

The Engagement of Faculty Members with Disabilities

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Peter Joseph Campion

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Dr. Rebecca Ropers

March 2021

© Peter Joseph Campion 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have reached the summit of this journey without many supporters. To my partner, Amanda, thank you for loving me as I am. Thank you for reminding me what I am capable of accomplishing. I love you, and I look forward to supporting you as you soon begin your journey towards earning a doctoral degree.

To my children, Cadence and Addison, I love you both immensely. I am so proud of you. I look forward to all the great things that each of you will do. Thank you for showing me how “we can change the world.” Thank you for giving me reasons to be “strong and brave.” Thank you for giving me reasons to be “healthy, happy, and safe.” Thank you for showing me what it means to be “a great friend, a great learner, and a great teammate.” Thank you for showing me how I, too, “can do anything if I get up each day and do my best to be just a little bit better than I was yesterday.” Thank you for showing me how, “no matter how hard something is, or tired as we are, we can do anything as long as we keep trying.”

To my canine best friend, Koda Luna, thank you for going outside with me each morning. Thank you for checking on me when I am struggling.

To my brothers, Chad and Josh, thank you for being there when I have struggled. Thank you for the great examples of resilience.

To Dr. Johnson, my therapist, thank you for helping me to navigate through challenging issues over the last decade.

To my mentors, Bonnie Cooper, Leah Reinert, and Daniel Woldeab, thank you for the constant patience and uplifting attitude. Thank you for always being there when I need encouragement and advice.

To all the individuals at the University of Minnesota who supported me along this journey, thank you. Thanks also go to my mentors at the Disability Resource Center: Neal Binsfeld, Emily Ehlinger, Dave Fuecker, Cynthia Fuller, and Donna Johnson. The programming offered by Student Services and UReturn both had a significant influence on my life. Thank you for supporting and helping me mold this study. Thank you for showing me how to serve others.

To the University of Minnesota Extension, thank you. My time with the Center for Community Vitality, Leadership, and Civic Engagement provided me with a stable base as I began this work. To my mentors, Brent Hales, Mary Ann Hennen, Mike Liepold, and Lori Rothstein, thank you for seeing my strengths and supporting me to further develop them.

From the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development (OLPD), thank yous go to Melissa Andersen and Jeremy Hernandez. I appreciate the extra time that I needed to travel along this path. To the Leadership for Intercultural and International Education program, a thank you goes to Deanne Magnusson, Gerry Fry, and the late Michael Paige for taking a chance on an aspiring scholar. To the Human Resources Development and Business Marketing Education program, thank you for the opportunities to teach and continue to grow as an educator. To my mentor, Rosemarie Park, thank you for inviting me to give guest lectures in your courses over the last five

years. Thank you for seeing me as I could be and for pushing me to be open about my disabilities, knowing that I would help others with my story. To all of the OLPD professors and administrators who have shaped who I am today, I appreciate how much you pushed me to grow and to become stronger.

To the brave and inspirational faculty members who participated in this study, thank you. Without your openness to share your journeys, this research would not have been possible. Thank you for the amazing examples you have given and for becoming my mentors.

To my dissertation committee members, Kenneth Bartlett, Joshua Collins, and Brandon Sullivan, thank you for providing a stable base for this work. I have appreciated all of your encouragement and openness to guide me down this path.

Last, but certainly not least, to my mentor and adviser, Rebecca Ropers, thank you for always giving me the space to be open with who I am. Thank you for taking a chance on me as your advisee. I so appreciate your belief in me. Thank you for always seeing me for who I could become and for helping me know who I will be. I would not be where I am today without your help, Rebecca. I value all of your kindness and support. I promise to carry on your legacy because I, too, will create a lasting ripple effect by building hope, strength, and confidence among marginalized and underrepresented people in higher education.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to everyone who perseveres in silence each day. This study honors all who choose to be strong and to step out of their shame and self-doubt. I dedicate this work to the individuals who choose to own and be transparent about their struggles, so others do not feel so alone. This research honors all who shine their light towards others who follow along the path that has been cleared. Please do not give up! We are following you!

ABSTRACT

Employee engagement has been studied in many contexts, but studies have often failed to consider how a disability affects engagement. A deeper understanding about the engagement of faculty members with disabilities is necessary to ensure that research and practice are inclusive of all scholars' experiences. This qualitative study explored how disabilities and relationships relate to employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking. The research was based on 22 interviews with 11 faculty members from 3 public university campuses in the Midwest. Participants included assistant, associate, and full professors who were registered and receiving accommodations from a university resource center as well as some individuals who had not disclosed their disabilities. Findings illustrated how universities can foster organizational cultures and meaningful relationships that support faculty members with disabilities. Initiatives that facilitate employee engagement for faculty members with disabilities are likely to lead to increased disclosure and accommodation-seeking behaviors. Findings also suggested that universities must bolster support by offering resources and training in order to enable faculty members to overcome the stigma that they experience related to their disabilities. Resources should explain how to navigate both the accommodation-seeking and tenure processes as well as how to effectively work with a disability liaison. Finally, they should help faculty members to advocate for themselves and others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Context of the Study	1
Definition and Prevalence of Disability	2
Disclosure and Accommodations.....	5
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions	9
Research Gap.....	10
Research Strategy	12
Significance of the Study	13
Positionality.....	13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	15
Defining Employee Engagement	15
Frameworks and Assessment	17
Personal-Role Engagement.....	17
Work-Related Engagement.....	20
Job Demands-Resources	23
Antecedents	26
Individual.....	26

Organizational	27
Complexities and Ambiguities Associated with Organizational Interventions.....	29
Decreased Levels of Employee Engagement	31
Outcomes.....	32
Individual.....	32
Organizational	33
Salient Developments in the Field of Employee Engagement.....	34
Uniqueness and Conceptual Boundaries of Employee Engagement as Compared to Other Associated Constructs	41
Job Satisfaction.....	41
Organizational Commitment	42
Organizational Citizenship Behavior.....	43
Acknowledgment and Consideration of the Interrelatedness Between the Key Constructs Related to Employee Engagement	45
Shuck and Associates' Rebuttal	46
A Short-Form Employee-Engagement Guide.....	51
The Selection of Employee Engagement for My Study.....	52
Employee Engagement in Higher Education	53
Experiences and Challenges for Faculty Members with Disabilities.....	57
Non-Inclusive Cultures.....	62
Power, Unearned Privilege, and Microaggressions.....	62
Conclusion.....	63

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	65
Research Questions	65
Study Design	66
Context	67
Participant Selection	67
Portrayal of Participants	72
Participant Consent, Confidentiality, and Protection	75
Data Collection	76
Data Analysis	78
Coding	79
Trustworthiness	81
Contextual Considerations	82
Conclusion	83
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	85
Disability and Employee Engagement	85
Disability, Engagement, and Fatigue	85
Disabilities, Mobility, and Employee Engagement	88
Reframing and Overcoming Obstacles Related to Disability	90
Relationships and Engagement	92
Building Friendships that Support Engagement	92
Following Their Passions While Building Relationships	95
Networks	97

Support, Resources, and Engagement	98
Work Environments	99
Limited Resources.....	104
Stigma.....	105
Ableism	108
Communication	110
Engagement, Disclosure, and Accommodations.....	113
Engagement in Teaching and with Students	113
Engagement with a Disability Liaison	115
Conclusion.....	117
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	121
Implications for Theory and Research	122
Implications for Practice	126
Conclusion.....	129
REFERENCES.....	133
APPENDIX A	155
APPENDIX B	156
APPENDIX C	157
APPENDIX D	158
APPENDIX E	159
APPENDIX F	161

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Demographic Data for the Interview Participants 71

Table 2. Data-Analysis Plan 79

Table 3. Utilizing Codes, Identifying Conceptual Themes, and Building Theory 81

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Coming from a focus on improving people's levels of well-being, performance, and production (Flaherty, 2015), employee-engagement research has recently seen increased attention at higher education institutions (Shuck, 2019; Sullivan, Bartlett, & Rana, 2015). Historically, studies have focused on the engagement of administrators, faculty members, and staff in higher education without considering whether people had a disability. Although disability has been studied in academia (Fuecker & Harbour, 2011; Price, Salzer, O'Shea, & Kerschbaum, 2017), a deeper understanding about the engagement of faculty members with disabilities who are serving at institutions of higher education is necessary in order to ensure that research and practice related to engagement within academic communities are inclusive of the experiences for a diverse group of scholars (Hakkola & Ropers, 2018; Shuck, Collins, Rocco, & Diaz, 2016).

My dissertation focuses on employee engagement, relationships, support, resources, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors for faculty members with disabilities. In this chapter, I provide the study's background and context. Further, I define disability and discuss the prevalence of faculty with disabilities. I also consider how faculty members with disabilities decide to disclose their disabilities and how institutions provide accommodations to support those individuals' engagement.

Background and Context of the Study

A single definition of employee engagement has yet to be agreed upon within the higher-education research. The employee-engagement literature at-large has also failed to offer a clear-cut explanation of the concept (Shuck & Wollard, 2013). Instead, principles of employee engagement, including definitions and assessment methods, have been used

in several ways (Bailey, Madden, Alfes, & Fletcher, 2017; Shuck, Osam, Zigarmi, & Nimon, 2017). In one of the most prevailing views, Kahn's (1990) vision of personal engagement focuses on the three psychological antecedents of employee engagement: meaningfulness, safety, and availability. Employee engagement was initially conceptualized by Kahn (1990) as an ever-changing construct that is focused on the balance of expression of one's full self and detachment. Kahn analyzed the behavioral manifestations of employee engagement in organizational settings (Bailey et al., 2017).

Distinct in the literature is the transformation beyond Kahn's (1990) view about personal-role engagement towards the dominant definition provided by the Utrecht Group (Bailey et al., 2017). This group perceives employee engagement as a multi-dimensional, work-related construct that includes vigor, dedication, and absorption, each of which can be assessed through the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). The understanding that emerged from the Utrecht Group further characterized employee engagement as "a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior" (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Building from Kahn's (1990) work that observed employee engagement as a "qualitative, behavioral and transitory experience that followed the 'ebbs and flows' of daily activities, the Utrecht Group saw engagement as a more stable and enduring attitudinal frame of mind that could be assessed through quantitative methods" (Bailey et al., 2017, p. 23).

Definition and Prevalence of Disability

In this dissertation, I investigated the employee-engagement experiences of faculty members with disabilities who are serving in higher education. An essential part

of this study was to discover how faculty members' disabilities affect their employee engagement. The Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments of 2008 defined disability as "a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities" (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2008, para. 9). Rocco, Bowman, and Bryant (2014) expanded the definition with the addition that "disability is a complex phenomenon influenced by a socio-historical context, functional and medical realities, and individual perception" (p. 4). Approximately 22% of the population in the United States has a disability (Grigely, 2017). With a population of around 53 million, individuals with disabilities are the largest minority group in the United States (Munger & Mertens, 2011).

Yet this group also remains arguably the most oppressed minority group, as individuals with disabilities are far less likely to be employed, earn a college degree, and live independently as compared to their nondisabled counterparts . . . nearly 85 percent of people with disabilities are impoverished, and in many areas of the world, educational and employment prospects for this group are virtually nonexistent (Charlton, 1998). These . . . [findings stem] not from disabled individuals' innate functional limitations but from lack of opportunities to participate as equal and integral members of their communities. (Munger & Mertens, 2011, p. 23)

Furthermore, approximately 12% of the population has a significant disability (Brault, 2012). The U.S. AbilityOne Commission (2016) defined disability in two ways. First, the organization defined blindness as

central visual acuity which does not exceed 20/200 in the better eye with correcting lenses or visual acuity, if better than 20/200, is accompanied by a limit to the field of vision in the better eye to such a degree that its widest diameter subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees. (para. 2)

The association then defined a significant disability other than blindness as follows:

a severe physical or mental impairment (a residual, limiting condition resulting from an injury, disease, or congenital defect) which so limits the person's functional capabilities (mobility, communication, self-care, self-direction, work tolerance, or work skills) that the individual is unable to engage in normal competitive employment over an extended period. (para. 3)

Forty-six percent of disabled individuals strive to maintain careers, but they struggle with underemployment and unemployment, causing people with disabilities to be the largest underrepresented minority group in the United States workforce (Shapiro & Gallico, 1993). Disability is unpredictable because approximately 30% of individuals who are free from a disability experience some disability while at the pinnacle of their careers (Stone-Romero, Stone, & Lukaszewski, 2006).

