IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH POLICIES FOR FACULTY'S ASPIRATIONS FOR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION

*Ayesha Afzal, **Dr. Seema Arif, ***Farrukh Kamran

ABSTRACT:

The faculty is the heart of the academy. To this end, addressing the developmental needs of the faculty should be a central mission of any institution of higher education. The quality of research output of the faculty working in a higher education institution is among the topics of contemporary debates in academia. The Higher Education Commission, Pakistan provides a complete framework for faculty development centered on research activities. The implementation of these policies is mandatory for all public and private universities of Pakistan. This research was conducted to determine the effect of the implementation of university research policies on faculty motivation, professional development, and career satisfaction. The multistage sampling technique was used to select 689 faculty members from 3 selected departments (social sciences, engineering, and business) of six public and private universities of Punjab. The survey questionnaire for faculty with reliability (.800) was used. Expert opinion was taken to check the face and content validity of the tool. Factor Analysis of quantitative data by SPSS yielded 5 factors. Pearson Correlation and Multiple Linear Regression were used to answer research questions. The study concluded that internal motivation is the key factor leading to career success, but this factor is minimally supported by the university management through ample career development opportunities. The faculty has reported zero organizational support to carry out research activities. This pioneering study has emphasized the crucial missing factors needed to enhance research culture in Pakistani universities.

Key Words: University research policies, Professional development, Career satisfaction

Introduction
Research policies are designed to ensure integrity in the research process. These policies are formulated by keeping in view internationally accepted guidelines to facilitate research. Universities around the world aim to facilitate faculty members and students by publishing these guidelines. This in turn helps researchers in ensuring that their work meets ethical and academic standards (Musselin & Teixeira, 2013). In the book "Fostering Integrity in Research" it is stated that for research integrity to be upheld, the employment of best practices must be observed. These practices or guidelines are not only a moral obligation upon researchers but also ensure positive contributions.

---

*Lecturer, University of Management and Technology, Lahore(Corresponding Author)
**University of Management and Technology, Lahore.
***Lecturer, University of Baltistan Skardu

It must be stated here that although these research policies provide a much larger benefit to a particular discipline, they also inculcate personal and professional values among researchers. Practices such as peer reviews allow authors to gain from the expert advice of senior colleagues (Yielder & Codling, 2004). Similarly, policies on authorship allow collaborative research which is an integral feature of modern research (Kenny, 2018). Collaboration among authors results in better prospects for research and development as well as research productivity (Kenny, 2018). Hence policies on authorship foster collective working, paving the way for personal and career development.

The concept of faculty development is not a new phenomenon. Sabbatical leaves are the oldest form of faculty development, which began on the campus of Harvard University in 1810 (Srikanth & Jomon, 2020). For many decades, sabbatical leave represented the only type of faculty development that existed in American higher education until the 1970s, when institutions faced significant financial and enrollment shortages. It was during this time that the emergence of a professional organization emerged in 1974, The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD). Like other organizations of the 1970s, POD was mainly concerned with issues of teaching and learning, though there was some call for the development of the whole faculty person (Welch, Bolin & Reardon, 2019). Today, faculty development has acquired a much broader meaning than merely focusing on teaching strategies. Hardy (2012, p. 68) refers to faculty development as an "omnibus term referring to a myriad of activities that universities undertake to enhance individual and institutional capacities". Others have offered their interpretation of faculty development as "activities that are designed to help faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars" (Brinthaupt & Otto, 2016). Many contextual factors as the economic, cultural, and political system of the country along with the personality characteristics of the individuals are the factors that have a strong influence on the career of a person. All these factors and situations demand the individuals adopt different roles and modifications in their life to achieve their set goals and empower their personal career beliefs (Le, Newman, Menzies, Zheng & Fermelis, 2020).

