==

Trends in Studies Regarding the Engagement of Faculty Members (2010-2015)

🆔 **Seher ÖZCAN**
Gazi Üniversitesi
seherozcan@gazi.edu.tr

🆔 **Serçin KARATAŞ**
Gazi Üniversitesi
sercin@gazi.edu.tr

Article Info	ABSTRACT
Keywords: Engagement, Faculty engagement, Instructional engagement, Engagement research, Trends	Engagement is an important element for student success and gaining permanent learning. So, what engages our students? Faculty has critical role in educational environment with the instructional structure they provide. Therefore, the present study aims to evaluate the trends in studies involving instructional faculty engagement. Engagement of the faculty is an important factor in the permanent learning of the students, quality of the institution, and more importantly, one's own productivity. Conducted studies in this way, it will be possible to determine which factors are more influential on faculty engagement and on the other hand; it will help to see the gap in the literature. The literature examined and analyzed based on subject areas, theories and models, delivery modes, research methods, used statistics, and collected data. It is reviewed 99 full-text publication found in widely used databases. Based on the results, the most prominent subject areas were found to be institutional factors for the main themes and institutional supports for the sub-themes. It was observed that the JD-R model was predominantly used, and the f2f (face-to-face) method was preferred as an educational method. It was seen that correlational studies were common while surveys were the most frequently used data collection method.

Öğretim Elemanlarının Bağlılığına İlişkin Yapılan Araştırmalarda Eğilimler (2010-2015)

Makale Bilgileri	ÖZET
Anahtar Kelimeler: Bağlılık, Öğretim elemanı bağlılığı, Öğretime bağlılık, Bağlılık araştırmaları, Eğilim	Bağlılık, öğrenci başarısı ve kalıcı öğrenme için önemli bir unsurdur. Söz konusu öğrenci bağlılığı olduğunda ise öğretim elemanı eğitim ortamında sağladığı öğretimin niteliği ile kritik bir role sahiptir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma öğretim elemanlarının bağlılığı ile ilgili çalışmalardaki eğilimleri değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Öğretim elemanı bağlılığı, öğrencilerin kalıcı öğrenmesinde, kurumun kalitesinde ve daha da önemlisi öğrencinin kendi üretkenliğinde önemli bir faktördür. Bu çalışma öğretim elemanı bağlılığı ile ilgili yapılan araştırmaları betimlemesi ve genel bir resim ortaya koyması açısından önemlidir. Böylelikleyapılan çalışmanın bağlılık üzerine çalışan araştırmacılara alan yazındaki eksiklikleri görmeleri açısından yol gösterici olacağı düşünülmektedir. Öğretim elemanı bağlılığı ile ilgili alan yazında 2010-2015 yılları arasında yayınlanan araştırmalar; konu alanı, kuram ve model, eğitim dağıtım şekli, araştırma yöntemi, kullanılan istatistik ve toplanan verilere göre incelenip analiz edilmiştir. Yaygın olarak kullanılan veri tabanlarında bulunan 99 tam metin yayını gözden geçirilmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, öne çıkan ana tema kurumsal faktörler olurken, alt temada ise kurumsal destekler olduğu tespit edilmiştir. İncelenen çalışmalarda JD-R modelinin ağırlıklı olarak kullanıldığı ve daha çok yüz yüze eğitimin ortamlarında araştırma yapıldığı dikkat çekmektedir. Korelasyonel çalışmaların yaygın olduğu, anketlerin en sık kullanılan veri toplama yöntemi olduğu görülmüştür..

INTRODUCTION

Positive psychology is a scientific domain which analyzes the factors allowing individuals, institutions, and communities to develop and accordingly maximize human productivity (Truss, Alfes, Delbridge, Shantz & Saone, 2013). Along with the development of the positive psychology movement, which has emerged to balance negative psychology, the idea of *engagement* has been one of the concepts at the center of researchers' interests (Bailey et al. 2015). By introducing the concept of engagement in their studies, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1990) and William Kahn (1990) were the pioneer researchers in this subject. Whereas Kahn (1990) defined situations related to both engagement and disengagement in his study, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) associated the concept of engagement with the *flow* concept as a concept of organizational behavior. The *flow* concept, defined sometimes as a commitment to a specific task, is also related to focus of attention, clarity of mind, mind and body integration, ease of concentration, loss of self-awareness, and internal engagement. On the other hand, Kahn (1990) defines *engagement* as the commitment of personal energy to role performance and the individuals' feeling of complete absorption in their role, physically, cognitively, and emotionally. Within the theoretical framework established, a

positive correlation between *engagement* and these situations, which can be described as meaningfulness, safety and availability, was established (Kahn, 1990). Whereas *meaningfulness* refers to what is felt as a result of personal engagement to the performance of the role, *safety* refers to the capacity for self-expression without any hesitation related to self-image, status, and career. Finally, *availability* refers to having adequate physical, emotional, and psychological resources to perform one's role (Kahn, 1990). Although these situations are associated with the notion of psychological presence in the theoretical engagement model, Kahn (1992) emphasized in another study that *engagement* itself is different from psychological presence in terms of being careful, feeling integrated, commitment, or focusing on role performance. Among the studies on engagement, studies involving *work engagement* have been mainly of interest. The association of engagement in everyday connotation refers to involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, absorption, focused effort, zeal, dedication and energy (Schaufeli, 2013).