Research related to the number of individuals with an invisible or non-apparent disability, defined as “one that is hidden so as not to be immediately noticed by an observer except under unusual circumstances or by disclosure from the disabled person or other outside source” (Matthews, 1994, p. 7), is unavailable. It is crucial to consider that 20.8% of individuals’ disabilities are non-apparent (hearing 10.8%, mental 7.8%, and speech 2.2%; Brault, 2012). Research regarding the percentage of individuals with a non-apparent physical disability, such as fibromyalgia, chronic pain, chronic fatigue

syndrome, a seizure disorder, or a heart condition, is unavailable. Scholars disagree about the terminology that should be used to define non-apparent or invisible disabilities (Olney & Brockelman, 2005). Finally, professionals in the disability field indicate that many faculty members with non-apparent disabilities choose not to disclose their disabilities (Price et al., 2017).

Disclosure and Accommodations

Professionals cite a fear of negative judgments and career consequences at the root of the apprehension to disclose and to receive accommodations (N. Binsfeld, personal communication, July 29, 2018). The dynamics of this situation can be daunting to faculty members with disabilities because “disclosure is, in fact, one of the key challenges behind ensuring needed accommodations are in place . . . [and] disclosing a disability and negotiating accommodations can be particularly difficult” (Kerschbaum, O’Shea, Price, & Salzer, 2017, pp. 311-312). Unintentional disclosure often occurs when faculty members make inquiries to various departments about workplace accommodations.

Simply disclosing this sort of “unfitness” can put one’s job at risk—not only for untenured faculty, but even for tenured faculty, all of whom work under the requirement of being able to fulfill the essential functions of their jobs . . . Even if the problematics of disclosure are not an issue (a big if), asking for an individual accommodation for a disability that involves being unable to teach, probably at short notice and at unpredictable intervals, would sound absurd in most departments. (Kerschbaum et al., 2017, p. 322)

Stigma may lead to unfavorable attention, reprisal, or losing one's position. The possibility of these negative consequences can discourage someone from disclosing a disability and seeking accommodations (Kerschbaum et al., 2017).

Fifty-nine percent of all accommodations cost nothing for an employer to perform, with the remaining ones costing the organization around \$500 per one-time accommodation (Cech & Blair-Loy, 2014). Similar reports found that 66% of one-time accommodations cost under \$600 with the remaining accommodations not requiring employers to incur costs (Hendricks, Batiste, Hirsh, Schartz, & Blanck, 2005). Although the expense of making accommodations is low, only a small minority of institutions have a qualified staff member who is charged with supporting faculty members who have disabilities with those disability-related accommodation requests (Fuecker & Harbour, 2011; Grigely, 2017). Given the issues explained, it is essential that administrators build inclusive spaces for faculty members with disabilities (Evans, Broido, Brown, & Wilke, 2017; Olkin, 2011).

Disclosure, Accommodation Seeking, and Engagement of Faculty with Disabilities

With a rising focus on improving the levels of well-being, performance, and production (Flaherty, 2015), researchers have given increased attention to employee engagement at large institutions of higher learning, particularly to initiatives aimed at assessing and enhancing the employee engagement of administrators, faculty members, and staff (Sullivan et al., 2015). For example, the University of Minnesota (UMN) administered employee-engagement surveys to the entire university system, encapsulating the main elements of employee engagement (Sullivan et al., 2015). The UMN studied factors related to

- commitment to excellence,
- authority and empowerment,
- commitment and dedication,
- clear expectations and feedback,
- respect and recognition,
- collaboration,
- effective environment,
- development opportunities,
- clear and promising direction,
- confidence in leaders,
- support and resources,
- work,
- structure and process, and
- survey follow-up (Sullivan et al., 2015).

Inside Higher Ed and Gallup created a hybrid survey of the Gallup Q12 employee-engagement model and additional survey questions related explicitly to the workplace employee engagement of faculty members in higher education (Jaschik & Lederman, 2015).

Similarly, the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) conducted a system-wide employee-engagement survey aimed at increasing the faculty members' involvement with the institution beyond essential work duties (Lee, 2015). Other organizations are using inquiries of this nature, following the examples of the UMN, Inside Higher Ed, Gallup, and UCLA, in order to discern how their employees are

engaged at their workplaces. The momentum around institutional initiatives aimed at increasing employee engagement in higher education is growing (Jaschik & Lederman, 2015), yet only 47% of institutions are investigating employee engagement (Gonzalez & Jones, 2016).

The employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities is directly related to inclusiveness. Perhaps because faculty members with disabilities are commonly unnoticed and seen as less critical than other underrepresented groups in higher education, insufficient scholarship and theory focus on the engagement of these individuals. Although data have been obtained related to engagement and faculty members' age, gender, race, ethnicity, academic experience, and rank, data about the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities are often unavailable either for legal reasons or because faculty members have not disclosed. Like the data on engagement, data related to disclosure and the accommodation-seeking experiences of faculty members with disabilities are also limited (Evans et al., 2017; Kerschbaum et al., 2017).

Although there is research on employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation, that research has neglected the intersection of these constructs for faculty members with disabilities. Research about employee engagement has failed to incorporate the views of people with disabilities explicitly and, therefore, has yet to bring to light how the disabilities of faculty members relate to people's engagement (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017). Given the significance of context related to employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking, it is difficult to believe that all methods will be effective with every faculty member within all academic units. My study

explored the faculty members' perceptions in order to determine the practices that promote people's engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to better understand how faculty members with disabilities believe that their disabilities and relationships relate to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking. I used Shuck, Osam, et al.'s (2017) definition of employee engagement: "a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy" (p. 269). This study examined how faculty members believe their relationships with university administration, department chairs/heads, other faculty members, staff, and students relate to the engagement phenomenon (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017).

A deeper understanding of the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities serving at institutions of higher education is necessary in order to ensure that research and practice related to engagement within academic communities are inclusive of the experiences for a diverse group of scholars (Shuck et al., 2016). The faculty members' real concerns about disclosing a disability and receiving accommodations are also critical knowledge if universities are to ensure that people in a position to influence disability disclosure and accommodation seeking are strategically focused on connecting with and meeting the needs of scholars with disabilities.

Overall, employee engagement is important to improve levels of well-being, performance, and production (Flaherty, 2015). This dissertation aimed to understand how faculty members with disabilities experience and are engaged with their academic

environments. This study also sought to understand the faculty members' perceptions regarding disclosure and accommodation seeking. My study was guided by the following research questions.

1. How do faculty members with disabilities engage in their academic work?
 - a. How do faculty members with disabilities believe their disabilities relate to their employee engagement?
 - b. How do faculty members with disabilities believe relationships with colleagues within their institutions relate to their employee engagement?
 - c. How do faculty members with disabilities believe that support and resources within their institutions relate to their employee engagement?
 - d. How does the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities relate to their decisions to disclose and to receive accommodations?

Research Gap

In most disciplines, including human-resource research, scholars have narrowly investigated (Rocco et al., 2014) or neglected (Rocco & Delgado, 2011) disability. Most disability scholarship focuses solely on aspects related to the legal (Muyia-Nafukho, Roessler, & Kacirek, 2010), medical, and financial contexts (Rocco & Fornes, 2010; Rocco et al., 2014). Earlier studies have left gaps in the research on engagement in higher education. Therefore, additional research is necessary to increase the insight about how faculty members' disabilities affect employee engagement.

Research about the employee engagement of individuals with disabilities in higher education has remained marginalized within engagement studies, and research investigating the experiences of faculty members with disabilities is also limited (Evans

et al., 2017; Kerschbaum et al., 2017). Studies concentrating on employee engagement as defined by Shuck and associates (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) were particularly beneficial while bringing to light how the faculty members' disabilities relate to engagement (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck et al., 2016). Many scholars researched engagement but had not utilized employee engagement as defined by Shuck and associates (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) to discover the possible benefits of engagement in higher education environments for faculty members with disabilities. This qualitative study utilized the engagement as defined by Shuck and associates (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) to guide the qualitative methods, data collection, and analysis. The concepts presented by Shuck and associates' (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) quantitative measures were utilized to conduct the qualitative research.

Studies examining the views of faculty members with disabilities related to disclosure and accommodation seeking (Evans et al., 2017; Kerschbaum et al., 2017) focus on how people engage with their work (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017a). Additional research to better understand these faculty members' views regarding how relationships with colleagues relate to engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking helped to create a comprehensive and inclusive view of engagement. My study investigated the engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking experiences of faculty members within the unique higher-education community, highlighting how relationships, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors converge to influence the engagement of faculty members with disabilities.

Research Strategy

Qualitative data for this research were gathered from faculty members on three campuses in the Midwest; those individuals had a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments of 2008. I established trust with the participants through a non-recorded and non-transcribed introductory meeting. The data examined for this study were gathered by conducting two individual interviews with each participant. With the aim of maintaining an open process to assure a better understanding of the faculty members' experiences before putting a structure on those experiences, the interviews targeted the concepts more broadly through an inductive data analysis. The inductive interview protocol included predetermined codes.

The inductive interview focused on each concept while targeting a deductive analysis using predetermined codes (Harding, 2013). All participants came from three campuses within one university system. The term "University in the Midwest" was utilized for all official references to the institutions being investigated in order to protect the faculty members' identities. A qualitative data analysis aligned with the constant comparative method, where components of the data were arranged and contrasted to find sequences and patterns (Harding, 2013).

Shuck et al.'s (2016) views on employee engagement were used to frame my research. Guided by constructivism, I strove to work with participants in order to make meaning together (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). With constructivism, meaning is forged through dialogue, and I sought insight from conversations with participants while searching for the ways faculty members believe that their disabilities affected their

employee engagement (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). The faculty members' courage, and trust were needed to have open and rich conversations.

Significance of the Study

My study will help scholars and practitioners better understand the employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking of faculty members with disabilities. I utilized the work provided by Shuck and associates (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017b) to frame my engagement research. My own life experiences and my worldview, which is centered on equity, diversity, and inclusion, shaped this study and has, undoubtedly, affected my insight about the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities and my perceptions for the data collected (Kaye, Jans, & Jones, 2011). Through such approaches, this research has produced valuable contributions to the study of higher education, disability, and human-resource development. By affecting interventions, actions, and programs related to faculty members with disabilities, this study has also led to results with implications for theory, practice, and organizational and academic policy. Ultimately, I hope that my study will improve the levels of well-being, performance, production (Flaherty, 2015), employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors for faculty members with disabilities at higher-education institutions.

Positionality

As a white, cisgender male doctoral candidate, many of my identities are associated with simultaneous power, unearned privilege, and oppression. I also have non-apparent disabilities which are a part of my subjectivity. As opposed to attempting to disregard or bracket my positionality and preconceptions, I wrestled with them during

this study in order to determine how they affected my analysis. I determined how my identities related to my interactions and analyses. I scheduled and maintained a daily (Monday through Friday) reflective journaling routine. I programmed post-interview reflection time into my data-collection protocols. I found quiet spaces to complete the post-interview reflections, which I finished no more than 30 minutes after each meeting concluded. My positionality as a person with disabilities influenced conversations with faculty participants as well as my interpretation of their stories. I acknowledge my unique journey and how my identities have created a broader awareness of the underrepresented and marginalized, the necessity for social justice, and the need to have equity for individuals with disabilities.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I focus on the definition, frameworks, assessment, antecedents, and outcomes of employee engagement. I discuss salient developments as well as the uniqueness, boundaries, and interrelatedness of the concept. I address Shuck and associates' rebuttal to others' criticisms of the concept along with Shuck's new employee-engagement guide. I discuss why I have framed my study around employee engagement. I offer a review of employee engagement in higher education. I end this chapter with a review of the experiences, challenges, and consequences for faculty members with disabilities.