The quality of research output of the faculty working in a higher education institution is among the topics of contemporary debates in academia. Massification of higher education globally has exerted pressure on the higher education governing institutions to develop policies that raise high-quality research output from the universities (Song, 2018; Dill, 2020). Each public and the private university has to establish the Office of Research and Commercialization (ORIC) to guide the research activities. Moreover, the Higher Education Commission (HEC), Pakistan has set the criteria for a tenure track, identifying faculty development needs and its accomplishment accordingly. The Pakistani universities appraise and promote the faculty according to HEC criteria (Tanveer, Bhaumik & Haq, 2020)

The faculty members themselves face a lot of pressures when it comes to managing their performance as per parameters outlined by the institutional policies. The faculty members, especially those working in the universities in developing countries, are usually found struggling to keep themselves up with the parameters related to the quality of research output (Tian & Lu,

2017). The institutions measure the quality of their research output on basis of the impact factor of the journal in which they publish their research. It is not easy for them to get themselves published in a high-impact factor journal because of the demand for high standards of review and evaluation of the submitted research (Nicholas et al., 2017).

An aspect of the change in higher education is the increasing strain between teaching and research. Issues of faculty retention and satisfaction appear to be related to the tension between these two seemingly synergetic entities. The discord that exists between teaching and research impacts faculty careers. With the current structure of tenure and promotion, review of faculty activities focuses predominantly on research, while activities involving teaching are given nominal weight. Sharma and Pandher (2017) attest that "despite the proliferation of teaching awards and other public affirmations of the importance of teaching, there is little doubt that salary, promotions, and tenure at research universities continue to depend more on research productivity than on instructional performance." Perspectives on the impact of faculty development in addressing research and teaching vary greatly. This issue is a key aspect of faculty satisfaction as many view teachings as being at the center of their mission but are gravely aware of the "publish or perish" reality of higher education (Al-Asfour & Young, 2018).

One of the reasons for the complexity of faculty satisfaction is that it is influenced by a variety of internal and external factors, some of which institutions have no control over (Ambrose, Huston & Norman, 2005). Faculty satisfaction is high in healthy institutions, which not only retains but also attracts them. Some college and university faculty members view their jobs as a source of satisfaction; others view them as a source of grief (Barton, Bates & O'Donovan, 2019). Most colleges and universities intend to provide a working environment for faculty that encourages satisfaction.

Professional happiness and career success are used interchangeably in many career studies. Positive psychological or job-related outcomes or achievements that a person acquires as a result of work experiences are characterized as career success (Volmer & Wolff, 2018). According to Webber and Rogers (2018), no one model could fully describe the idea of faculty satisfaction. Nonetheless, Hagedorn created a scale on which all of the important characteristics of faculty satisfaction could be measured, with the greatest level indicating appreciation, the intermediate level indicating acceptance, and the lowest level indicating disengagement from higher education faculty (Angervall & Beach, 2020).

Research plays an important role to run with the modern world by discovering new ideas for problem-solving, opportunities, and new technologies. Conducting research is an exhaustive activity that must be carried out with great scrutiny. For higher education faculty one of these skills is research (Garbe & Duberley, 2019). By declaring oneself to be an author, the researcher associates himself with the research outcomes (Tarkang, Kweku, & Zotor, 2017), they consider authorship as an integral part of the research process which is associated with "personal satisfaction and career rewards". Tarkang et al. in the same article cited Riggs et al, suggesting that publication productivity of a researcher leads to diverse career growth opportunities such as promotion. It also strengthens job security as it positively contributes to tenure assessments (Horta & Santos, 2016). In academic decisions, faculty research productivity became an important criterion for faculty recruitment and selection. The trend that began in developed

countries followed to the less developed countries. However, there was limited literature that examined these dimensions in Pakistan.

Research productivity has become increasingly important in higher education, both domestically and globally. Higher education demands on professors to be prolific researchers to be hired, tenured, and promoted at institutions have prompted this trend (Do, 2021). According to Teodorescu (2000), one of the major criteria used to judge universities in national and worldwide rankings of academic institutions was the quality and amount of their research. There were many benefits related to the faculty's research productivity. Bland, Weber-Main, Lund, and Finstad (2005) described individual and institutional benefits associated with research productivity. Some of these benefits include (a) research grants received by faculty members to cover the research costs incurred, and (b) discoveries and patents generated more money and contributed to the institution's prestige and reputation.

Further, it is noted that research policies are an important aspect of professional development that fosters scholarship and creativity which in turn leads to personal, professional development, as well as increasing pedagogic content knowledge among the faculty of higher education (Taylor, Colet, Saroyan & Frenay, 2012). By upholding these policies authors and editors can enhance the credibility of research so that positive contributions can be made to the academic community. This also makes the way for the satisfaction of personal as well professional objectives for all stakeholders involved in the ongoing process of research (Natrajan, Sanjeev & Singh, 2019).