Researchers conducting studies on work engagement generally addressed the concept of engagement in connection with the concept of burnout. For instance, research by Maslach and Leiter (1997) emphasizes in their study that engagement was the exact opposite of burnout and defined burnout as a situation where engagement was corrupted. As for burnout, it is defined as a situation where a person suffers from emotional exhaustion, cynicism and chronic professional stress resulting from the lack of personal success (González-Romá, Schaufeli, Bakker & Lloret, 2006). Although engagement and burnout are two opposite concepts, the studies conducted on burnout have significantly contributed to the studies related to engagement (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008). Differently from burnout, work engagement is defined as the state of a person displaying high energy, strong participation and sense of activity towards the work (Leiter & Maslach, 2004). According to another definition, work engagement refers to a work-related positive and satisfying state of mind characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova González-Romá & Bakker, 2002). Out of these dimensions, vigour is characterized by a high level of physical energy, emotional strength, willingness to exert efforts and struggling against difficulties while dedication refers to a state characterized by a high level of involvement, pride, efforts for proving oneself, challenging and enthusiasm for working. As for absorption, it is characterized by a state of being fully concentrated, getting lost in work and thus not realizing the elapsed time and having difficulty in giving up the work being done (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002). When the literature is examined, it is seen that work engagement is associated with such other concepts as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement as well. Although they are associated, it must be noted that they are different concepts. Research by Lu, While and Barriball (2005) emphasizes that job satisfaction is an indicator of the state of burnout as well as the intention to quit the job. However, engagement differs from job satisfaction in that it combines high pleasure of working and high

activation. Therefore, job satisfaction is generally accepted as a more passive state of employee welfare (Baker & Hakanen, 2013). Organisational commitment refers to identification of a person with his/her organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997) while work engagement means identification with the job (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Lastly, job involvement refers to a stable attitude and includes a person's cognitive and personal beliefs with respect to the job. On the other hand, the level of engagement which is characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption can vary on a day-to-day basis (Dalal, Brummel & Thomas, 2008).

According to Gallup Consulting, there are three types of employees. The first group consists of the employees deeply committed to their organisation in which they constitute the backbone. The other group consists of the employees who do not feel commitment for their organisation and focus on tasks rather than the targets and outputs expected from them. Last group consists of the employees who do not feel commitment at all and such employees constantly oppose to everything (Krueger & Killham, 2005). An engaged employee is aware of the concept of the job and thus, cooperates with his/her colleagues in order to increase work performance for the benefit of the organisation. This is an indicator of the fact that these employees possess a positive attitude towards the organisation and its values (Shani & Narayanasamy, 2011).

Work engagement can be defined as a personal feeling of high energy related with the work, a strong participation, and a sense of effectiveness (Leiter & Maslach, 2004). Additionally, although this is a significant factor in one's subjective feeling of personal health, it has an important effect not only on the quality of life, but also on the mental and physical health (Leijten, Van Den Heuvel, Van Der Beek, Ybema, Robroek & Burdorf, 2015). Barman and Saikat (2011) consider engagement as a degree of commitment. When commitment is considered in terms of the context of work, it is possible to approach it from two perspectives: rational commitment and emotional commitment. From this point of view, whereas rational commitment takes into consideration the financial reward that arises on the basis of personal needs, affective commitment can be considered as a type of engagement that is more governed by personal beliefs and attitudes towards one's work, coworkers, and the work place (Barman & Saikat, 2011). On the other hand, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) defined work engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working face of difficulties. Dedication is characterized by a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge and the absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Educational institutions can be considered as one of the organizations where engagement in one's work is very important because faculty members engaged in their work feel more energetic, and they are willing to participate, and effective, which is vitally important for positive learning outcomes (Munson, 2013). Relevant studies in the literature address the idea that the engagement levels of the faculty have a significant influence on the effectiveness of teaching, motivation of students, and the quality and effectiveness of the organization (Jaggars & Xu, 2016; Stenerson, Blanchard, Fassiotto, Hernadez & Murth, 2010; Blackburn, 2014). Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi (2005), define faculty engagement in four different fields: student education, preserving and advancing a specific domain of knowledge, serving the needs of the institution, serving the needs of the broader society. All these four areas are related to the teacher's enjoyment of work, self-development in the field, research and writing, commitment to the institution's culture, and devotion to work.

In terms of the educational process, the notion of engagement has mostly been considered in the researches from the viewpoint of students. The key to developing a high-quality program is to increase engagement, along with increased interaction between students, instructors, community members, and course content (Angelino, Williams & Natvig, 2007). Many researchers agree that the key component of the effective learning environment is the learner's engagement to the learning (Norman, Spohrer, 1996; Conrad & Donaldson, 2011; Evans, Hartman, & Anderson, 2013; Mercer, 2018). For this reason, the role of faculty is to develop effective learning environments to train students with active, autonomous and self-regulation skills (Liaw & Huang, 2013). Even if there is a student at the center of the learning, the faculty is also the most important stakeholders of the educational system and one of the most important factors determining the quality and sustainability of education (Alhawiti, 2011; Betts, 2009, Darling-Hammond, 1999; Medinger, 2009; Okur & Yüzer, 2011; Rabinovich, Berthon ve Fedorenko, 2017). Therefore, engagement of faculty and faculty-student interaction has a positive effect on the student retention, persistence and success in both face-to-face and online education (Blackburn, 2014; Colak, 2018; Fowler & Boylan, 2010; Moore, 1997).