Defining Employee Engagement

Employee engagement has been defined as an active and positive state of mind as well as a relationship between a leader and follower (Nimon, Shuck, & Zigarmi, 2016). Typically, employee-engagement research has focused on some dimensions of motivation, enthusiasm, and satisfaction (Batista-Taran, Shuck, Gutierrez, & Baralt, 2013). When engaged, individuals dedicate themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010) towards organizational objectives (Shuck & Wollard, 2010) through the three work-related mindsets of vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakibinga, Vinje, & Mittelmark, 2012).

Employee engagement has been defined both as a management practice and as a composite attitudinal and behavioral construct that consists of various components (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017). The definition of employee engagement as a management practice (Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, & Delbridge, 2013) differs from the understandings of employee engagement when using a psychological frame because the

former classification focuses on the leaders' involvement and participation (Townsend, Wilkinson, & Burgess, 2013). Employee engagement, seen as a composite attitudinal and behavioral construct that combines a range of perspectives into one measure, is developed through satisfaction with resources, communication, and relationships with administrators (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017; Swanberg, McKechnie, Ojha, & James, 2011). Most research investigating employee engagement has found that employees encounter different types of employee engagement related to the various and dynamic work elements.

Scholars agree that employee engagement is an individual choice as well as an organizational construct (Shuck & Wollard, 2013). Additionally, scholars have recognized that high levels of employee engagement entail surpassing individual and organizational expectations through transformative action; however, there has been limited consistency about the definition of and method for assessing employee engagement (Shuck, Osam, et al., 2017). Scholars have also challenged the current targets of employee engagement, suggesting that the concept, formed within a communal group practice, is guided by a beneficial relationship with the administration, not merely around individual work. Limited research has been conducted to illustrate definitive, conclusive evidence for this connection (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011). Overall, researchers have used different employee-engagement definitions, each representing the “unique perspectives of the time and field, [and thus] the disjointed approach to defining employee engagement has lent itself to its misconceptualization and the potential for misinterpretation” (Shuck & Wollard, 2010, p. 101).

Frameworks and Assessment

As suggested above, the literature has failed to offer a clear and consistent definition of employee engagement (Shuck & Wollard, 2013). Instead, views about the concept, including definitions, frameworks, and assessment methods, have been used in several ways (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017; Shuck, Osam, et al., 2017). These concepts include personal role (meaningfulness, safety, and availability), work related (vigor, dedication, and absorption), and job demands-resources.

Personal-Role Engagement

In one of the earliest and most prevalent views, Kahn (1990) conceptualized the term “employee engagement” as an ever-changing construct that is focused on the balance of expressing one’s full self as well as burnout, detachment, and disengagement, which are the antithesis of psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability. Kahn’s (1990) view of personal-role engagement focuses on developing the three psychological conditions of employee engagement: psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004), the measures taken by a person that establish pre-conditions for employee engagement (Chen, Zhang, & Vogel, 2011).

Meaningfulness entails an experience where individuals feel that their job and work efforts are valuable and supported by a sense of personal satisfaction as well as professional worth and importance (Shuck et al., 2016). “Higher-order needs are translated into values, working toward a higher cause, [and, thus, a sense of] meaningfulness” is experienced (Chalofsky, 2003, p. 71). Frequently referenced regarding actual physical health and equally determined by psychological and emotional

factors is the sense of safety, an individual's feeling of security and the capacity to become peoples' ideal self emotionally, physically, and cognitively without the fear of adverse effects on individuals' self-esteem and professional identity (Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002). Safety also encompasses a psychologically safe environment, framed as a resource, with clear work-related expectations and a belief that individuals can be themselves while on the job (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). The concept of availability encompasses the access to physical, emotional, and psychological tools and assets which are essential for work tasks (Shuck et al., 2016). According to Kahn (1990), availability "measures how ready people are to engage, given the distractions they experience as members of social systems" (p. 703).

Kahn (1990) analyzed the behavioral expressions of personal-role engagement in organizational settings by utilizing qualitative research (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017). Personal-role engagement, an essential construct within the research investigating elements associated with employee engagement, is defined as the "harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances" (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). Personal-role engagement involves a positive mental presence while efficiently completing work objectives (Reio & Sanders-Reio, 2011). Personal-role engagement is the "investment of personal energies and aspects of the self into the work role" (Fletcher, 2016, p. 33) and leads to an "active, full work performance" (Rich et al., 2010, p. 619).

Kahn's (1990) view about personal-role engagement and the three psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability were developed from a study which

investigated the determinants and mediating influences of the psychological conditions at an insurance company. Kahn examined the determinants as well as the arbitrating influences of the psychological states on personal-role engagement through ethnographic research with 16 summer-camp counselors who had an average age of 25.5 years and 16 architects who had an average age of 34.3 years. Kahn (1990) “focused on how people’s experience of themselves and their work contexts influenced moments of personal engagement and disengagement” (p. 702).

Kahn (1990) asserted that the personal-role theory transcended several constructs while explaining the forces which influence personal-role connections and employee engagement during role performance. Kahn explained how personal-role engagement related elements with an explicit charge towards a construct focused on a strong psychological presence during work tasks. The approach has essential dimensions, including

a simultaneous concern with people’s emotional reactions to conscious and unconscious phenomena and the objective properties of jobs, roles, and work contexts; the primacy of people’s experiences of themselves and their contexts as the mediator of the depths to which they employ and express or withdraw and defend themselves during role performances; and the self-in-role as the unit of analysis, a focus on how both person and role are enlivened or deadened during role performances. (Kahn, 1990, p. 717)

It is important to remember that meaningfulness, safety, and availability are the psychological conditions needed to enhance personal-role engagement. Kahn (1990) asserted:

[T]he multiple levels of influences - individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational - that shape people's personal engagements and disengagements [are taken seriously because it] . . . is at the swirling intersection of those influences that individuals make choices, at different levels of awareness, to employ and express or withdraw and defend themselves during role performances . . . to focus on the discrete moments of role performances that represent microcosms of the larger complexity; those moments are windows into the multiplicity of factors that are constantly relevant to person-role dynamics. (p. 719)

As noted above, Kahn's (1990) views and the three psychological antecedents are predominantly used to examine the personal-role components of employee engagement (May et al., 2004). In a complementary way, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) is predominantly utilized to investigate levels of work-related engagement by examining the three work-related mindsets of vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakibinga et al., 2012).

Work-Related Engagement

As stated previously, there is a distinction in the literature to show the transformation beyond Kahn's (1990) view on personal-role engagement towards the dominant definition, framework, and assessment that are focused on work-related engagement and are provided by the Utrecht Group (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017). The Utrecht Group, led by Taris and Schaufeli, is located in the Utrecht University (Netherlands) Department of Work and Organizational Psychology. It is important to remember that the understanding which emerged from the Utrecht Group

further characterized employee engagement as “a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior” (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 74). Developed from Kahn’s scholarship observing personal-role engagement as a “qualitative, behavioral and transitory experience that followed the ‘ebbs and flows’ of daily activities,” the Utrecht Group’s scholarship grew to include positive psychology while keeping employee engagement in a balanced and lasting mindset (Bailey et al., 2017, p. 35).

The UWES described “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind . . . that an engaged employee will possess a solid feeling of vigor towards, dedication to, and absorption in work activities” (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 74). Vigor is associated with the feeling of constant and prolonged resilience and persistence, gaining strength through adversity, the urge to accomplish work tasks, and an abundance of vitality and stamina while completing objectives (Shirom, 2007). Dedication is a state when employees feel challenged, driven, and motivated (Rana, Ardichvili, & Tkachenko, 2014). Individuals feel excited and passionate about their work when they are dedicated as well as having a sense of pleasure and satisfaction with their accomplishments, thus producing a feeling of abundance and personal significance, value, and purpose (Shuck, Reio, Jr., & Rocco, 2011). Absorption is how individuals feel when they are performing work tasks with a sense that time goes by very quickly (Van Bogaert, Wouters, Willems, Mondelaers, & Clarke, 2013). Absorption is enjoyable when deep work immersion occurs; individuals might even find it difficult to disconnect themselves from their work when they are genuinely absorbed (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is a self-reporting survey, ranging from 9 to 17 items (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). Seppala and associates (2009) explained:

The structure of the UWES-17 did not remain the same across the samples and time, the structure of the UWES-9 remained relatively unchanged. Thus, the UWES-9 has good construct validity and use of the 9-item version can be recommended in future research. (p. 459)

“Discriminant validity is defined as the extent to which the score of a[n] . . . instrument differs from that of a tool that measures a related, but . . . different concept” (Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003, p. 193). When compared to job satisfaction, the UWES shows limited discriminant validity (Viljevac, Cooper-Thomas, & Saks, 2012). Thus, there is a need to draw more distinction between the UWES and job satisfaction.

Complicated and unreliable results are found when employee engagement is studied at the component level while using the UWES (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017). While isolating vigor, for example, researchers will not see the entire employee-engagement picture or the situation an individual is experiencing when dedication and absorption are not considered. According to Csikszentmihalyi (2000), flow is a “dynamic state-the holistic sensation that people feel when they act with total involvement” (p. 36). Most scholars say that erroneous conclusions are exposed when employee engagement is investigated at the component level; when the three work-related mindsets are divided, absorption is the first element to be excluded from the UWES because this mentality, “akin to the concept of flow [found in Csikszentmihalyi's work,] . . . should be considered a consequence of work engagement, rather than one of its components. . . . In contrast, vigor and dedication are considered the core dimensions

of engagement” (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008, p. 118). While emphasizing employee engagement as a “positive psychological state of motivation with behavioral manifestations (i.e., discretionary efforts, organizational citizenship behaviors, etc.),” institutions and administrators can utilize the UWES to assess employee engagement with a clear focus on the levels of vigor, dedication, and absorption (Shuck, 2011, p. 305).

As stated above, employee engagement is a dynamic concept, encompassing numerous elements. It is important to remember that the UWES, offered in multiple versions and languages, focuses on positive psychology through the work-related mindsets of vigor, dedication, and absorption by using a quantitative survey. In contrast, Kahn (1990) uses interview questions to qualitatively investigate psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability. The relationship between the work of Kahn and the Utrecht Group can be further described and related in how Kahn’s groundbreaking scholarship investigating personal-role engagement with the three psychological conditions paved the way for the Utrecht Group’s scholarly work to study mindsets with the UWES.

Job Demands-Resources

Bakker and Demerouti's (2007) Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model theorizes that elevated levels of job resources result in more significant drive and efficiency while high job-demand levels result in stress and decreased well-being (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). Researchers have used the JD-R model as the basis for surveys and evaluations related to work-related engagement (Inoue et al., 2013; Sardeshmukh, Sharma, & Golden, 2012; Schaufeli & Taris, 2014).

The JD-R model's evolution and theory were analyzed by Schaufeli and Taris (2014) who offered the following description: “[P]erhaps the most distinctive feature of the JD-R model is its generality and flexibility, meaning that the model can be used in a broad array of situations” (p. 63). Much of the employee-engagement research has highlighted the reliability and validity of Bakker and Demerouti's (2007) JD-R model (Inoue et al., 2013; Sardeshmukh et al., 2012; Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). Limited inquiry suggests that resources increase employee engagement while demands exhaust employee engagement (Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010). Research indicates that demands will enhance, neutralize, or decrease employee engagement, suggesting that challenge and hindrance demands function in unique and yet-to-be comprehended ways.