Statement of the Problem

Faculty members are the cornerstone of an academic institution. Their authentic and credible research, not only benefits the students and their respective disciplines but also contributes towards enhancing the prestige of a university. In order to facilitate credible and dependable research, universities establish an effective system to reach national and international benchmarks. procedures. The better a university implements the national research policy, the more it foretells academic excellence, securing an upgrade in League Tables.

Astonishingly, the published literature scantly addresses this real-world dilemma from the Pakistani perspective and does not provide any satisfactorily justifiable answers to this problem. This research aims to explore how does the implementation of university research policies affects faculty's aspirations for personal and professional development and career satisfaction.

The Objective of the Study

i.   To explore the dynamics of faculty career satisfaction with the implementation of university research policies.

Research Question

i.   How does the implementation of university research policies affect faculty's aspirations for personal and professional development and career satisfaction?

Methodology

The survey method was used to conduct this research. The population of the study comprised all the public and private universities of Lahore. The multistage sampling technique was used to select 689 faculty members from 3 selected departments (social sciences, engineering, and business) of 6 public and private universities of Punjab. The researchers employed a two-part

self-constructed questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire were chosen from the deep literature review. Experts, three university professors, and two practitioners in the field evaluated the selected items for content evaluation. To assure the clarity and understanding of the items, the face validity was achieved by peer review. The questionnaire was then put through its paces with 100 faculty members in a pilot study. The pilot had produced consistent findings. The final questionnaire comprised 32 items, including a scale and demographic information about faculty's age, qualification, and experience. The data of (689) respondents was recorded in SPSS. Pearson Correlation and Multiple Linear Regression were applied besides descriptive statistics.

Results and Analysis

The following section illustrates the demographic composition of the sample, the results, and its detailed statistical analysis.

Demographic Description of the Data

Table 1: *Age of the participants*

	Frequency	%	Mean	SD
31-40 Years	289	41.9		
41-50 Years	293	42.5	2.73	.711
51-60 Years	107	15.5		
Total	689	100.0		

Total 689 faculty members participated in this research in which 289 (41/9%) were from the age bracket of 31 to 40 years, 293 (42/5%) were from the age bracket of 41 to 50 years and 107 (15.5%) were from the age bracket of 51 to 60 years with the total Mean score 2.73 and standard deviation .711.

Table 2: *Qualification of the participants*

	Frequency	%	Mean	SD
M.Phil	289	41.9	2.5	.018
PhD	400	58.1		
Total	689	100.0		

From 689 total faculty members of different universities, the qualification of 289 (41.9%) faculty members was M Phil, whereas 400 (58.1) were PhD candidates with a total Mean score of 2.5 and standard deviation of .018.

Table 3: *Experience of the participants*

Experience	Frequency	%	Mean	SD
1-5	121	17.6		
6-10	254	36.9	2.58	.081
11-15	277	40.2		
16-20	29	4.2		
21-25	8	1.2		
Total	689	100.0		

From 689 total faculty members of different universities, 121 (17.6%) have experience of 1 to 5 years, 254 (36.9%) have experience of 6 to 10 years, 277 (40.2%) have experience of 11 to 15 years, 29 (4.2%) have the experience of 16 to 20 years, whereas 8 (1.2%) have the experience of 21 to 25 years, with the total Mean score 2.58 and standard deviation .081.

Reliability .800

Table 4: *KMO and Bartlett's Test*

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.869
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	15496.585
	df	435
	Sig.	.000

Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed, using the Principal Component Factoring extraction method followed by Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. The factors fulfilled the minimum identifiability criteria of at least three items per factor (Beavers et al., 2013). Scree plot identified the presence of nine factors explaining 68.02% of the total variance. KMO and Bartlett's sphericity test (Table) exhibited that all items comprising a common factor were well fitted, certifying EFA. Cronbach Alpha score identified the internal consistency of each subscale (factor). The Cronbach Alpha value was more than 0.6 for all factors meeting the minimum cut point (Lee &Wang, 2003). The outcome was five robust factors; their statistics are shared below:

