engagement survey [Doctoral dissertation, Azusa Pacific University]. ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (3467979).

Locke, E.A. & Taylor, M.S. (1990). Stress, coping, and the meaning of work. In Brief, A., & Nord, W.R. (Eds), *Meanings of Occupational Work* (pp. 135-170). Lexington Books.

Luthans, F., Baack, D., & Taylor, L. (1987). Organisational commitment: Analysis of antecedents. *Human Relations, 40*(4), 219-236.

Luthans, K. W., Luthans, B. C., & Palmer, N. F. (2016). A positive approach to management education: The relationship between academic PsyCap and student engagement. *Journal of Management Development*, *35*(9), 1098-1118.

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*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Maheshwari, R., & Mathur, M. (2020). Linking leader-member exchange and innovative work behaviour through faculty engagement: Rethinking management education in the era of VUCA world. *Our Heritage Journal, 68*(1), 3289-3306.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P., (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations causes personal stress and what to do about it*. Jossey-Bass.

Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organisational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.

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 Organisational Psychology, 77*(1), 11-37.

Mayer, R.C., & Schoorman. F.D. (1998). Differentiating antecedents of organisational commitment: A test of march and simon's model. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 19*(1), 15-28.

Meyer, J. P & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory research and application.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (2004). TCM employee commitment survey academic users guide. Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario.

Mishra, P.K. (1992). Does organisational climate help improving commitments? *Social Science International, 8*(1-2), 37-43.

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. 10.1177/097215091001100210

Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2005). Engagement in a profession: The case of undergraduate teaching. *Daedalus, 134*(3), 60-67.

Ngo, H., & Tsang, A., Ngar, W. (1998). Employment practices and organisational commitment: Differential aspects for men and women. *International Journal of Organisational Analysis, 6*(3), 251-266.

Niehoff, B.P., Enz. C.A., & Grover, R.A. (1990). The impact of top management actions on employee attitudes and perceptions. *Group and Organisational Studies, 15*(3), 337-352.

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. 10.1007/s10755-010-9159-3

Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of management, 20*(2), 465-478.

Palich, L.E., Hom, P.W. & Griffeth, R.W. (1995). Managing in the international context: Testing cultural generality of sources of commitment to multinational enterprises, *Journal of Management, 21*(4), 671- 690.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* Jossey-Bass.

Paradise, A. (2008). Influences engagement ASTD. *Training and Development, 62*(1), 54-59.

Patrick, B. C., Hisley, J., & Kempler, T. (2000). What's everybody so excited about? The effects of teacher enthusiasm on student intrinsic motivation and vitality. *Journal of Experimental Education, 68*, 217-236.

Perrin, T. (2003). *Working today: Understanding what drives employee engagement.* www.towersperrin.com/hrservices/webcache/towers/Unitedstaestes/Publications/Talent_Report_2003/Talent_2003.pdf.

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.

Randal, D.M., & Cote, J. A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. *Working and Occupation. 18*, 194-211

Remo, N. (2012). *Comparing two models of employee engagement: An examination of antecedents and outcome variables* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Windsor].

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. 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

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.

Richman, A. (2006), Everyone wants an engaged workforce: How can you create it? *Workspan, 49*(1), 36-39.

Roberts, K. J. (2009). Capacity building for new model universities. *Excellence in higher education (4)*, 108-118.

Rochi, W.S., & S. Swardlow. (1999). Training and its impact on organisational commitment among lodging employees. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 23*(2), 176-195.

Rooper, K. (2009). *The relationship between employees' perceptions of talent management practices and levels of engagement: A Botswana organisation case study*, (Master Thesis, 2009).

Rothausen, T.J., Gonzalez, J.A., Clarke, N. E., & O'Dell, L. L. (1998). Family-friendly backlash: Fact or fiction? The case of organisation's on-site child care centres. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(3), 687-697.

Rowley, G., & Purcell, K. (2001). As cooks go, she went: Is labour churn inevitable? *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 20*, 163-185.

Sak, A. M. & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25*(2), 155-182. 10.1002/hrdq.21187

Sak, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.

Saks, A., & Rotman, J. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *UWES – Utrecht work engagement scale: Test manual.* Department of Psychology, Utrecht University.

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., Bakker, A.B., & Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 30*(7), 893- 917.

Schneider, B., Macey, W.H. and Barbera, K.M. (2009), Driving customer satisfaction and financial success through employee engagement. *People and Strategy, 32*(2), 23-27.

Selmer, J., Jonasson , C., & Lauring, 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.

Sharma, B. R. & Rama, J. J. (2001).Determinants of organisational commitment in a manufacturing organisation in the private sector. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations,* 37(2), 199-216.

Sharma, Radha R. & Sharma, Baldev R. (2003). Organisational commitment and motivation among managerial staff. *Productivity, 44*(2), 251-257.

Sharma., &Singh. (1991). Determinants of organisational commitment. *Management and Labour Studies, 16*(2), 63-75.

Shaw, D.J., John, E.D., Jenkins, G.D. Jr and Nina, G. (1998). An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(5), 511-525.

Shrivastava, P.K. & Dolke, A.M. (1978). *Personality and organisational correlates of work and organisational identification*. ATIRA.

Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review, 9*(1), 89-110.

Smeby, J. C. (2003). The impact of massification of university research. *Tertiary Education and Management, 9*(2), 131-144.

Stairs, M. (2008). Work happy: Developing employee engagement to deliver competitive advantage. *Selection and Development Review, 21*(5).

Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N., & Keynes, M. (2002). A longitudinal study of the relationship between career management and organisational

commitment among graduates in the first ten years at work. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 23*(6), 731-748.

Tao, M., Takagi, H., Masahiro, I., & Kei, M. (1998). A study of antecedents of organisational commitment. *Japanese Psychological Research, 40*(4), 198-205.

Tight, M. (2003). *Researching higher education (eds).* The society for research into Higher Education and Open University press.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Trowler, P., & Wareham, T. (2008). *Tribes, territories, research and teaching: Enhancing the teaching-research nexus*. The Higher Education Academy.

Truss, K., Soane, E., Edwards, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A., & Burnett, J. (2006). *Working life: Employee attitudes and engagement.* 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. 10.1108/PR-11-2012-0198

Walker, J. W. (2001). Perspectives. *Human Resource Planning, 24*, 6-10.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of management, 34*(1), 89-126.

Wang, P. and Walumbwa, F. (2007). Family-friendly programs, organizational commitment, and work withdrawal: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 397-427.

Weigl, M., Hornung, S., Parker, S., Petru, R., Glaser, J., & Angerer, P. (2010). Work engagement accumulation of task, social, personal resources: A three-wave structural equation model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior 77*(1), 140-153

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(50),* 515-535. https://journals.sagepub.com/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. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/02756661011076282/full/html

Willis, C. (2000). Go for your goals. *Working Woman, March*, 6-7.

Wright, P.L. (1990). Teller job satisfaction and organisational commitment as they relate to career orientations. *Human Relations, 43*(4), 369-381.

Wuttaphan, N. (2016). Factors affecting faculty engagement: A review literature. *HROD Journal*, *8(2),* 92-118.