While dedication is most directly associated with commitment and satisfaction (Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O'Boyle, 2012), the JD-R model lowers the importance of dedication as being a “distinguishing characteristic . . . to being a transactional commodity that occurs because someone else dispenses resources” (Bargagliotti, 2012, p. 1416). The JD-R model also neglects the vital elements of politics (Fineman, 2006). The intricacies explained above have reinforced and influenced the scholarly stance that the JD-R model and the UWES need further development (Wefald, Mills, Smith, & Downey, 2012).

Other Frameworks and Assessments

Along with the dominant frameworks and assessments provided by Kahn's (1990) three psychological conditions, the Utrecht Group's UWES and three work-related mindsets, and Bakker and Demerouti's (2007) Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, there are various other frameworks and assessments offered to investigate employee

engagement. The intellectual, social, and affective (ISA) scale concentrates on the intellectual, social, and affective components of employee engagement (Soane et al., 2012). The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI-GS) can be used as a tool when evaluating employee engagement (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1997) while understanding how personality traits contribute towards defying states of burnout and disengagement (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

The social exchange theory (SET) can be defined as “a distinct and unique construct consisting of cognitive, emotional and behavioral components that are associated with individual role performance” (Saks, 2006, p. 602) and are utilized to investigate elements such as “autonomy, task identity, skill variety, task significance, feedback from others, feedback from the job . . . rewards, recognition, [and] procedural and distributive justice” (Saks, 2006, p. 608) while assessing employee engagement. The conservation of resources (COR) theory centers on the idea that people attempt to obtain and to maintain assets such as personal, energetic, social, and material resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The COR theory can be used to acknowledge and to emphasize the influence of resource loss while focusing on what hardships might occur for individuals with a limited access to resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Finally, the affective shift model (ASM) is “based on the assumption that both positive and negative affect have important functions for work-related engagement” and posits “that negative affect is positively related to work-related engagement if negative affect is followed by positive affect,” an approach that can be utilized while investigating employee engagement (Bledow, Schmitt, Frese, & Kühnel, 2011, p. 1246).

Regardless of the areas of contention and the significant room for growth in this nebulous field of study, the frameworks and assessment methods which are used to understand employee engagement are well grounded in positive psychology (Fineman, 2006). Research has shown that utilizing these frameworks while assessing employee engagement is crucial, but there is little research that explicitly evaluates the employee engagement of diverse populations, specifically people with disabilities, using these tools (Shuck et al., 2016). It is vital to assess employee engagement with the aim to reveal possible disengagement and to utilize the results in order to develop employee-engagement programming for faculty members with disabilities. Employee engagement can be evaluated and improved upon by utilizing all the frameworks and assessments explained previously.

Antecedents

Most research investigating the antecedents of employee engagement targets the relationship among job demands, resources, design, organizational and team factors, and psychological states (Bailey et al., 2017; Madden & Bailey, 2017). Much of the research acknowledges that “the formation of employee engagement is dependent on the experience of its known antecedents” (Shuck et al., 2016, p. 210). The antecedents of employee engagement can be divided into two categories: individual and organizational (Wollard & Shuck, 2011).

Individual

Defined as precursory personality or psychological measures taken by a person, individual antecedents of employee engagement affect the vitality for work, assets, job atmosphere, and dynamics (Judge, Van Vianen, & De Pater, 2004). Mental strength

(Mendes & Stander, 2011), a positive outlook, and self-image (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007), along with a belief in one's self-worth (Del Líbano, Llorens, Salanova, & Schaufeli, 2012), curiosity (Reio & Callahan, 2004), and confidence (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007), are all individual antecedents of employee engagement. Aggressive, yet conscientious, personalities (Macey & Schneider, 2008); receptivity; and vitality are also individual antecedents of employee engagement.

Organizational

Defined as precursory measures taken by a group, organizational antecedents of employee engagement are related to job resources, support, recognition, rewards, and justice (Saks, 2006). Leadership can be an organizational antecedent for employee engagement. Specifically, transformational leadership and practices that target training which is focused on growth and building trust, transparency, responsibility, autonomy, and achievement have been found to be antecedents of employee engagement (Konczak, Stelly, & Trusty, 2000; Shuck & Herd, 2012; Van Schalkwyk, Du Toit, Bothma, & Rothmann, 2010). Finally, faith and confidence in leaders (Rees, Alfes, & Gatenby, 2013), an uplifting exchange between a leader and a follower (Cheng, Lu, Chang, & Johnstone, 2013), and positive impressions of human-resource procedures and beliefs about leaders' expectations and roles (Bezuijen, van den Berg, van Dam, & Thierry, 2009) are also positively associated with employee engagement.

While striving to increase levels of employee engagement, leaders have built emotionally healthy and positive work environments (Dollard & Bakker, 2010). These settings focus on the implementation and utilization of mission and vision statements (Fleming & Asplund, 2007), knowledge sharing (Chen et al., 2011), education and talent

development (Czarnowsky, 2008), volunteer opportunities (Davies & Crane, 2010), third-party performance evaluations (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2013), and feedback sessions (Menguc, Auh, Fisher, & Haddad, 2013). These groups are focused on relevant work (Anaza & Rutherford, 2012), developing service environments (Barnes & Collier, 2013), autonomy (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009), collegiality, encouragement, and support (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007).

Meaningful work, an organizational focus aimed at increasing self-expression, control, challenges, role and task transparency, authentic and encouraging management (Wang & Hsieh, 2013), and supportive organizational development and identification (He, Zhu, & Zheng, 2014) are also organizational antecedents. Finally, job control, demands, clarity of goals (Inoue et al., 2013), structural empowerment (De Braine & Roodt, 2011), and career resources, as defined by the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), are organizational antecedents of employee engagement. There are many intricate individual and organizational antecedents of employee engagement, and “overall, these studies suggest that positive antecedents, such as job resources, positive psychological states and positive perceptions of leaders and organizations, are associated with higher levels of engagement” (Bailey et al., 2017, p. 40). Finally, the nature for the dynamic of the leader-employee relationship with employee engagement needs to be founded on healthy, goal-orientated partnerships; a relationship that is open, welcoming, transparent, and growth-focused promotes employee engagement.

Complexities and Ambiguities Associated with Organizational Interventions

Research has also shown complexities and ambiguities associated with organizational interventions and employee engagement (Jenkins & Delbridge, 2013). Self-care, as an organizational intervention, was found to have limited association with employee engagement (Kühnel & Sonnentag, 2011). Other organizational interventions, such as job resources (Ouweneel, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & van Wijhe, 2012), autonomy (Buys & Rothmann, 2010), and demands (Gan & Gan, 2014), had no association with employee engagement. Using two case studies of employee engagement, Jenkins and Delbridge (2013) investigated how organizational incentive tactics and compensation frameworks reflected “the different external contexts in which management operate[s] and their influence on management’s ability to promote a supportive internal context” (p. 2670). A continuum can be envisioned while investigating employee engagement. On one end of the continuum is “soft” engagement focused on the employees’ individual needs. On the other end of the continuum is “hard” employee engagement, “the explicit objective of gaining competitive advantage through increased employee productivity wherein employee engagement aims to directly increase employee effort to improve organizational performance” (Jenkins & Delbridge, 2013, p. 2670). Leaders can learn how to guide their teams towards a balanced atmosphere in the middle of the continuum where the needs of engaged employees are met, therefore leading to increased organizational engagement and performance.

The ways that leaders address interpersonal relationships within internal and external contexts significantly affect how institutions work together and the potential for developing employee engagement (Jenkins & Delbridge, 2013). The scholars indicated

how “insights drawn from these particular cases can inform more systematic research approaches which examine the internal and external conditions and the range of management practices which operate as a continuum from softer to harder approaches to engagement” (Jenkins & Delbridge, 2013, p. 2688). While Jenkins and Delbridge (2013) offered unique observations regarding the fundamental obstacles to develop soft employee-based and hard institutional performance-based employee engagement, the importance of research investigating the antecedents of employee engagement is suggested in this work.

Kühnel and Sonnentag (2011) reviewed the long-term effects of taking vacations on the work-related engagement and well-being of German primary-school educators. The researchers used data gained through surveys completed once before and three times following the educators’ holidays. The research suggested that self-care in the form of vacation time significantly enhanced short-term, work-related engagement and notably decreased the educators’ burnout. These results did not last longer than four weeks. The main limitations of this study were the self-reported data, the lack of a control group, and the limited generalizability of the results. Kühnel and Sonnentag (2011) indicated that further research needs to be undertaken to examine how organizational factors, such as the provision of vacation time, influence employee-engagement outcomes in educational contexts.

Ouweneel et al. (2012) reviewed the possibility of positive individual connections among uplifting thoughts, optimism, day-to-day work-related engagement and vigor, dedication, and absorption. The authors utilized the broaden-and-build theory and affective events theory while collecting data through a diary questionnaire completed

twice a day for 5 days by 59 participants who were employed by a university in the Netherlands. The “broaden-and-build theory [is named for the] . . . positive emotions [that] appear to broaden peoples’ momentary thought-action repertoires and build their enduring personal resources” (Fredrickson, 2004, p. 1369). The “Affective Events Theory (AET) is a psychological model designed to explain the connection between emotions and feelings in the workplace and job performance, job satisfaction and behaviors” (Wilkinson, 2017, p. 202). Ouweneel et al. (2012) suggested that uplifting thoughts had a mediated influence on the degree of vigor, dedication, and absorption through optimism over extended time. The main limitation of this research resulted from the use of self-reports while evaluating uplifting thoughts, confidence and vigor, dedication, and absorption. The scholars indicated that more extensive research needs to investigate the different antecedents and outcomes of vigor, dedication, and absorption individually.

Decreased Levels of Employee Engagement

Detrimental actions on behalf of administrators (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012), conflict and harassment (Cogin & Fish, 2009), and abusive leaders (Sulea et al., 2012) are associated with decreased levels of employee engagement. Workload issues (Rickard et al., 2012), flexible working arrangements (Brummelhuis, Bakker, Hetland, & Keulemans, 2012), and telecommuting (Sardeshmukh et al., 2012) are associated with decreased levels of employee engagement. The infringement on psychological contracts (Bal, Kooij, & De Jong, 2013), failed (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2013) and transactional agreements (Yeh, 2012), as well as misappropriations (Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010) is also associated with decreased levels of employee engagement. I discuss the outcomes of employee engagement in the next section.

Outcomes

Individual

Like antecedents, the outcomes of employee engagement can also be divided into two categories: individual and organizational. The most salient individual outcomes for employee engagement include happiness (Høigaard, Giske, & Sundsli, 2012), relationship satisfaction (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014), relief from stress and burnout (Buys & Rothmann, 2010), and life fulfillment (Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kubota, & Kawakami, 2012). Other significant individual results of employee engagement include harmonious work-life balance (Singh, Chang, & Dika, 2010), physical health (Sonntag, Mojza, Binnewies, & Scholl, 2008), psychological health (Torp, Grimsmo, Hagen, Duran, & Gudbergsson, 2013), motivation (Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013), coping skills (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009), increased capabilities (Mache, Danzer, Klapp, & Groneberg, 2013), job satisfaction (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013), and work performance (Bakker, Tims, & Derts, 2012).

Bakker et al. (2012) analyzed an enthusiastic temperament as a forecaster of work-related engagement. They utilized information gathered from 190 individuals (65% female, 17% in supervisory positions, and 50% with at least a bachelor's degree) with an average age of 38 years and an average of 6 years serving in their organization. Participants worked an average of 36 hours in different roles, including "teaching, tax office, city hall, general practice" as well as roles at "career agency, consultancy, recruitment and selection and shop" (Bakker et al., 2012, p. 1366). The study investigated how an individual's temperament affected people's career development, employee engagement, and success. These scholars suggested that individuals who enthusiastically

adapt to and align with their work will remain engaged and will execute at high levels, although the authors also acknowledged that research needs to be extended into other contexts and situations.