Table 5: *Scale Statistics*

Factors	No of Items	Mean	Variance	SD	Alpha
Policy Implementation in university	5	15.3774	6.139	2.47778	.662
Career Development opportunities	4	16.4354	6.429	2.53561	.738
Organizational Support	6	26.1147	11.849	3.44220	.706
Personal Motivation	6	24.6821	7.284	2.69889	.734
Career Satisfaction	6	24.4398	8.180	2.86005	.706

Pearson Product Moment Correlation

After factor analysis, the relationship among the factors was confirmed using the Pearson Product Moment formula. The details are explained below:

Table 6: *Correlation Matrix of Research Variables*

	PIIU	CDO	OS	PM	CS
Policy Implementation in university	1	.536**	-.118**	.262**	.191**
Career Development opportunities		1	-.079*	.376**	.270**
Organizational Support			1	.056	-.239**
Personal Motivation				1	.291**
Career Satisfaction					1

The test was run on 5 identified factors, policy implementation in university, career development opportunities, organizational support, personal motivation, and career satisfaction. The results informed that policy implementation is most closely related to career development opportunities of university faculty (r=.536;p=>.001). The other significant and positive relationship was found between career development opportunities and personal motivation of university faculty (r=.376;p=<.001), followed by the relationship between personal motivation

162

and career satisfaction (r=.291;p=<.001). However, a negative but significant relationship between policy implementation in university and organizational support (r=-118;p=<.001), career development opportunities and organizational support (r=-.079; p=<.001), and career satisfaction and organizational support (r=-.239; p=<.001) severs the relationship.

Multiple Linear Regression

The correlation results clearly distinguished the positive and negative relationships among variables. Therefore, Multiple Linear Regression (step-wise method) was further employed to identify the significant risk factors associated with university faculty career satisfaction. Policy implementation in university, career development opportunities, organizational support, and personal motivation were considered as predictor variables, while career satisfaction was held as the dependent variable. Consequently, three models were generated, which are explained below

Table 7: *Multiple Linear Regression (Career Satisfaction is the dependent variable)*

Model		Standardized Coefficients β	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
					Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)		13.716	.000		
	Motivation	.291	7.966	.000	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)		15.816	.000		
	Motivation	.305	8.656	.000	.997	1.003
	Organizational support	-.256	-7.266	.000	.997	1.003
3	(Constant)		14.256	.000		
	Motivation	.244	6.486	.000	.852	1.174
	Organizational support	-.240	-6.856	.000	.985	1.015
	Career development opportunities	.159	4.219	.000	.849	1.178

a. Dependent Variable: Career Satisfaction

The 1st model describes that personal motivation (PM) can singularly cause 29% variance in career satisfaction (β=.291, p=>.001). Model 2 explains that both personal motivation (PM) and organizational support (OS) can collectively cause a 56% variance in career satisfaction (β=.305, p>.001; β=.256, p>.001). Model 3 explains that all these three factors personal motivation (PM), organizational support (OS), and career development opportunities (CDO) can collectively cause 64% variance in career satisfaction (β=.244, p>.001; β=.240, p>.001; β=.159, p>.001).

Findings

The correlation analysis has identified that for better career development opportunities, faculty needs the strict implementation of the research policies. The more career development opportunities they will get from the organization, the more satisfied they will be with their career. The career development opportunities also enhance the personal motivation of university

faculty. But the negative relationship of organizational support with all variables thwarts personal and professional development and career satisfaction.

Multiple Linear Regression results have pointed out that that personal motivation is the prime factor in getting career satisfaction, which is boosted by career development opportunities and better implementation of research policies.

Discussion

The discussion of this study begins with an overview of the major findings and is followed by an analysis of these findings. The major finding of this study indicates that effective implementation of research policy provides desirable career development opportunities leading to enhanced personal motivation and career satisfaction. These findings support the concept that career satisfaction among academics is a product of the environments in which they work. Faculty-research productivity is greatly associated with personal motivation and research self-efficacy, research goals, research involvement, and networking among all faculty.

Therefore, universities must develop appropriate research policies and procedures to facilitate their faculty members to produce credible and authentic research. These research policies and procedures must be clearly defined and stated by all the universities and educational institutions and must be followed and strictly adhered to to ensure academic honesty and excellence (Hancock, & Algozzine, 2017).