However, faculty is another key factor that should not be ignored (Hogan & McKnight, 2007). Although the responsibility of the faculty in this process has increased over time, their engagement has been investigated by only a limited number of studies (Barman & Saikat, 2011; Selmer, Jonassen & Lauring, 2014). However, one of the most important factors which ensures that students remain within the educational process and which affects their engagement in education is the engagement of faculty with the teaching process. Therefore, it is also aimed to provide researchers in the field with a general description of and trends in studies involving instructional faculty engagement as well as the gaps in the literature regarding the subject area.

This systematic literature review reveals to see the big picture and proposes a guidance to researchers interested in instructional faculty engagement to see current situation, recognize deficiencies and discover new topics. For this reason, the present study reviewed several research studies regarding faculty engagement and answers for the following questions were investigated:

1. What are the common subject and thematic areas studied in faculty engagement studies?
2. How do the subject areas commonly used in studies on faculty engagement differ across the time period studied?
3. What are the common theories and models utilized in faculty engagement studies?
4. What are the common educational delivery modes utilized in faculty engagement studies?
5. What is the distribution of the following factors utilized in faculty engagement studies?
   a. Methods
   b. Data collection tools
   c. Sample size
   d. Professional levels of teaching personnel

METHOD

In this systematic literature review, studies conducted in the period of 2010-2015 regarding instructional faculty engagement examined. For this systematic review, content analysis method was used. Content analysis is used to measure the frequency and diversity of messages within data (Altheide, 1987). To this end, Elsevier E-reference, ProQuest, Wiley, EBSCO, and Google Scholar research databases, which were the databases available to the authors during the research period, were searched using some keywords in the title, abstract and keywords of the studies. Within the scope of the present research, articles and dissertations in full text were also searched. In this study, in order to find studies on faculty engagement in online education, the keywords *teacher engagement, faculty engagement* and *instructor engagement* were searched for, together with the words *online, distance*, and *e-learning*. However, an insufficient number of studies were found as a result of this search process. Consequently, the keywords *teacher engagement, faculty engagement* and *instructor engagement* keywords were searched for alone, and a total of 157 studies were found. Some of these findings were duplicates, and some were irrelevant to the subject. Thus, after the removal of the aforesaid findings, a total of 99 studies were included for the content analysis. The reason for evaluating studies related with *distance education* first was that the data acquired from the study were planned to be used in a study on the engagement of teaching staff in online education. Although the keywords *teacher engagement, faculty engagement* and *instructor engagement* keywords were all employed in the search process, all these keywords will be considered together as *faculty engagement* in the rest of the present study. Another researcher has read publications and encoded the data to provide reliability and accuracy checks of the authors' coding. Inter-coder reliability is an important component of content analysis

because it increases the coders' familiarity with the coding scheme (Kolbe & Burnett, 1991). Inter-coder agreement calculation was used for measuring reliability in this study ,). The formula is *reliability = number of agreements / (total number of agreements + disagreements),* and this formula is used by many researchers (Miles and Huberman (1994). Inter-coder reliability is found as 89%. Miles, Huberman & Saldana (2013) wrote that "Inter-coder agreement should be within the 85% to 90% range depending on the size and range of the coding scheme".

The literature review showed that there exist trend studies and classifications of academic subjects conducted in numerous fields. However, no specific definition/classification of the subject areas studied has been reported. Thus, some relevant definitions for the subject areas studied under the heading *engagement* were prepared by the authors. This process of subject area classification was carried out according to the variables influencing engagement, variables influenced by engagement, and studies describing engagement. Consequently, basic subject areas involved in the research studies assessed were determined to be the following: social relationship, professional development, support, institutional factors, teaching environment, personal factors, literature review of engagement, and learning outcomes. The sub-themes coming under the main thematic areas were examined in the first research question.

FINDINGS

Findings based on the content analyses are grouped under some topics. These topics are subject areas, theories, frameworks, and models, delivery modes, methods, data collection tools, sample size and professional levels of teaching personnel.

1. **Which subject areas are most commonly studied in faculty engagement studies?**

The main themes and relevant sub-themes are exhibited in detail in Table 1.

Table 1.
Descriptive statistics of the subject areas examined by studies conducted between 2010 and 2015

Themes	Sub Themes	N	%
Social Relationship	Interaction with administrator	15	6.67
	Interaction with colleagues	13	5.78
	Interaction with students	12	5.33
	Interaction with staff	5	2.22
Sub Total		**45**	**20**
Professional Development	Group or team meetings (social work climate)	12	5.33
	workshops/ seminars/ conferences /resources-peer Programs/training/ teacher education	8	3.56
Sub Total		**20**	**8.89**
Institutional Factors	Institutional support (development support, financial support, technical support)	27	12
	Barriers/obstacles	20	8.9
	School culture/innovative school climate	8	3.56
	Institutional characteristics (location, number of students, experience…)	3	1.4
Sub Total		**58**	**25.86**

Teaching Environment	**F2f** (designing learning environment, using technological tools, integration of technology, teaching level, learning outcomes assessment)	12	5.33
	Online (work environment, using technological tools, designing and organizing learning activities, facilitating discourse, providing students with one on one instruction, nurturing safe and caring learning environment, motivating, monitoring)	11	4.89
	Blended (designing learning environment, using technological tools)	2	0.88
Sub Total		**25**	**11.1**
Personal Factors	Teaching/work experience	13	5.78
	Demographics	10	4.44
	Academic rank/unionization/status	3	1.33
Sub Total		**26**	**11.55**
Personal Resources	Job satisfaction, Self-efficacy, Motivation, Coping strategies	17	7.56
Sub Total		**17**	**7.56**
Personal Traits	Burnout, stress…	10	4.44
Sub Total		**10**	**4.44**
Defining engagement-literature review	Presence - sense of availability	7	3.11
	Level of engagement	5	2.22
Sub Total		**12**	**5.33**
Learning outcomes	Student presence, student engagement, student achievement…	12	5.33
Sub Total		**12**	**5.33**
Total		225	1100