Organizational

As stated earlier, leadership is a primary organizational antecedent for employee engagement. While striving to increase the levels of employee engagement, leaders have strengthened safety, efficiency, and economic performance (Soane et al., 2012) while decreasing turnover intentions and increasing organizational commitment (Hu, Schaufeli, & Taris, 2011). While striving to improve the levels of employee engagement, leaders have also reached overarching organizational objectives (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002) and developed organizational citizenship behaviors (Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012).

Harter et al. (2002) analyzed the connection between employee engagement and desired outcomes by using data gained through a meta-analysis of 7,939 departments in 36 organizations (financial, manufacturing, retail, services, transportation, and public utilities). Harter et al. (2002) looked at “the relationship at the business-unit level between satisfaction engagement and the business-unit outcomes of customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover, and accidents” (p. 268) and found that “employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organizations and that these correlations generalize across companies” (p. 276).

Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) investigated the connection between organizational citizenship behavior and employee engagement. They utilized quantitative data gathered from 522 junior employees with bachelor’s degrees who were working in non-managerial

roles (52.5% female, 25-29 years of age with 8.76 years of employment at the organizations) for four organizations in Thailand in order to better understand individual perceptions about human-resource development (HRD) strategies. These organizations, indicative of significant and recognized employers, included two public and two private companies. Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) found a positive connection among employee engagement and all elements of organizational citizenship behaviors: altruism, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and conscientiousness. The link was most significant for the civic-virtue element of organizational citizenship behavior. These scholars also found that “there is a positive relationship between employee engagement, perceptions of HRD practices . . . [including] organizational support, access to HRD opportunities, support for HRD opportunities, perceived benefits of training, and formal career management support” (pp. 159-160). Finally, Rurkkhum and Bartlett called for further research, away from Thailand, on the implications of organizational citizenship behavior that is associated with performance and outcomes for individuals who carry out organizational citizenship behavior.

In this dissertation, I targeted employee engagement as defined by Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017). The next section further explains Shuck, Osam, et al.’s (2017) operational definition and Shuck, Adelson, and Reio’s (2017) employee engagement scale (EES) alongside other recent and salient developments in the field of employee engagement.

Salient Developments in the Field of Employee Engagement

As mentioned above, recent developments in the field of employee engagement have included clarifying the definitions, types, and the positionalities of employee engagement as well as the development of an assessment, coined the employee

engagement scale (EES), by Shuck, Adelson, & Reio (2017). In the following sections, I describe the salient scholarship while explaining what this research contributes to the field of employee engagement.

In the first of the recent developments in employee engagement, Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) made a significant advancement in the field with the further development of the distinct operational definition of employee engagement: “a positive, active, work-related psychological state operationalized by the maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral energy” (p. 269). In this article, the scholars utilized a two-stage review of the literature while comparing scholarly definitions, frameworks, and assessments with their new operationalized definition of employee engagement.

All the definitions and categorized alternative types provided by Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) can be utilized while investigating employee engagement. The authors attested that many others in the field have not used established definitions for employee engagement and that this situation has created a conflated and confusing understanding of the terms related to employee engagement. Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) elaborated, “[C]onsequently, employee engagement is misunderstood and, at times, misused. Misunderstanding and misuse have limited the applicability of employee engagement in theory building and practice as well as stifled the maturation of the construct in the human resource field” (p. 264).

Due to this common misunderstanding and misuse, Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) called for more disciplined work using employee-engagement terms, assessments, and frameworks. The authors made it very clear that employee engagement is a unique, stand-alone construct with an accompanying frame and evaluation; people should only use a

definition of employee engagement that is in distinct alignment with the correct assessment and framework. The authors “note[d] (and point[ed] interested readers to) the recent development of the Employee Engagement Scale (cf. Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017), a measurement tool grounded within the definitional and conceptual positioning of employee engagement offered throughout” in their review (Shuck, Osam, et al., 2017, p. 279).

The scholarship provided by Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) advanced my understanding of employee engagement and all the accompanying terms, definitions, assessments, and frameworks. The work called out many accomplished scholars, including themselves, for being confused and misusing employee engagement-related definitions, assessments, and frameworks over the years. My study utilized the scholarship provided by Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) to navigate the investigation of the employee engagement for faculty members with disabilities who are serving in higher education. My work maintained a keen focus on clarity of the concept.

Shuck, Adelson, and Reio (2017) covered the employee engagement scale (EES) while offering explanations about construct validity, the extent to which a test examines what it professes to investigate, and the implications for theory and practice related to this newly developed measure. The EES, a 3-dimensional, 12-item measure of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral factors, was created by two researchers: one academic and one from the private sector. These researchers conducted four individual studies aimed at developing the measure with the final test evaluating incremental validity to learn if the evaluation will enhance the predictive capability past what is rendered by current

assessment modes (Martínez-Domínguez, Penadés, Segura, González-Rodríguez, & Catalán, 2015; Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017).

Employee engagement was distinctly defined in context with the EES “as a positive, active psychological state” (Shuck et al., 2016, p. 209). While developing and validating the EES alongside other employee-engagement scales, Shuck, Adelson, and Reio (2017) positioned and distinguished the definition of employee engagement from different employee-engagement concepts. The authors offered that, because of concept redundancy and due to the overuse of quantitatively investigating the work-related mindsets of vigor, dedication, and absorption, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale should no longer be the absolute measure implemented when studying employee engagement. Shuck, Adelson, and Reio (2017) described the EES as the first and only measurement aligned with a distinct definition and framework for employee engagement. Like the UWES, a measure utilized by most researchers investigating employee engagement in higher education, people can also use the EES with a seemingly exact line and overarching connection to the field of employee engagement.

Shuck et al. (2016) examined the Job Demands-Resource (JD-R) model through a privilege and power lens, focusing on four questions: “(a) Who controls the framework of work? (b) Who determines the experience of engagement? (c) Who defines the value of engagement? and (d) Who benefits from high levels of engagement?” (p. 210). Shuck et al. offered the pathways to (dis)engagement, eight propositions about how engagement is not always equitably accessible in every circumstance, and an essential conceptual framework while contrasting, framing, and discussing the crucial intersections of employee engagement, privilege, and power. Because they “operationalize the symbolic

nature of resources and demands as socially constructed perceptions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability explored through privilege and power,” these scholars asserted that “resources and demands are relevant in a subjective context” (Shuck et al., 2016, p. 212). The scholars further explained that employees and organizations mutually benefit from employee engagement, but organizations have control over the systems that influence the privilege and power needed for employee engagement. Shuck et al. (2016) contended that organizations which desire high levels of employee engagement must address the manifestations of privilege and power.

Shuck et al.’s (2016) conceptual model is useful for my study given my focus on individuals who are embedded in a particular context. The authors wrote:

[E]ngagement manifests itself through positive and negative self-perceptions nested within the context and identification of an employee’s work identity . . . the idea that despite widespread desire for high levels of engagement within an organization, engagement may actually not be possible in all places and at all times in equal parts. Unfortunately, for those outside positions of power [such as individuals with disabilities], engagement is a state of privilege they are simply unable to experience. It is, after all, a mark of privilege for an employee to be in a position to even ask questions regarding their experience . . . not to mention reflect on their own personal levels of employee engagement. (Shuck et al., 2016, pp. 222-223)

Shuck and associates (2016) described privilege and power in a context and manner that aligns with how I have investigated the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities who are serving in higher education.

Collins and Rocco (2018) utilized a phenomenological approach “to provide a ‘queered’ understanding of gay male law enforcement officers’ (LEOs’) employee engagement (EE), to improve performance and inclusion for all LEOs” (p. 273). Collins and Rocco highlighted how hyper-masculine groups, like the police, have historically enabled masculine and heteronormative cultures and, therefore, have limited gay men’s potential to reach peak states of employee engagement. Collins and Rocco contended that the employee engagement of gay, male police officers had been blocked based on the degree to which individuals believed that they were protected when open about their sexuality. The authors asserted that uplifting emotion towards coming out about their sexuality leads to higher levels of employee engagement. Further,

being in the closet or being involuntarily outed produced feelings of isolation and disengagement, whereas framing coming out as beneficial for social interactions and positive perceptions of competency was important as officers made meaning of their experiences with being engaged. (Collins & Rocco, 2018, p. 290).

The scholarship offered by Collins and Rocco (2018) was useful while forming my study because the research established the ability to shape a positive mindset about coming out with a minoritized identity as essential towards the development of healthy and productive interpersonal career connections. Like the scholarship of Shuck et al. (2016), the critical scholarly work of Collins and Rocco (2018) aligned with how I investigated the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities who were serving in higher education.

As with the study of Collins and Rocco (2018), Sambrook’s (2016) autoethnography was particularly useful to consider for its qualitative contributions to

employee-engagement research. This scholarship was useful to my study because Sambrook (2016) pointed out how a qualitative “approach harnesses both the experiences of those involved in HRM [engagement] and the researcher’s experiences and interpretations to elicit richer, layered insights. Such nuanced understanding can help facilitate more appropriate, realistic HR interventions [engagement]” (pp. 42-43). Sambrook also laid out qualitative research methods in a context and manner that aligned with how I qualitatively investigated the “highly personal HR phenomena” of employee engagement for faculty members with disabilities who are serving in higher education (p. 57). The constructs furnished by Sambrook (2016)

illustrate (evocatively) from personal examples how and why . . . [qualitative research] is an entirely appropriate alternative method to penetrate and illuminate otherwise neglected unique, emotional experiences of HRM [engagement]. . . . [Qualitative research] captures both the individual and social nature of HR concepts [engagement] and enables the researcher’s voice and experience to complement (but not dominate) the participants’. This synthesis elicits richer, layered, more nuanced insights that can help facilitate more appropriate, realistic HR interventions related to the PC [psychological contract] and EE [employee engagement]. (p. 57)

The qualitative scholarship provided by Sambrook (2016) draws attention to the need to consider overlooked viewpoints while conveying the cultural, as well as personal, traits of employee engagement. Like Sambrook, I consider how to support employee engagement.

Uniqueness and Conceptual Boundaries of Employee Engagement as Compared to Other Associated Constructs

While comparatively examining employee engagement alongside other associated constructs, scholars have envisioned the novel characteristics of this concept while settling conceptual boundaries (Bartlett, Quast, Paetzel, & Aroonsri, 2017). These associated constructs have included job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior (Meyer, 2017; Saks & Gruman, 2014). In this section, I define each associated construct while explaining the similarity and uniqueness of employee engagement. I consider the criticisms, embedded in academic contexts, for using employee engagement to study employee behavior. I describe why my study was focused on employee engagement.

Job Satisfaction

While developing and testing “a conceptual model of the joint effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on two outcome variables: motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention” (p. 295), Egan, Yang, and Bartlett (2004) cited Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992), asserting that “job satisfaction is typically defined as an employee’s affective reactions to a job based on comparing desired outcomes with actual outcomes” (p. 283). The focus on investigating this concept began to flourish in the 1930s because of the belief that “happy workers are productive workers” and that an organization’s competitiveness requires it to retain workers (Meyer, 2017, p. 87). Employee engagement, an advanced motivational concept, is distinct from job satisfaction because engagement is found to hold unique connections with an individual’s drive (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter 2011; Rich et al., 2010; Saks & Gruman, 2014).

Job satisfaction, an analysis of an individual's level of happiness at work, fails to gauge the amount of energy an individual is prepared to exhaust at work, whereas employee engagement views the individual's levels of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral energy, exerted at their discretion, which are devoted to the work. Therefore, job satisfaction is unique to employee engagement because this associated construct offers

a broad, attitudinal outcome, like organizational loyalty or pride . . . [Job satisfaction] is hard to act on, and some facets of satisfaction are irrelevant to performance. Engagement, on the other hand, predicts satisfaction, as well as many different concrete business outcomes. (Blizzard, 2004, para. 1)

Finally, job satisfaction relates to employee engagement because both concepts share the overarching retention goal, but employee engagement, with a distinct focus on an employee's involvement, investment, and productivity, differs from job satisfaction. Due to the criticisms explained above, the focus on job satisfaction moved towards organizational commitment in the 1970s (Meyer, 2017).