However, Professor Richard Felder from North Carolina State University highlighted the unreasonable pressures of extensive research that is placed on faculty members as a result of university research policies (Prince, Felder & Brent, 2007). He states that over the years, tenuring and promotion of engineering faculty has been entirely based on their ability to invite funding grants and publish papers. This has understandably led to a decline in teaching quality, poor personal relationships, and often discriminatory career entitlements. The problem according to Jeffery Buller lies in how universities and colleges are structured; where teaching and research are considered as "competing" instead of being "interrelated" (Buller, 2013).

A strong association between implementation of research policy and personal motivation was reported by several earlier research studies (Yielder & Codling, 2004; Bland et al., 2005; Kenny, 2018; Angervall, 2018; Lee, Willis & Tian, 2018; Angervall & Beach, 2020). Researchers reported an association between implementation of research policy and career development opportunities of university faculty and between career development opportunities of university faculty and personal motivation of faculty (Yielder & Codling, 2004; Bland et al., 2005; Hedjazi & Behravan, 2011; Barker, Ali, Musselin & Teixeira,2014). Therefore, all universities must translate HEC policies into an effective implementation framework to reach desired benchmarks.

Brennan, Cusack, Delahunt, Kuznesof, and Donnelly (2019) proclaimed that dynamic research framework must be tripartite, i) teaching is boosted by research and vice versa; ii) developing research skills and enhancing research competence, and iii) generating a scholarly community by involving students in research. Lapoule and Lynch (2018) recommended that institutions must adopt a variety of research goals and strategies for effective management for their faculty. Hence, university leaders must execute organizational support in a way that fulfills their research goals. Inviting the faculty to conduct case studies on critical issues would help them better plan and management of research activities in their universities.

Career satisfaction is regarded to be another variable that is associated with faculty career development opportunities. Many studies supported the idea that provision of career development opportunities from the university administration enabled their faculty to be more satisfied with their institution and their job (Vardi, 2009; Cameron & Blackburn, 1981; Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Sabzwari et al., 2009; Chaolertseree & Taephant, 2020).

The negative relationship between organizational support and other factors is the most critical finding of this study. While less or no organizational support is regarded by many faculty as the most stressful element of their work role due to the time-consuming procedures and extra pressure it creates (Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1984). The results of this study reveal that having access to high-quality career development opportunities and organizational support in this regard may help mediate the effects of research-related stress on the career satisfaction of university faculty. The availability of high-quality internet facilities and equipment, library space, office space, performance space, and organizational support directly affect faculty satisfaction with their jobs and the extent to which they plan on leaving their positions. With this in mind, the university administrators should implement proper research policies that place a greater emphasis to motivate university faculty on producing and conducting credible and authentic research.

Cha and Carrier (2016) hinted at the changing face of 21st-century universities; though focused around research, the universities will be more responsive to student needs than those of the state. The student needs are best satisfied by faculty (Arif, Ilyas, & Hameed, 2013, 2017; Arif, Iqbal & Nadeem, 2021). Therefore, an urgent call is hurled for understanding faculty, the stakeholder who is ever-increasing in its significance, and providing appropriate support to them. One of the critical resources needed by the researchers is uninterrupted time (Fawzi & Al-Hattami, 2017). Mentoring could be another type of organizational support needed to develop a research culture (Santo, Engstrom, Reetz, Schweinle, & Reed, 2009). However, organizational support does not only include better facilities but entails a handsome starting package as well (Baldwin, DeZure, Shaw, & Moretto, 2008; Höfrová, Moore de Peralta, Rosopa, Small, Payne, Rymešová, 2021).

Conclusion

This study adds to the important discussion of what leads to motivation, professional development, and career satisfaction. The article has emphasized effective implementation of HEC research policies would be possible by planned organizational support for the purpose. The findings of this study build foundations for further research as it provides significant guidelines for practice. Ideally, implementation of HEC research policies for professional development of faculty must aim at career satisfaction of the faculty as well, suiting the needs of faculty with diverse profiles and experiences.

Implications

In this study, the implementation of university research policy has a positive effect on faculty work attitudes, particularly support for research and professional or career development opportunities. The results of this study suggested several avenues in which proper implementation of institutional research policies can enhance faculty's aspirations for personal and professional development and career satisfaction. The results reinforce the argument for improving university resources, facilities, and services linked to research, professional

development, and particularly with the implementation of research policy in university. Such proper implementation of research policy holds the potential to improve faculty career satisfaction and reduce turnover, particularly among younger faculty.