Table 1 exhibits the subject classification of studies conducted on faculty engagement in the period between 2010 and 2015. In terms of sub-themes, Table 1 indicates that questions of institutional support (n=27, 12%), barriers/obstacles (n=20, 8.9%), and interaction with administrators (n=15, 6.67%) were most often included in the studies. In terms of the main themes, the distribution of subjects studied was determined as: social relationship, 45 (20%), professional development, 20 (8.89%), institutional factors, 58 (25.86%), teaching environment, 25 (11.1%), personal factors, 26 (11.55%), personal resources, 17 (7.56%), personal traits, 10 (4.44%), defining engagement, 12 (5.33%), and learning outcomes, 12 (5.33%). The total number of subject areas is greater than the number of studies included in this study because some studies were classified under multiple sub-theme categories.

2. **How do the subject areas commonly used in studies on faculty engagement differ across the time period studied?**

Firstly, the distribution of the studies to the years covered was found as: 11 studies in 2010 (11.11%), 16 studies in 2011 (16.16%), 18 studies in 2012 (18.18%), 20 studies in 2013 (20.20%), 23 studies in 2014 (23.23%), and 11 studies in 2015 (11.11%). While 14 of these studies (14.14%) were

related to faculty engagement in online education; 3 of them (3.03%) were related to a blended teaching environment.

Although an article may be included in multiple sub-themes under the main theme, since the main theme is assessed with respect to the time period involved, for this purpose they were regarded as "one". Accordingly, the distribution of subject areas researched across the years studied is exhibited in Table 2.

Table 2.
Distribution of research subjects over time

Subject Classification	2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Social relationship	1	0.52	4	2.08	5	2.60	2	1.04	5	2.60	5	2.60	22	11.46
Professional development	0	0.00	3	1.56	3	1.56	1	0.52	8	4.17	2	1.04	17	8.85
Institutional factors	4	2.08	9	4.69	13	6.77	12	6.25	15	7.81	6	3.13	59	30.73
Teaching environment	2	1.04	4	2.08	2	1.04	6	3.13	7	3.65	1	0.52	22	11.46
Personal factors	4	2.08	5	2.60	3	1.56	2	1.04	2	1.04	3	1.56	19	9.90
Personal resources	1	0.52	2	1.04	2	1.04	5	2.60	6	3.13	5	2.60	21	10.94
Personal traits	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1.56	1	0.52	2	1.04	3	1.56	9	4.69
Defining engagement	0	0.00	3	1.56	1	0.52	2	1.04	3	1.56	1	0.52	10	5.21
Learning outcomes	1	0.52	4	2.08	0	0.00	4	2.08	3	1.56	1	0.52	13	6.77
Total	13	6.77	34	17.71	32	16.67	35	18.23	51	26.56	27	14.06	192	100.00

According to the distribution of the subject areas across the years given in Table 2, the most popular subject studied in 2010 to 2015 was institutional factors (n=59; 30.73%). Other popular subjects were social relationship (n=22; 11.46%) and teaching environment (n=22, 11.46%). Again, according to Table 2, the largest number of studies was observed in 2014 (n=51; 26.56%). The reason for this result was considered to be the fact that the largest number of relevant studies were conducted in 2014. The titles of f2f, online and blended included under the title of teaching environment should not be confused with the distribution method. Under this title, the aim was to address the factors involved in the organisation of different teaching environments.

In Table 3, the distribution of studies on faculty engagement conducted in the period of 2010-2015 according to the countries.

Table 3.
Distribution of studies according to the countries

Publication countries	N	%
USA	51	51.51
Canada	5	5.05
Netherlands	5	5.05
Australia	4	4.04
Spain	4	4.04
China	3	3.03
Finland	2	2.02
Denmark	2	2.02
Poland	1	1.01
Ireland	1	1.01
Saudi Arabia	1	1.01
More than one country	3	3,03
Unspecified	17	17.17
Total	99	100

According to Table 3, Studies conducted in the period of 2010 and 2015, more publication is conducted in USA (51 publications, 51.51%), than any other countries. USA is followed by Canada and Netherlands (5 publications, 5.05%), Australia and Spain (4 publications, 4.04%), Finland and Denmark (2 publications, 2.02%), Poland and Ireland (1 publication, 1.01%). The reason of this distribution may be population density of USA and another reason could be only English publication mentioned. Another striking point of contrast to the densely populated Asian countries were found to only publications is done in China (3 publications, 3.03%) and Saudi Arabia (1 publication, 1.01%). Three of the publication was conducted in more than one country.

In Table 4, the distribution of studies on faculty engagement conducted in the period of 2010-2015 according to the related publications.

Table 4.
Distribution of studies according to the related publications.