Organizational Commitment

According to Bartlett (2001), "organizational commitment refers to a person's type and strength of attachment to" his/her/their institution (p. 336). Furthermore, Chaudhuri and Bartlett (2014) asserted that Meyer and Allen's (1991) representation of organizational commitment with its focus on three aspects—*affective*, *continuance*, and *normative*—may have provided the greatest scholarly development regarding the concept's distinction. Organizational commitment has a clear focus on "implications for retention," yet "concerns about organizational commitment began to wane in the 1990s as

trends toward downsizing, outsourcing, and contract work made employer/employee relationships more tenuous” (Meyer, 2017, p. 90).

Employee engagement and organizational commitment have much in common and the conditions that contribute to one are likely to contribute to the other. However, they can have unique effects on behavior . . . [because] . . . engagement might be more important when high levels of performance, creativity, or innovation are a priority, whereas affective commitment to the organization might be of greater importance when long-term retention or buy-in to broader organizational goals and values are keys to organizational effectiveness. (Meyer, 2017, p. 91)

Reinforcement about the unique nature and utility of employee engagement is supported when comparisons with organizational commitment and job involvement are made, consequently displaying novel associations with the constructs’ precursors and consequences (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Saks & Gruman, 2014).

Finally, like much of the scholarship in this vein, the relationship between organizational commitment and employee engagement is unclear. Organizational commitment is seemingly intertwined with employee engagement because both concepts share overarching retention goals; organizational commitment differs from employee engagement by targeting organizational buy-in, retention, goals, and effectiveness, whereas employee engagement focuses on elevated performance.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as “discretionary job performance . . . that goes beyond formal job requirements, [and] is increasingly important to the

achievement of organizational goals and performance” (Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012, p. 158). Moreover, scholars have “found support for the positive relationship between engagement and organizational citizenship behavior” (Sullivan et al., 2015, p. 3), elevating levels of organizational citizenship behaviors (Bartlett et al., 2017; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2018). Finally, while focusing on production for an individual’s work role, employee engagement drives the organizational citizenship behavior’s overarching concentration on the voluntary actions needed to not quit and to exceed the organizational work expectations (Saks, 2006). My study has a clear focus on employee engagement. Utilizing the results of this study, future research could investigate cognitive, emotional, and behavioral energy as well as the organizational citizenship behaviors of faculty members with disabilities.

In summary, the overarching definitions and utilization of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior can all be linked to the overall employee-engagement concept to some extent. One could make sound arguments for all four constructs while developing an investigation that is centered on faculty members with disabilities who are serving in higher education. I utilized employee engagement because it encompasses the essence of a faculty member’s work role: emotion, discretionary energy, high levels of individual performance, function, imagination, innovation, and production. See Appendix B for a conceptual model that gives further explanation about the uniqueness and conceptual boundaries of employee engagement compared to other associated constructs.

Acknowledgment and Consideration of the Interrelatedness Between the Key Constructs Related to Employee Engagement

There has been scholarly contention around employee engagement's definition and utility as associated with other pre-existing concepts. The conflict has led to the indictment and defense of the employee-engagement concept within an academic context. In this section, I explore the contention (Saks, 2008), lower-level positioning (Newman, Joseph, & Hulin, 2010), and the indictment of employee engagement (Newman, Joseph, Sparkman, & Carpenter, 2011). I also explore the rebuttals for these three viewpoints (Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017; Shuck, Zigarmi, & Owen, 2015).

Old Wine in a New Bottle and the A-Factor

The contentious sentiment around employee engagement has been most eloquently described with some variation of the phrase "old wine in a new bottle" (Saks, 2008, p. 40). In response to the contention, Newman and associates (2010, 2011) positioned employee engagement under an A-factor, "operationalized as a higher-order factor that accounts for the shared variance of the well-established constructs of job satisfaction (JS), job involvement (JI), and organizational commitment (OC; e.g., job attitudes)" (Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017, p. 80). Utilizing a

meta-analytic procedure, Newman, Joseph, and Hulin (2010) presented evidence that the relations between employee engagement (via the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale [UWES]) and JS, OC, and JI indicated that attitudinal engagement correlated .77 with the A-factor (the higher-order factor of JS, JI, and OC). Resultantly, Newman et al. (2010; Newman et al., 2011) suggested that this

high correlation was evidence of questionable nomological network overlap between engagement and job attitudes. (Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017, p. 80)

Jangle Fallacy Indictment

In support of the A-factor, employee engagement has been indicted with what has been most eloquently described as the “jangle [fallacy] indictment” (Newman et al., 2011, p. 38). The jangle fallacy indictment is centered on claiming that employee engagement is a superfluous state of mind, with an underlying nomological network that is redundant with pre-existing concepts (Newman et al., 2011). Newman et al. (2011) believed, “the UWES employee engagement measure appears to primarily tap the overlapping variance among job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and job involvement” (p. 41). In the next section, I address Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi’s (2017) rebuttal.

Shuck and Associates’ Rebuttal

In one of the most salient articles to address these nebulous issues, Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) analyzed the predictive nomological validity of employee engagement by employing the three job attitudes previously investigated by Newman et al. (2011): job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) suggested that “implications of the Newman et al. (2011) jangle fallacy indictment raise serious concerns and call into question the nomological network of engagement” (p. 80). To address Newman et al.’s (2011) concerns and questions, Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) utilized figures acquired by correlations (subscale-level and scale-level) that were extracted from a collection of electronic survey feedback from pre-existing research. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi’s research and rebuttal

to Newman et al.'s (2011) claims were centered on breaking the variability related to employee engagement down into the component levels while linking all conceivable permutations of Newman et al.'s three predictors for job attitudes: job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017)

examine[d] the credibility of the Newman et al.'s (2010; Newman et al., 2011) engagement jangle fallacy claim as well as position[ed] a potential nomological network of engagement . . . [while drawing] from propositions previously forwarded by Shuck et al. (2013) who presented a detailed theoretical overview and conceptual model of a proposed nomological network between engagement, JS, JI, and OC . . . [and] examined the nomological networks that JI, JS, and OC concurrently shared with engagement by positioning engagement as a dependent variable and exploring both unique and joint common variance components concurrently . . . [and asserted that,] although we know from the Newman et al. (2010) study that after correcting for the attenuation caused by modeling JS, JI, and OC as a single factor that 59% of the variance in UWES was explained by the A-factor, we do not know how the individual job attitudes either individually or in combination contributed toward shared variance, despite the claim. (pp. 82-83)

Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) asserted that the alignment of engagement within an empirical nomological network remains ambiguous because breaking down the variance demands critiques that are unavailable in Newman et al.'s (2011) work. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) went on to point out that “two core issues linger within the

Newman et al. (2010; Newman et al., 2011) jangle indictment: (a) engagement as a redundant attitude and (b) empirical nomological network overlap” (p. 82).

Doubt about employee engagement as an essential stand-alone mindset continues to be a vital question for scholars and practitioners. To answer if employee engagement is a quantifiable mindset, which is unique to job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment either separately or perhaps in various hybrid versions, research is required to consider Newman et al.’s (2011) claim regarding the jangle fallacy. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) assert that research should be aimed towards empirically assessing nomological network convergence and the chance that engagement is found to be distinguishable within a nomological network.

Revealing this query’s indications demands an empirical examination of statistical parallels, with employee engagement as a dependent variable. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) noted that a focus on investigating the relationships of employee engagement with job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment is imperative. To achieve these aims, Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi reviewed the results from an electronic survey targeting the nine-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9), the job engagement scale (JES) offered by Rich et al. (2010), and job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) found that job satisfaction offered the most significant distinctive variance when one examines each element compared to employee engagement. In contrast, the job-involvement and organizational-commitment elements succeeded. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) also found:

across both scales (UWES-9 and JES) . . . [one] can empirically comment on the jangle indictment proposed by Newman et al. (2010; Newman et al., 2011) . . . [as the] models [offered], no first-order, second-order, or third-order commonality coefficients fully account[ing] for, stand-alone or in combination, all the variance in the two engagement measures. (p. 98)

While empirically charting these nomological networks, Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) found that employee engagement and job satisfaction

- are unique and yet linked;
- satisfaction is a crucial element of engagement;
- satisfaction lends itself to projecting engagement;
- satisfaction exclusively relates to an overall and universal work-related notion centered on gratification;
- satisfaction embraces the same variance as engagement while being operationalized as an equivalent aspect of work;
- however, satisfaction functions uniquely with regards to outcomes.

Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) found that employee engagement and job involvement are linked when focusing on cognition. They also argued that employee engagement and organizational commitment share embedded elements, but must be comprehended with distinction. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) went on to state that there is

a substantial amount of unexplained variance in each measurement, 47% of the variance remains unexplained in the JES, and 34% of the variance remains unexplained in the UWES-9, suggesting that the measures with different names

examined in this work actually measured different constructs, lending support for debunking the engagement jangle fallacy. (p. 98)

Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) stressed

- the way people regard work, as well as the way of life inside their workplace, affects the quantity of effort and time invested;
- before implementing employee engagement, in all settings and sectors, attention must always be applied while identifying the scale which will span and link similar concepts; and
- future research should center on unitizing a priori methods which empirically unwind different engagement viewpoints.

The main limitations of Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi's (2017) article included

- comparisons restricted to the three specific collections of job attitude and employee-engagement criteria employed throughout the initial pre-existing examination, and
- descriptive data acquired from a private-sector management training organization.

Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) recognized that the degree of the relationships in this research varied from average to significant. In general, these scholars described substantial variance among job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, and employee engagement. However, they acknowledged:

although the correlations in . . . [their] study were based on a fairly robust sample (n = 1,580), the collective literature regarding high correlations between the job attitudes (e.g., the A-factor; Newman et al., 2010) and engagement is based on

tens of thousands of individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds. (Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017, p. 102)

Ultimately, Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017) provided a clear indication that employee engagement is not an overarching expression. Instead, the scholars described employee engagement as a particular concept possessing a one-of-a-kind definition and a theoretical framework. Their scholarship provided verification about the significance of empirically evaluating the nomological networks of employee engagement. These scholars enhanced the study of and theoretical insight about employee engagement. Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi also made it easier for engagement professionals to utilize highly accurate procedures. In the next section, I address a new short-form guide.

A Short-Form Employee-Engagement Guide

In the most recent and salient piece to address employee engagement, Shuck (2019) offered scholars and practitioners a distinct guide that was forged from the ever-changing research on engagement. While Shuck acknowledged how employee engagement has evolved, he further asserted how there is ambiguity regarding how employee engagement endures, notwithstanding the investigation and subsequent application advancements. While addressing and clarifying the meaning of employee engagement and the hands-on application measures, Shuck identified essential research, principles, and concepts. Furthermore, while guiding thinkers through diverse philosophical strategies, he pointed to and created connections among the latest and most-salient studies. With a target of further innovation towards employee-engagement investigation, he offered clear pathways to follow when contemplating how the nebulous

employee-engagement theories can enlighten application and create new paths for potential studies.

Ultimately, Shuck's (2019) text echoes his earlier work (both alone and with his many associates), all of which has been applied to my study and future plans. Shuck (2019) verified the significance of evaluating employee engagement. Once again, Shuck further evolved the course of, and theoretical insight about, employee engagement. He offered a seminal guide to make the comprehension and utilization of employee engagement easier for researchers and practitioners. In the next section, I address my selection of employee engagement for this study.

The Selection of Employee Engagement for My Study

Employee engagement is a dynamically fluid concept that encompasses numerous elements. The overarching definitions and utilization of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior can all be linked to the overall employee-engagement concept. These constructs stand alone from employee engagement, "a unique framework . . . [which is conceptually] . . . speaking . . . not synonymous with anything else, nor is it empirically redundant" (Shuck, Osam, et al., 2017, p. 283).