The quality of an institution depended on the quality of the faculty members. If faculty members were productive in research, they disseminated these skills to their students also. The students then played their role toward a better society, a society in which individuals were better informed about their decisions based on inquiry and exploration not on vague information (Gruber et al., 2020).

Research faculty are rendered an asset to the universities and countries that they belong to. It is of utmost importance that appropriate policies must be formulated and subsequently implemented to support faculty members at the organizational and national levels (Do, 2021). Hénard and Roseveare (2012) proposed that strategic planning goals should be envisaged in a way that would ensure the alignment of research and teaching objectives. Moreover, institutes should also be able to encourage teaching teams so that instructors who also work as researchers can collaborate and work towards a blend between teaching and research (Hénard & Roseveare, 2012).

van Dijk, van Tartwijk, van der Schaaf, and Kluijtmans (2020) concluded that educational scholarship and research, and professional development are the major tasks that determine the expertise of higher education faculty. They further added that performing tasks underhand in a better way, the ability to complete diverse tasks, and creating a bigger influence circle set the foundation of teacher expertise. Ideally, professional development policies for higher education faculty must include these dimensions of teacher expertise in policies to enhance their career satisfaction, suiting the needs of faculty with diverse profiles and experiences.

Acquiring career management skills (CSM) is very important because they help faculty to take maximum advantage of their education and the opportunities available in their careers. These skills help individuals to cope with difficult situations at the workplace and to maintain balance in the different roles of teaching and research throughout their careers. Proper planning and decision taken by the organization, influences the attitudes, actions, and working performance of its employees. Moreover, for the welfare and future success of the employees, it is very crucial that how different policies are compiled and implemented in the organization (Mgaiwa & Kapinga, 2021).

Faculty satisfaction and turnover intentions are strongly related to support of academic research, including access to state-of-the-art research equipment and instruments, laboratory space and supplies, library holdings, and research assistants (Wezel et al., 2018). Indeed, many faculty members regard the proper implementation of research policy as a "detriment to their careers", in part due to the importance of research productivity in determining pay, promotion, and tenure advancement at many institutions (Moon & Wood, 2020). Professionals and administrators engaged in academic planning and analyses should take the role of implementation of research policy into consideration when formulating faculty recruitment and retention efforts. There is an old exercise of facilitating mid-career faculty members by reserving a portion of funding for them to conduct research (Baldwin & Chang, 2006; Strage & Merdinger,

2015) worth following. Many institutions also provide "bridge funding" awards to research faculty who have lost funds, hence ensuring continued professional growth.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was limited to the universities of Punjab only. A similar study could be conducted in universities of any other province of Pakistan. An indepth Phenomenological study could be conducted to know the dynamics of lack of organizational support and its consequences.

REFERENCES

Al-Asfour, A., & Young, S. (2018). Perceived faculty professional development needs at tribal colleges and universities. *Tribal College and University Research Journal, 2*(1), 68-89.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. Research in Higher Education, 46(7), 803-830.

Angervall, P. (2018). The academic career: A study of subjectivity, gender and movement among women university lecturers. *Gender and Education, 30*(1), 105-118.

Angervall, P., & Beach, D. (2020). Dividing academic work: gender and academic career at Swedish universities. *Gender and Education, 32*(3), 347-362.

Arif, S., Ilyas, M. & Hameed, A. (2013). Student Satisfaction with Services in private universities of Pakistan: The impact of leadership. *Total Quality Management (TQM), 25*(4), 399-416.

Arif, S., Iqbal, S., & Nadeem, M. (2021). Leadership Effectiveness in Implementing Quality Assurance Programs at Private Universities of Lahore. *International Review of Management and Business Research, 2*(2), 56-72.

Baldwin, R. G., & Chang, D. A. (2006*). Reinforcing our. Liberal Education, 92*(4), 28-35.

Baldwin, R., DeZure, D., Shaw, A., & Moretto, K. (2008). Mapping the terrain of mid-career faculty at a research university: Implications for faculty and academic leaders. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 40*(5), 46-55.

Barker, M. N. K., Ali, S., Musselin, C., & Teixeira, P. (2014). Policy Pressures and the Changing Organisation of University Research. In *Reforming Higher Eduction: Public Policy Design and Implementation*. Springer Nature.