Publication Type	Publications	N	%
Doctoral Dissertation	ProQuest	43	43.43
Journal	Teaching and Teacher Education	9	9.09
Master Dissertation	ProQuest	7	7.07
Journal	Australian Journal of Teacher Education	4	4.04
Journal	International Journal of Educational Research	4	4.04
Journal	Educational Psychology	2	2.02
	Other	30	30.3
Total		99	100

According to Table 4, whereas faculty engagement was mostly studied in doctoral theses found in the ProQuest database (43.43%), which was followed by Teaching and Teacher Education Journal (9.09%) and master's dissertations in the ProQuest database (7.07%). Apart

from doctoral theses and Master's dissertations, the notable presence of publications, such as *Teaching and Teacher Education* and the *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* could be associated with running the keywords *teacher*, *faculty*, and *instructor* during the review of the aforementioned databases and with the fact that these publications are the ones specializing in research on *teachers, teaching*, or *teacher education*.

3. What are the theories, frameworks, and models commonly utilized in faculty engagement studies?

The theories, frameworks, and models utilized in the studies are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.
Descriptive statistics for the classification of theories used in the studies conducted between 2010 and 2015

Researher(s)	Theory	N	%
Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner and Schaufeli: 2001	The Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R)	7	9.09
Ryan & Deci,2000	Self Determination Theory	5	6.49
Wenger, 1998	Community of Practice Theory	4	5.19
Garrison, Anderson & Archer, 2000	Community of Inquiry (COI) Framework	3	3.9
Watt & Richardson, 2007	FIT-Choice Theory (The Factors Influencing Teaching)	3	3.9
Kahn, 1990	Kahn's Psychological Engagement Framework	3	3.9
Covington, 2000	Goal Theory	2	2.6
Rogers, 2003	Diffusion of InnovationTheory	2	2.6
Pittaway, 2012	Pittaways Engagement Framework	2	2.6
Blau, 1964	Social Exchange Theory	2	2.6
Moore, 1989	Transactional Distance Theory	2	2.6
Bandura, 1977, 1986	The Social Cognitive Theory	2	2.6
	Others	40	51.95
Total		**77**	100

According to Table 5, the distribution of theories utilized by studies was as follows: *The Job Demands and Resources Model (JD-R)*, 7 (9.09%); *The Self-Determination Theory*, 5 (6.49%); *Community of Practice Theory*, 4 (5.19%); *Community of Inquiry (COI) Framework*, 3 (3.9%); *FIT-Choice Theory* (the Factors Influencing Teaching), 3 (3.9%); *Kahn's Psychological Engagement Framework*, 3 (3.9%); *Goal theory*, 2 (2.6%); *Innovation diffusion theory"*, 2 (2.6%); *Pittaways Engagement Framework*, 2 (2.6%); *Social Exchange Theory*, 2 (2.6%); *Transactional Distance Theory*, 2 (2.6%); and *Social Cognitive Theory* 2 (2.6%). These results suggest that the most prominent theories and models utilized by the studies were *Job Demands and Resources Model (JD-R)*, *Self Determination Theory* and *Community of Practice Theory*. On the other hand, with regard to the studies on online and blended

teaching environments, unlike the f2f environments, *Community of Inquiry (COI) Framework* (n=3), *Transactional Distance Theory* (n= 2), and *Diffusion of Innovation Theory* (n= 2) were more prominent.

4. **What educational delivery modes are commonly utilized in studies on faculty engagement?**

The distribution of studies according to their educational delivery modes are exhibited in Table 6.

Table 6.
Descriptive statistics for the delivery mode of the studies

Delivery mode	N	%
Face to face (f2f)	72	72.73
Online	14	14.14
Blended	3	3.03
Unspecified	10	10.10
Total	99	100.00

According to the data exhibited in Table 6, concerning the education delivery modes utilized in studies conducted in the period of 2010-2015, the distribution was as follows: f2f delivery, 72 (72.73%); online delivery, 14 (14.14%), and blended delivery mode, 3 (3.03%). The reason for this result was considered to be simply that f2f education is the most common type of education.

5. **Distributions of factors utilized in studies**

a. **Methods**

The distribution of the studies according to the methods utilized is exhibited in Table 7.

Table 7.
Descriptive statistics for the research methods utilized in the studies

Research method	N	%
Correlational Designs	31	31.31
Survey Designs	20	20.2
Mixed Method Designs	15	15.15
Grounded Theory Designs	11	11.11
Case Study Designs	10	10.1
Experimental Designs	4	4.04
Action Research Designs	3	3.03
Literature Review	3	3.03
Phenomenological Inquiry	2	2.02
Total	**99**	**100.00**

According to Table 7, in terms of research methods used in the studies, the most prominent methods were correlational studies (n = 31, 31.31%), survey research, 20 (20.20%), and mixed research (combination of research methods), 15 (15.15%). The reason for the prominence of

correlational design was that the majority of the studies on engagement investigated either multiple factors influencing engagement or multiple factors falling under the influence of engagement, because researchers have usually preferred to use correlational studies in order to investigate the relationship among two or more variables (Cresswell, 2012).

b. Data collection techniques

The distribution of data collection techniques utilized in studies on faculty engagement is exhibited in Table 8.