In this study, I used employee engagement instead of job satisfaction because employee engagement focuses on emotional loyalty while applying discretionary energy, whereas satisfaction centers on contentment. Although the targets of organizational commitment (buy-in, organizational retention, goals, and effectiveness) align with employee engagement, I used employee engagement instead of organizational commitment because employee engagement focuses on high levels of individual

performance while fulfilling a function with imagination towards innovation, the essence of the faculty member's role. Employee engagement focuses on production while in work roles. In contrast, organizational citizenship behavior, a seemingly later stage/outcome of employee engagement, centers on the voluntary actions needed to exceed work expectations.

My study was centered on how employee engagement can help faculty members with disabilities become more engaged. I defined employee engagement using Shuck, Osam, et al.'s (2017) operational definition: "a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy" (p. 269). This definition was utilized because of the extensive vetting and groundwork research offered by Shuck, Adelson, and Reio (2017); Shuck, Nimon, and Zigarmi (2017); and Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017). These scholars brought clarity and conceptual distinction to the employee-engagement concept, and the research's validity focused on engagement. In the next section, I consider employee engagement for higher education.

Employee Engagement in Higher Education

To better understand and to maximize the contributions of their faculty, higher-education institutions have focused on employee engagement (Deligero & Laguador, 2014). Deligero and Laguador (2014) used data obtained with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale in order to evaluate the work-related engagement of administrators and faculty members who were working at Philippine universities. These researchers aimed to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender and length of service in the university; to determine the level of work-related

engagement in terms of vigor, dedication and absorption; to test the differences on the level of respondents' work-related engagement when they are grouped according to profile; to determine the overall employee performance of colleges and support services and to analyze the relationship between work engagement and work unit's performance. (Deligero & Laguador, 2014, p. 909)

The study found that married individuals over the age of 40, with high performance-evaluation ratings, were highly dedicated, even if their dedication was not always applied to elevated levels of performance. Deligero and Laguador (2014) indicated that job resources predicted vigor and dedication while job demands only forecasted dedication, which is positively associated with job security. Future research should include the integration of the burnout function and the addition of meaningfulness, safety, and availability as components by which job demands and job resources influence work-related engagement (Deligero & Laguador, 2014).

In a large-scale, university study, Langford (2010) compared the work standards and outcomes found in academia with results from over 2,000 primarily private-industry organizations (construction, leisure, and small-/medium-sized businesses). The researcher utilized the voice climate survey which was found to be "a well-validated and normed employee survey that measures 31 work practices" focused on empowering employees with a voice, echoing their feelings towards comprehensive organizational plans (Langford, 2010, p. 46). The research, concentrating on the feedback gathered from just over 26,000 participants working at 17 universities in Australia, agreed with earlier studies indicating that the work-related strain experienced by people in academia is more

intense when compared to the stress encountered by individuals working in different industries (Langford, 2010).

When comparing the results related to the components of employee engagement, Langford (2010) learned that university employees were more stressed and had lower component levels of wellness, involvement with decision making, availability of adequate facilities, resources, technology, clarity, efficiency of processes, cross-unit cooperation, and work-life balance when compared to other organizations. On a more positive note, Langford found that universities were equal to other public organizations when it came to effectively managing change. There were higher component levels of commitment; job satisfaction; employee retention; healthy and productive relationships between coworkers; role clarity; and confidence in organizational purpose, beliefs, values and mission, and collegiality at universities when compared to other organizations.

Langford (2010) stated:

[V]ery high levels of reported stress were observed . . . [although this] study did not find significant differences between universities and other large public-sector organizations with regards to involvement in decision making, leadership skills, rewards and recognition or day-to-day resourcing. Given these practices appear equivalent across universities and other large public-sector organizations, yet universities score more poorly in stress levels, the current study suggests alternative policy priorities. Current results point toward the need to develop and modernize university facilities, redesign operational processes, and improve horizontal cooperation and coordination between academic faculties and with operational divisions. (p. 51)

Langford's (2010) examination of the employee engagement, satisfaction, and productivity of university employees indicates that further research needs to create a more detailed familiarity with the effect of modifying work standards for employee stress, absenteeism, turnover, and productivity.

Selmer, Jonasson, and Lauring (2013) reviewed connections among trust, conflict, and the employee engagement of people working within large intercultural academic departments. The authors utilized data obtained by surveying nearly 500 academics who were working within natural sciences in Denmark. The researchers' focus was "on assessing the effect of group trust, group relational conflict and group task conflict on indicators of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement" (Selmer et al., 2013, p. 96). The scholars found that group trust was positively associated with employee engagement and that conflict was negatively associated with engagement. These findings led the authors to define employee engagement "as a positive, fulfilling yet pervasive and persistent cognitive state of mind" (Selmer et al., 2013, p. 97) and to call for more research focused on the intricacies of group conflict and employee engagement in academia.

Rothmann and Jordaan (2006) used data gained through a stratified random sample to examine "the work engagement of academics in selected South African higher education institutions as well as the impact of job demands and job resources on their work engagement" (p. 87). The research with 471 academics from all educational backgrounds focused on evaluating employee engagement with the Job Demands-Resources model as well as the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. These scholars learned that "at least three aspects should be addressed to increase the work-related engagement

of academics in higher education institutions, namely growth opportunities in the job, organizational support, and advancement opportunities” (Rothmann & Jordaan, 2006, p. 95).

Engaged faculty members have increased levels of physical and emotional well-being as well as higher levels of performance and production, yet only 34% of college and university faculty members are positively and productively engaged (Flaherty, 2015). According to Jaschik and Lederman (2015), tenure-track faculty members, as well as individuals at small, private colleges and universities, are more inclined to be engaged than their counterparts in non-tenure track positions or at larger institutions. Importantly, disengaged faculty members who are worried about benefits, pay, positional security, and their academic freedom remain productive but may bring down the department’s morale (Jaschik & Lederman, 2015). Much like the studies above is the nebulous and dynamic nature of the experiences, challenges, and consequences for faculty members with disabilities, as explained in the next section.

Experiences and Challenges for Faculty Members with Disabilities

My research focused on determining the factors that lead to the engagement or disengagement of faculty members with disabilities. The National Center for College Students with Disabilities (NCCSD) reported that 4% of the faculty members in higher education have a disability (Grigely, 2017). The National Science Foundation (NSF) reported that approximately 7.3% of individuals with doctorates at 4-year colleges and universities who were working within science, engineering, and health reported having a disability (Franke, Bérubé, O’Neil, & Kurland, 2012). This rate varied by the level of career advancement: 9.7% of the tenured faculty members in the NSF study reported

having a disability while only 5.4% of the individuals who were still on the tenure track reported having a disability. The percentage of faculty members reporting a disability in the NSF study nearly doubled once the protection of tenure was in place.

Faculty members in higher education, like all other work populations, have all types of disabilities. The University of Minnesota Twin Cities reports that approximately 300 of 3,800 faculty members (7.8%) register and receive accommodations and services through the Disability Resource Center each year. The University of California at Berkeley (UCB) claims that only 1.5% of its full-time faculty members have reported having a disability (Grigely, 2017). Professionals in the disability field indicate how many faculty members with non-apparent disabilities choose not to disclose their disabilities due to the fear of negative judgments and career consequences.

Considering that nearly a quarter of the U.S. population has a disability, these figures indicate the apparent underrepresentation of faculty members with disabilities in higher education. While determining why this underrepresentation exists, it is important to emphasize that the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities is directly related to the critical institutional initiatives aimed at creating diverse and inclusive learning and working environments. Academic environments rely on the employees' high levels of cognitive energy (focus, concentration, effort, and attention), emotional energy (personal meaning; a sense of belonging; pride; and a belief in the mission, purpose, and future of their departments, colleges, and universities), and behavioral energy (exceeding expectations; pushing themselves beyond expectations; unsolicited extra effort; a team-based mindset; and a focus on helping their department, college, and university to be successful).

In an ideal scenario, the professional journey for faculty members with disabilities is mapped in five phases (Franke et al., 2012). The first step is self-acceptance. The next step is connecting, building trust, and creating a healthy working relationship and a bond with colleagues and administrators. The third step, creating transparency while bringing up disabilities to colleagues and administrators, leads to the fourth step of working with colleagues and administrators to define the essential work goals and functions that are needed in order to achieve academic objectives. After working with colleagues and administrators, faculty members with disabilities move into step five and map out the necessary accommodations (Franke et al., 2012).

The groundbreaking research offered by Price et al. (2017) was also salient to my study. Price et al. analyzed 36 interviews and 267 surveys as part of their groundbreaking research of faculty members with invisible disabilities. With a focus on maximum variation, these scholars interviewed faculty members who had various visible and invisible disabilities. The authors also surveyed faculty members who self-identified as living with invisible disabilities related to mental health. Recruitment for Price et al.'s (2017) study included contacting disability and human-resource offices at multiple institutions. The scholars also recruited participants while connecting with professional organizations and broadcasting messages that spanned many fields of study. These thinkers sought to assemble the unique and untold journeys, related to mental health, of faculty members with invisible disabilities.

The population for Price et al.'s (2017) study was primarily identified as white (93.3%), tenured (33.5%) individuals who identified as women (69.7%) and were serving at a graduate-level institution (73.3%). Of the participants who had disclosed, 46.8%

disclosed depression as their central disability; 37.5% disclosed anxiety as their central disability; 8.2% disclosed bipolar disorder as their central disability; and 4.5% disclosed attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder as their central disability.

The key themes that Price et al. (2017) found included how almost all participants who had invisible disabilities related to their mental health were unaware of the accommodations. These participants were not likely to seek out and to utilize accommodations. These individuals experienced favorable circumstances after disclosure. The study's participants experienced the most significant support from their partners, family, and friends/colleagues at the local and cosmopolitan levels (Price et al., 2017). The participants experienced limited support from their local health providers, administration, and professional organizations. Most participants were fearful of unfavorable academic consequences from their disclosure. Stigma and privacy were also prevalent concerns associated with disclosure. With the exclusion of disclosing to human resources, most participants believed that disclosure was worthwhile. Individuals who disclosed to students reported positive experiences (Price et al., 2017).

Price et al. (2017) explained that, to encourage familiarity with disability resources, campuses must institute infrastructure for dialogue regarding disability accommodations. These scholars acknowledged that systems for accommodating faculty members with disabilities are nebulous. These thinkers also pointed out how academic issues related to disabilities are commonly managed using an individualized approach.

Price et al. (2017) stressed that the facilitation of communication about issues related to disability in higher education must also entail establishing novel and uniform guidelines. Price et al. (2017) asserted:

[W]hen the attitude toward mental disability is uncertain or unclear, faculty members may be more conservative concerning sharing their mental disabilities with others. Wider attention to such issues among faculty—that is, systemic attention to making workplaces more accessible for mental disabilities—is a necessary step toward reducing the stigma associated with such disabilities. (p. 3)

These scholars acknowledged their study's limitations; their research failed to encompass all higher-education contexts while distinguishing the population of higher-education faculty members who had invisible disabilities related to mental illness (Price et al., 2017). Price et al. (2017) recognized how their study could have had a stronger focus on intersectionality. They admitted that they failed to recruit an adequate number of participants of color; individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, queer (LGBTQ); and men.

Ultimately, like my study, Price et al. (2017) provided a clear indication about the substantial amount of investigation ahead, such as research targeting the journeys of all employees with disabilities who are serving in academia. Similar to my research, the analysis offered by Price et al. showed how, with support, faculty members with disabilities have overcome obstacles along their journeys. Finally, while investigating the support for disclosure and the utilization of disability accommodations, Price et al. and I illustrated the limitations and gaps in the higher-education system.

Non-inclusive cultures, power, unearned privilege, microaggressions, disclosure, and accommodations all influence employment relationships as well as the employee-engagement experiences for faculty members with disabilities in higher education (Shuck

et al., 2016). The minoritized identities of faculty members with disabilities also influence their experiences.

Non-Inclusive Cultures

Self-acceptance of a disability can be daunting for anyone, especially for individuals who are striving to create a career in a competitive academic environment (Grigely, 2017). As Evans et al. (2017) asserted:

Structural norms, as well as formal organizational policies and practices, can be barriers to the full inclusion and success of staff and faculty with disabilities.