Barton, E., Bates, E. A., & O'Donovan, R. (2019). 'That extra sparkle': students' experiences of volunteering and the impact on satisfaction and employability in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 43*(4), 453-466.

Beavers, G. A., Iwata, B. A., & Lerman, D. C. (2013). Thirty years of research on the functional analysis of problem behavior. *Journal of applied behavior analysis*, *46*(1), 1-21.

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. G. (2005). A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity. *Academic Medicine, 80*(3), 225-237.

Brennan, L., Cusack, T., Delahunt, E., Kuznesof, S., & Donnelly, S. (2019). Academics' conceptualisations of the research-teaching nexus in a research-intensive Irish university: A dynamic framework for growth & development. *Learning and Instruction, 60*, 301-309.

Brinthaupt, T. M., Neal, A., & Otto, S. (2016). A faculty wellness workshop series: Leveraging on- campus expertise. *To Improve the Academy, 35*(2), 377-394.

Buller, J. L. (2013). Positive academic leadership: How to stop putting out fires and start making a difference. John Wiley & Sons.

Cameron, S. W., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). Sponsorship and academic career success. *The Journal of Higher Education, 52*(4), 369-377.

Cha, M. Y., & Carrier, C. (2016). Contingent faculty perceptions of organizational support, workplace attitudes, and teaching evaluations at a public research university. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education, 1,* 121-151.

Chaolertseree, S., & Taephant, N. (2020). Outcomes of Meaningful Work with a Focus on Asia: A Systematic Review. *The Journal of Behavioral Science, 15*(3), 101-116.

Corcoran, M., & Clark, S. M. (1984). Professional socialization and contemporary career attitudes of three faculty generations. *Research in Higher Education, 20*(2), 131-153.

Dill, D. D. (2020). Enhancing academic quality and collegial control: Insights from US policy on the ethical conduct of human subjects' research. *Higher Education Policy, 33*(1), 45-64.

Do, T. M. H. (2021). *An investigation and development of policies to improve institutional autonomy in Vietnamese universities (Doctoral dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland).*

Fawzi, H., & Al-Hattami, A. (2017). Faculty production of research papers: Challenges and recommendations. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 7*(2), 221-228.

Garbe, E., & Duberley, J. (2019). How careers change: understanding the role of structure and agency in career change. The case of the humanitarian sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 1*-25.

Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilke, P. K. (1984). Sources of stress in academe: A national perspective. *Research in higher education, 20*(4), 477-490.

Gruber, J., Borelli, J. L., Prinstein, M. J., Clark, L. A., Davila, J., Gee, D. G., ... & Weinstock, L. M. (2020). Best practices in research mentoring in clinical science. *Journal of abnormal psychology, 129*(1), 70.

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2017). Doing case study research: *A practical guide for beginning researchers*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Hardy, I. (2012). *The politics of teacher professional development: Policy, research and practice.* London: Routledge.

Hedjazi, Y., & Behravan, J. (2011). Study of factors influencing research productivity of agriculture faculty members in Iran. *Higher education, 62*(5), 635-647.

Hénard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. Paris: OECD.

Horta, H., & Santos, J. M. (2016). The impact of publishing during PhD studies on career research publication, visibility, and collaborations. *Research in Higher Education, 57*(1), 28-50.

Höfrová, A., Moore de Peralta, A., Rosopa, P. J., Small, M. A., Payne, K. S., & Rymešová, P. (2021). Faculty Perception of the Contribution of Start-up Packages to Professional Development. *Innovative Higher Education, 46*(4), 481-497.

Kenny, J. (2018). Re-empowering academics in a corporate culture: An exploration of workload and performativity in a university. *Higher Education, 75*(2), 365-380.

Lapoule, P., & Lynch, R. (2018). The case study method: exploring the link between teaching and research. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 40*(5), 485-500.

Le, H., Newman, A., Menzies, J., Zheng, C., & Fermelis, J. (2020). Work–life balance in Asia: A systematic review. *Human Resource Management Review, 30*(4), 100766.

Lee, A., Willis, S., & Tian, A. W. (2018). Empowering leadership: A meta- analytic examination of incremental contribution, mediation, and moderation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(3), 306-325.

Lee, E. T., & Wang, J. (2003). *Statistical methods for survival data analysis* (Vol. 476). John Wiley & Sons.