Table 8.
Descriptive statistics for the data collection techniques used in the studies

Techniques	N	%
Survey	43	35.25
Interview	23	18.85
Questionnaire	13	10.66
Documents/ Reports	9	7.38
Observation	7	5.74
Focus Group Interview	5	4.1
Open-Ended Survey	5	4.1
Discussion/Focus Group Discussion	4	3.28
Participant Reflections	4	3.28
Inventory	3	2.46
Administrative Document	2	1.64
Archival Pre-Recorded Assessments	1	0.82
Artifacts of Implementations of Practice	1	0.82
Field Notes	1	0.82
LMS Tracking Data, LMS Interaction Data	1	0.82
Total	**122**	**100.00**

According to Table 8, the data collection techniques employed in the studies, it was observed that the most frequently used technique was survey (35.25%), which was followed by interview (18.85), questionnaire (10.66), and documents/ reports (7.38%). The survey technique, one of the most frequently used data collection techniques, is preferred since it is able to reach numerous respondents and collect information conveniently. This has been a popular data collection tool among researchers, especially since the introduction of web-based versions of survey and questionnaire techniques (Creswell, 2012).

c. Sample Size

Sample size, their ranges, and distributions are shown in Table 9.

Table 9.
Descriptive statistics for the sample size of the studies

Sample Size	N	%
0-10	9	9.89
11-30	12	13.19
31-100	15	16.48
101-300	24	26.37
301-1000	22	24.18
More than 1000	9	9.89
Total	91	100.00

According to Table 9, in terms of the distribution of the sample sizes of the studies, it was observed that the size in the range of 101-300 was the most preferred one (26.37%), which was followed by studies with sample sizes in the range of 301-1000 (24.18%). The percentage of studies with a sample size of 1-10 and more than 1000 was 9.89% in both cases, which was lower than the other sample sizes.

d. Professional Level of Personnel

The distribution of the professional level of the personnel included in the studies is listed in Table 10.

Table 10.
Descriptive statistics of the professional level of personnel included in the studies

Professional level	N	%
Teacher	39	44.83
Faculty	20	22.98
Preservice Teachers	9	10.34
Online Faculty	5	5.75
Adjunct Faculty	4	4.6
Staff	3	3.45
Administrators	3	3.45
Online Teacher Educators	1	1.15
Instructional Coaches	1	1.15
Instructor	1	1.15
Instructional Specialist	1	1.15
Total	87	100.00

In Table 10, educators who teach courses in f2f education environments were defined as teachers, faculty and instructors, and educators who teach in online education environments were specified by adding the word "online". Thus, it was observed in the studies reviewed that they were most often concerned with teachers and faculty members teaching courses in f2f

education environments. This was followed by studies on preservice teachers (10.34%). Based on these findings, it is possible to conclude that studies on faculty engagement mostly focused on f2f education- although faculties are carrying out increasing activities in online and blended education environments, they have been omitted.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In the present study, a total of 99 full-text dissertations and articles from the selected databases concerning faculty engagement were reviewed. The review examined the subject areas studied, the most commonly chosen theories, framework and models used as a basis for engagement-related studies, the research methods utilized, the educational methods deployed, the data collection tools used, the size of samples, and the professional level of the research subjects.

According to the study results, institutional factors were the most frequently studied subject areas concerning faculty engagement in the period 2010-2015. In terms of sub-themes, institutional support, barriers/obstacles, and interaction with administrators were determined as the most frequently studied subject areas. When it is considered that the engagement of faculty has an effect on student engagement, the educational productivity, and sustainability of institutions (Alhawiti, 2011; Betts, 2009), it can be claimed that the support provided by institutions to their faculty would be effective in increasing their sense of belonging and loyalty; and that this institutional support indeed would indirectly have an effect on the quality of their teaching (Elstad, Christopherson & Turmo, 2011; Varney, 2017).

If institutions provide an adequate workload, this could help teachers to cope with the emotional demands on faculty and have an influence on their job engagement (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Therefore, it can also be considered important to provide educational opportunities, financial resources to teachers, and a positive approach. Moreover, it can be considered that this type of support provided to faculty would influence their engagement by enabling them to develop themselves and would have a positive impact on their self-sufficiency, pedagogical abilities, and teaching experiences. Whereas Zone (2013) explored the idea that the faculty's perception of institutional support has a significant influence on their job satisfaction and degree of engagement with their work, Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) suggested that it yields positive results regarding their personal health as well. Although the administrators of the institution think that the teaching staff have a key role for successful online education, they unfortunately do not support them and do not provide enough resources (Lammers, Bryant, Michel & Seaman, 2017).

The results of this study indicate that the subject of institutional factors was found be among the significant subject areas in studies conducted on faculty engagement, which suggests that institutions have an important influence on the degree of engagement of the teaching staff. It is particularly important rewards and incentives given by institutions for the engagement of the faculty. Moreover, although the principal purpose of the present study was to review studies on the engagement levels of online teaching staff, the failure to find a sufficient number of studies on this subject led researchers to carry out a more general analysis. Nevertheless, in a similar way to f2f environments, faculty also undertake important responsibilities in online learning environments, and teaching personnel can face a number of similar problems in fulfilling these responsibilities.

Most researchers studying engagement using positive psychological paradigms utilized various theories, frameworks, and models to explain the correlation between the precursors and the outputs of engagement. In the present study, the theoretical frameworks utilized in the studies reviewed to explain the engagement process were investigated. The most frequently utilized theoretical frameworks were determined to be the JD-R Model, Self Determination Theory, and the Community of Practice Theory. Bailey et al. (2015) studied the same subject and investigated the theories used in research on engagement. They reported that the most frequently used theory was the Job Demands and Resources Model (JD-R). However, it was observed in the present study that if online and blended teaching environments are taken into consideration, the Community of Inquiry (COI) Framework, Transactional Distance Theory, and Diffusion of Innovation Theory come to prominence. The present study revealed that the concept of presence was emphasized and associated with engagement in the studies reviewed. For instance, Borup, Graham and Drysdale (2014) considered the concept of teaching presence as a form of teacher engagement in their study, and they suggested that it has six components: *design and organizing*, *facilitating discourse*, *instructing*, *nurturing*, *motivating,* and *monitoring*. It is possible to state that this finding conforms to the claim of Kahn (1990), who introduced the concept of engagement, in which personal presence is one of the components of engagement.

In studies reviewed under the concept of faculty engagement, f2f was the most frequently preferred method for the provision of education. In spite of their increasing popularity, it was observed that online and blended education methods were less preferred. In terms of research methods, correlational designs and survey designs were found to be the most frequently used research methods. Like other studies, the preference for correlational and survey methods in the studies on engagement could be a result of the rationale that they allow data collection from larger groups of respondents and they are more convenient in comparison with other methods. The fact that surveys were the most frequently used data collection method in the studies reviewed could

be associated with the finding that correlational and survey research were determined to be the most prominent research methods. The sample sizes mostly in the range between 101 and 1000, which could be associated again with the research methods and data collection techniques selected. The number of studies with a sample size of 101 and above could be associated with the employment of the survey method as a data collection tool because the purpose of surveys is to reach a larger number of respondents (Gable, 1994). According to the findings of the present study, it can be observed that a sample size in the range of 0-30 was more frequent (23.08%). The reason for this finding could be that limiting the sample size to a small group in experimental and case studies in particular can allow for a deep analysis of the relevant circumstances (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In terms of the professional level of the teaching staff involved, it was observed that teachers and faculty members who work in f2f educational environments were mostly preferred in the studies reviewed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is considered that taking into consideration the factors that have an effect on the engagement of faculty in general could also increase the efficiency of online education, which is becoming more popular than ever before. Employees who lose their sense of engagement with their profession could tend to leave their jobs and this could result in an adverse impact on the educational process. Engagement of the faculty has a key role in student success, permanent learning and quality of the institution. For this reason, it is necessary for the institutions to think about what kind of activities could be done to increase the instructional engagement of the faculty.

Another important point is the abundance of correlational and survey studies among the studies reviewed, and the fact that the survey method was the most frequently employed data collection tool. As a data collection tool, although surveys allow researchers to reach larger sample group, they may only enable superficial data to be collected. Therefore, it is considered that the studies available would be strengthened through a greater quantity of qualitative data so that more comprehensive results can be attained. It is also considered that determining the factors influencing the engagement of teaching personnel could have a significant influence on the quality and efficiency of both f2f and online teaching because the teaching staff is an essential element in the success of all educational processes. Therefore, determining the factors affecting the engagement of faculty in the education system could be effective in resolving of problems encountered in the process.

The present study was conducted to provide a general overview of studies on faculty engagement using various research questions to present a descriptive pattern. It will hopefully

also function as a guide for researchers studying this subject by presenting the gaps in the current literature. It is also providing an important reference for future research in the field of faculty engagement with the classification of the most widely used subject areas.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Like other studies the present study has some limitations. One of these limitations the present study is limited by identified databases. Future studies may take in consideration different databases. The study is also limited by the search terms (subject areas, theories and models, delivery modes, research methods, statistics used, and the other collected data), therefore future research may examine other used data. Also, the time period of the publication is limited 2010-2015. This period may have enhanced within a larger time period; thus, more publication may be accessible. Future studies may also use more different key words to find additional related publications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Alhawiti, M. M. (2011). *Faculty perceptions about attributes and barriers impacting the diffusion of online education in two Saudi Universities* (Order No. 3453898). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (868276692). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/868276692?accountid=11054

Altheide, D. L. (1987). Reflections: Ethnographic content analysis. *Qualitative sociology*, *10*(1), 65-77.

Angelino, L. M., Williams, F. K., & Natvig, D. (2007). Strategies to engage online students and reduce attrition rates. *Journal of Educators Online*, *4*(2), n2.

Bailey C., Madden A., Alfes K., Robinson D., Fletcher L., Holmes J., Buzzeo J. & Currie G. (2015). *Evaluating the evidence on employee engagement and its potential benefits to NHS staff: a narrative synthesis of the literature.* London: NIHR.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, *22*(3), 309-328.

Bakker, A. B., & Hakanen, J. J. (2013). Work engagement among public and private sector dentists. *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham*, 109-131.

Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of educational psychology*, *99*(2), 274.

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, *22*(3), 187-200. DOI: 10.1080/02678370802393649

Bakker, A. B. & Hakanen, J. J. (2013), Work engagement among public and private sector dentists, In: Burke, R. J., Noblet, A. J., Cooper, C. L. (eds.), *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector,* Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 109-131

Barman, A., & Saikat, R. (2011). Faculty Engagement in Higher Educational Institution-A proposed model. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională*, (7), 143-164.

Betts, K. (2009). Online human touch (OHT) training & support: A conceptual framework to increase faculty engagement, connectivity, and retention in online education, part 2. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 29-48.

Blackburn, H. A. (2014). *A mixed methods study: Assessing and understanding technology pedagogy and content knowledge among college level teaching faculty* (Order No. 3629463). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1562250625). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1562250625?accountid=11054

Borup, J., Graham, C. R., & Drysdale, J. S. (2014). The nature of teacher engagement at an online high school. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(5), 793-806. DOI: 10.1111/bjet.12089

Conrad, R. M., & Donaldson, J. A. (2011). *Engaging the online learner: Activities and resources for creative instruction* (Vol. 38). John Wiley & Sons.