Mgaiwa, S., & Kapinga, O. (2021). Mentorship of early career academics in Tanzania: issues and implications for the next generation of academics. *Higher Education Pedagogies, 6*(1), 114-134.

Moon, J. S., & Wood, D. A. (2020). Research initiatives in accounting education: Research relevance and research productivity. *Issues in Accounting Education, 35*(4), 111-124.

Musselin, C., & Teixeira, P. N. (Eds.). (2013). *Reforming higher education: public policy design and implementation* (Vol. 41). Springer Science & Business Media.

Natrajan, N. S., Sanjeev, R., & Singh, S. K. (2019). Achieving job performance from empowerment through the mediation of employee engagement: an empirical study. *Independent Journal of Management & Production, 10*(3), 1094-1105.

Nicholas, D., Rodríguez- Bravo, B., Watkinson, A., Boukacem- Zeghmouri, C., Herman, E., Xu, J., ... & Świgoń, M. (2017). Early career researchers and their publishing and authorship practices. *Learned Publishing, 30*(3), 205-217.

Prince, M. J., Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2007). Does faculty research improve undergraduate teaching? An analysis of existing and potential synergies. *Journal of engineering education, 96*(4), 283-294.

Sabzwari, S., Kauser, S., & Khuwaja, A. K. (2009). Experiences, attitudes and barriers towards research amongst junior faculty of Pakistani medical universities. *BMC medical education, 9*(1), 1-7.

Santo, S. A., Engstrom, M. E., Reetz, L., Schweinle, W. E., & Reed, K. (2009). Faculty Productivity Barriers and Supports at a School of Education. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(2), 117-129.

Sharma, P., & Pandher, J. S. (2017). Faculty competence and development methods in higher education: A critical analysis. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 6(1), 12.

Song, J. (2018). Creating world-class universities in China: Strategies and impacts at a renowned research university. *Higher Education, 75*(4), 729-742.

Srikanth, P. B., & Jomon, M. G. (2020). Developing managerial competencies: integrating work design characteristics and developmental challenge. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 31*(22), 2808-2839.

Strage, A., & Merdinger, J. (2015). Professional growth and renewal for mid-career faculty. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 29*(1), 41-50.

Tanveer, M., Bhaumik, A., & Haq, I. U. (2020). Pakistani universities and leadership reconnoitering the prospects of furtherance. *Journal of Seybold Report ISSN NO*, *1533*, 9211.

Tarkang, E. E., Kweku, M., & Zotor, F. B. (2017). Publication practices and responsible authorship: a review article. *Journal of Public Health in Africa, 8*(1).

Taylor, K. L., Colet, N. R., Saroyan, A., & Frenay, M. (2012). Making the shift from faculty development to educational development. *Building teaching capacities in higher education,* 139-167.

Teodorescu, D. (2000). Correlates of faculty publication productivity: A cross-national analysis. *Higher Education, 39*(2), 201-222.

Tian, M., & Lu, G. (2017). What price the building of world-class universities? Academic pressure faced by young lecturers at a research-centered University in China. *Teaching in Higher Education, 22*(8), 957-974.

van Dijk, E. E., van Tartwijk, J., van der Schaaf, M. F., & Kluijtmans, M. (2020). What makes an expert university teacher? A systematic review and synthesis of frameworks for teacher expertise in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 100365.

Vardi, I. (2009). The impacts of different types of workload allocation models on academic satisfaction and working life. *Higher education, 57*(4), 499-508.

Volmer, J., & Wolff, H. G. (2018). A daily diary study on the consequences of networking on employees' career-related outcomes: The mediating role of positive affect. *Frontiers in psychology, 9*, 2179.

Webber, K. L., & Rogers, S. M. (2018). Gender differences in faculty member job satisfaction: Equity forestalled?. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(8), 1105-1132.

Welch, A. G., Bolin, J., & Reardon, D. (2019). *Mid-career faculty: Trends, barriers, and possibilities*. Brill.

Wezel, A., Goette, J., Lagneaux, E., Passuello, G., Reisman, E., Rodier, C., & Turpin, G. (2018). Agroecology in Europe: *Research, education, collective action networks, and alternative food systems. Sustainability, 10*(4), 1214.

Yielder, J., & Codling, A. (2004). Management and leadership in the contemporary university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(3), 315–328.