Colak, A. (2018). *A multiple-case study examining faculty members' online course design and teaching experiences in distance education* (Order No. 10793578). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2049753970). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/2049753970?accountid=11054

Creswell, J. W., (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* (4th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Education.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York: Harper.

Dalal, R. S., Brummel, B. J., Wee, S. & Thomas, L. L. (2008). Defining employee engagement for productive research and practice. *Industrial and organizational psychology*, 1(01), 52-55. DOI: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.00008.x

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. American Psychological Association.

Elstad, E., Christopherson, K., & Turmo, A. (2011). Social exchange theory as an explanation of organizational citizenship behaviour among teachers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 14*(4), 405-421. DOI: 10.1080/13603124.2010.524250

Evans, K. E., Hartman, C. L., & Anderson, D. M. (2013). "It's More Than a Class": Leisure Education's Influence on College Student Engagement.*Innovative Higher Education*, 38(1), 45-58.

Fowler, P. R., & Boylan, H. R. (2010). Increasing student success and retention: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 34(2), 2-10.

Gable, G. G. (1994). Integrating case study and survey research methods: an example in information systems. *European journal of information systems*,3(2), 112-126.

González-Romá, V., Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Independent factors or opposite poles?. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 68(1), 165-174. DOI:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.01.003

==

Hogan, R. L., & McKnight, M. A. (2007). Exploring burnout among university online instructors: An initial investigation. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(2), 117-124. DOI:10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.03.001

Jaggars, S. S., & Xu, D. (2016). How do online course design features influence student performance?. *Computers & Education*, *95*, 270-284.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, *33*(4), 692-724. DOI: 10.2307/256287

Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human relations*, *45*(4), 321-349. DOI: 10.1177/001872679204500402

Kolbe, R. H., & Burnett, M. S. (1991). Content-analysis research: An examination of applications with directives for improving research reliability and objectivity. *Journal of consumer research*, 243-250.

Krueger, J., & Killham, E. (2005). At work, feeling good matters. *Gallup Management Journal*.

Lammers, E., Bryant, G., Michel, L. S., & Seaman, J. (2017). *Time for class: Lessons for the future of digital courseware in higher education.* 19.04.2019 tarihinde http://tytonpartners.com/tyton-wp/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Time-for-Class-_-2017.pdf adresinden alınmıştır.

Leiter, M. P. & Maslach, C. (2004). Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well being: Vol. 3. Emotional and physiological processes and positive intervention strategies* (pp. 91-134). Oxford, England: Elsevier.

Leijten, F. R., van den Heuvel, S. G., van der Beek, A. J., Ybema, J. F., Robroek, S. J., & Burdorf, A. (2015). Associations of work-related factors and work engagement with mental and physical health: a 1-year follow-up study among older workers. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation*, *25*(1), 86-95.

Liaw, S. S., & Huang, H. M. (2013). Perceived satisfaction, perceived usefulness and interactive learning environments as predictors to self-regulation in e-learning environments. *Computers & Education*, *60*(1), 14-24.

Lu, H., While, A. E., & Barriball, K. L. (2005). Job satisfaction among nurses: a literatüre review. *International journal of nursing studies*, *42*(2), 211-227. DOI:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2004.09.003

Maslach, C. & Leiter, M.P. (1997). *The Truth about Burnout.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Medinger, E. P. (2009). *Faculty Perceptıons Of Team-Developed Onlıne Courses.* Doctoral dissertation, Capella University, Minnesota.

Mercer, S. (2018). Language Learner Engagement: Setting the Scene. *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*, 1-19.

Meyer, J.P. & N.J. Allen. 1997. Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldana, J. (2013). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moore, M. (1997). Theory of transactional distance. In D. Keegan [. Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 22-38). New York: Routledge.

Munson, V. (2013). *Teacher engagement in a northwestern British Columbia School district* (Order No. MR94116). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1412340333). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1412340333?accountid=11054

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

Norman, D. A., & Spohrer, J. C. (1996). Learner-centered education. *Communications of the ACM, 39*(4), 24-27.

Okur, M. R. & Yüzer, T.V. (2011). E-Öğrenmede Öğretim Elemanı Desteği. Birim Balcı Demirci, Gonca Telli Yamamoto ve Uğur Demiray (Ed.), *Türkiye'de E-Öğrenme: Gelişmeler ve Uygulamalar II* (s. 75-85). T. C. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Rabinovich, T., Berthon, P., & Fedorenko, I. (2017). Reducing the distance: financial services education in web-extended learning environments. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing, 22*(3), 126-131.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies, 3*(1), 71-92.

Schaufeli, W.B. (2013). What is engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

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

Shani, N., & Narayanasamy.P.S, (2011). The Role of Employee Engagement and Strategic Tool in HRM. *International Journal of Management 2*(2), pp. 25 – 32.

Stenerson, J., Blanchard, L., Fassiotto, M., Hernandez, M., & Muth, A. (2010). The role of adjuncts in the professoriate. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 23-26.

Truss, C., Alfes, K., Delbridge, R., Shantz, A., and Soane, E.C. (2013a), Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice, London: Routledge.

Varney, J. (2017). *The impact of servant leadership on the engagement of adjunct higher education online faculty* (Order No. 10245578). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1873102153). https://search.proquest.com/docview/1873102153?accountid=11054

Zone, E. J. (2013). *The relationship of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and years of online teaching experience to work engagement among online undergraduate adjunct faculty members* (Order No. 3570880). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1419934767). http://search.proquest.com/docview/1419934767?accountid=11054.