Some of these are institution-level concerns; others play out across institutions and are discipline or job category concerns. (p. 206)

Misconceptions from administrators, colleagues, staff, and students related to limitations and reasonable accommodations make the self-acceptance, trust, connection, building of transparency, and defining-goals portions of the journey even more arduous for faculty members with disabilities (Harpur, 2014). Many non-disabled administrators lack education related to disability and accommodation, and they do not see disabilities as part of the comprehensive and critical institutional initiatives that are aimed at increasing equity, diversity, and inclusion (Basas, 2009). Finally, among the salient obstacles towards the inclusion of individuals with disabilities are strategies aimed at developing rigid workflow criteria that target volume while exclusively focusing on non-adjustable methods for executing work (Evans et al., 2017; Price, 2011).

Power, Unearned Privilege, and Microaggressions

Disclosure of a disability is required for faculty members to receive formal institutional accommodations (Rocco et al., 2014). Power and unearned privilege are

revealed when faculty members are required to disclose their disabilities (Shuck et al., 2016). “As employees disclose their disability . . . co-workers may view them as different, and with diminished capabilities, despite any earned privilege they may have, such as education or rank” (Shuck et al., 2016, p. 214). Faculty members with power and unearned privilege are not required to travel the same path as people who experience microaggressions. Thus, these privileged individuals can possess higher levels of employee engagement (Shuck et al., 2016; Sue & Sue, 2012). Challenging how power, unearned privilege, and microaggressions lead to different experiences for various groups of faculty members can increase the employee engagement for these marginalized educators by eliminating stigma (Collins & Rocco, 2018). Non-inclusive cultures, power, privilege, microaggressions, disclosure, and accommodations all influence employment relationships and experiences.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I focused on the definition, framework, assessment, antecedents, and outcomes of employee engagement. I discussed salient developments, and the uniqueness, boundaries, and interrelatedness of the concept. I addressed Shuck and associates’ rebuttal to others’ criticisms of the concept as well as Shuck’s new employee-engagement guide. I discussed why I framed my study around employee engagement. I offered a review of employee engagement in higher education. I concluded this chapter with a review of the experiences, challenges, and consequences for faculty members with disabilities.

Employee engagement is “a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and

behavioral energy” (Shuck, Osam, et al., 2017, p. 269). The promotion of employee engagement is multifaceted, with different attributes and guiding tactics concentrated on building an environment to engender the formation of that engagement. Employee engagement occurs when individuals dedicate their cognitive, emotional, and behavioral energy towards organizational objectives. Although some higher-education research has focused on the faculty members’ employee engagement, studies in academia have not considered what faculty members who have disabilities believe affects their employee engagement.

Prior research on faculty members’ employee engagement likely incorporated the views of faculty members with disabilities without explicitly calling attention to their potentially unique experiences. These academicians have not been investigated with the aim to understand how a disability affects employee engagement. Moreover, limited research related to disabilities and employee engagement has been performed within the context of a research university. Distinct from prior employee-engagement studies at higher-education institutions, my research focuses on disabilities and professional academic relationships. My research also investigates why faculty members with disabilities choose not to disclose and to seek accommodations. I provide the methodology for this research in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

In this chapter, I describe the techniques that I used to investigate my research questions. First, I present the Research Questions, Study Design, context of this study, participant-selection tactics, and a portrayal of the participants. I then describe the procedures for acquiring the participants' consent while maintaining the participants' confidentiality, data collection, data analysis, and coding techniques. Finally, I explain the research plan, methods for establishing trustworthiness, and contextual considerations.

Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to better understand how faculty members with disabilities believe that their disabilities and relationships relate to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking. I explored the collegial relationships that faculty members with disabilities have with university administration, department chairs/heads, other faculty members, staff, and students. I used Shuck, Osam, et al.'s (2017) definition of employee engagement: "a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy" (p. 269). Finally, my study examined how faculty members with disabilities believe that collegial relationships relate to the engagement phenomenon (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017).

A deeper understanding about the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities who are serving at institutions of higher education was important in order to ensure that the research and practice related to engagement within academic communities are inclusive of the experiences for a diverse group of scholars. A more extensive

understanding of how employee engagement relates to faculty members' decisions to disclose a disability and to receive accommodations is also critical to advance the ability of higher-education institutions to connect with and to meet the needs of scholars with disabilities. This research was guided by the following overarching research question: How do faculty members with disabilities engage in their academic work? Sub-questions included:

1. How do faculty members with disabilities believe their disabilities relate to their employee engagement?
2. How do faculty members with disabilities believe relationships with colleagues within their institutions relate to their employee engagement?
3. How do faculty members with disabilities believe that support and resources within their institutions relate to their employee engagement?
4. How does the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities relate to their decisions to disclose and to receive accommodations?

Study Design

My research was guided by a constructivist, epistemological stance that holds as true that “social knowledge is the active product of human ‘knowers,’ that knowledge is situated and relative, that it varies across people and their social groups, and that it is context-dependent” (Drisko & Maschi, 2015, p. 91). Constructivism was relevant for this research because I used interviews to discover how participants understand the relationships among their disabilities, employee engagement, professional academic relationships, support, and resources, and their disclosure and accommodation-seeking behaviors. Based on constructivism, I utilized a qualitative approach while investigating

the research questions (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). With qualitative research, the researcher is the principal tool for data collection and evaluation; qualitative analysis aims to grasp the significance which participants formulate related to procedures and events. To ensure the richness and accuracy of my observations about the faculty members' behavior and perceptions, I utilized several data sources to better understand the experience of each faculty participant with disabilities (Minichiello, Aroni, & Minichiello, 1990).

Context

Study participants worked at one of three university campuses in the Midwest, one a research university in a metro area, one a comprehensive university in a small city, and the third a liberal arts campus in a rural area. All campuses of this university have high academic expectations for both students and faculty members, which suggests that significant academic pressure is placed on faculty members to both produce outstanding research and to provide excellent education. These expectations and pressures likely influence the faculty members' stress levels and well-being, therefore affecting my study of engagement.

Participant Selection

I used purposive sampling to identify potential participants. "Purposive sampling technique is a type of non-probability sampling that is most effective when one needs to study a certain cultural domain with knowledgeable experts within" (Tongco, 2007, para. 1). For this research, I collaborated with disability-resource staff to identify prospective faculty members who self-identify as having a disability.

During routine meetings addressing accommodations, disability-resource staff members shared their endorsement of this work as well as the study details with faculty

members who have disabilities. The staff also sent an email (Appendix C) to all faculty members (assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors) who were registered and receiving accommodations, inviting them to fill out a brief, online Google Participant Information Form (Appendix D) if they were willing to participate in my study. The email correspondence explained my educational background and research interests, and gave an overview of the study, including interview methods and the expected time commitment for the participants, as well as my contact information. Participants included individuals who were registered and receiving accommodations from the resource center as well as people who had not disclosed their disabilities. With the hopes of reaching those faculty members who had not disclosed their disabilities, a similar email and form were sent to two department chairs/heads, from each of the quadrant fields, with a request for them to forward the recruitment materials to all faculty members. To overcome stigma and to connect with faculty members who identify as living with a long-term illness, such as anxiety or depression, but do not see themselves as having a disability, the form was framed to recruit people living with a long-term illness, such as anxiety or depression, as well as individuals with other disabilities.

The online form was linked to the email that requested potential participants to self-identify as having a disability. The form's data were secured within a password-protected account. Further, this email and form also served to acquire the demographic data needed for later stages of the study. The form inquired about each participant's disability status in order to make sure that individuals self-identify as having disabilities or as living with a long-term illness, such as anxiety or depression.

This study ensured confidentiality by selectively inquiring about disability (only visible or invisible), identifying participants in one of four major disciplinary areas (health/medical; humanities; science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM); social sciences), and excluding identifiers related to race/ethnicity. Additional information was collected on participants' rank and tenure status.

The acknowledgement of informed consent was provided at the top of the form. Twenty-one days were allocated for faculty members to complete the online form. I utilized purposive sampling to identify faculty members with a range of disabilities, academic rank, tenure status, and academic field (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). I attempted to recruit participants with a diversity of experiences, but ultimately this was limited by the traits of the population of faculty members with disabilities who finished the Google form as well as by the participants' desire to take part in this research. I had 11 participants for the study. All participants were provided with a list of the potential resources available to them (Appendix E).

To support the understanding of the participants' journey, I portray their unique individual scenarios. I interviewed 11 faculty members with disabilities. Table 1 gives the participants' demographic data. All the faculty members identified themselves as having invisible disabilities, and two recognized themselves as having both visible and invisible disabilities. During the recruitment process, the aim was to find individuals with a range of academic ranks. Six participants reported being an assistant professor; two people reported being an associate professor; and three individuals reported being a full professor. All but one faculty member served in a tenure-track position. Five people reported that they had earned tenure.

The general discipline where the participants served was distributed evenly. Two participants said that they were working in the health/medical area, with three individuals in the humanities, three people in STEM, and three participants in the social sciences. All faculty members reported having disclosed their disabilities publicly. Seven participants said that they utilized disability accommodations through the university system. The length of time that the faculty members had served the university system ranged from 3 to more than 40 years. The estimated average time of service was 13 years.

Table 1. *The Demographic Data for the Interview Participants*

Pseudonym	Disabilities	Rank	Tenure	Discipline	Years
Andrew	Invisible	Full	Tenured	STEM	20+
Audrey	Invisible	Assistant	Non-Tenured	Social Sciences	5+
Azure	Invisible/ Visible	Assistant	Non-Tenured	Health/ Medical	40+
Blue	Invisible	Assistant	Non-Tenured	Humanities	5+
Cyan	Invisible	Assistant	Non-Tenured	Social Sciences	3+
Ford	Invisible	Associate	Tenured	Health/ Medical	10+
Green	Invisible	Assistant	Non-Tenured	STEM	5+
Megan	Invisible	Associate	Tenured	Social Sciences	10+
Ned	Invisible	Full	Tenured	STEM	40+
Sarah	Invisible	Full	Tenured	Social Sciences	10+
Zack	Visible/ Invisible	Assistant	Non-Tenured	Humanities	5+

As to not identify a minority faculty member who served in a small department/college, I excluded race from this research. Only a small percentage of the sample population had minoritized or underrepresented identities. The intersectionality of their identities played into their experiences and will be a focus for future research.

All participants who submitted the consent form completed the interview process. The lack of this study's faculty members who reported only living with visible disabilities echoes the representation of participants with invisible disabilities in higher education (Evans et al., 2017). A lack of participants who only have visible disabilities is a limitation for this research.

In a variety of ways, the faculty members who participated in this research are unique. They reported a variety of academic ranks as well as tenure status. The faculty members also served in different general areas of study as they traveled along their professional, academic journeys. The next section describes the participants.

Portrayal of Participants

Andrew. Andrew is a full, tenured STEM professor. He disclosed having invisible disabilities, although he did not receive accommodations from his institution. He had worked at his current university for over 20 years. His present job was an ideal position for him when he first started because his role was a tenure-track professor position with a curatorial appointment. His current role had all he wanted after completing his postdoc because the position offered curation, teaching, service, and research.

Audrey. Audrey is a non-tenured assistant professor in the social sciences. She publicly disclosed having invisible disabilities, although she did not receive

accommodations from her institution. Audrey had worked at her current university for over five years. She believed that her current position was perfect because teaching is valued, and research is supported. Audrey believed that it was for these reasons she was serving at her current campus.

Azure. Azure is a non-tenured assistant professor in the health/medical field. She had visible and disclosed her invisible disabilities and received accommodations from her institution. She had served at her current university for over 40 years. Based on her education and department, she served in an unorthodox position. Azure commented that it was difficult, in most cases, to move up in her department because she held a position that was different than all other faculty members in her unit.

Blue. Blue is a non-tenured assistant professor in the humanities. She disclosed her invisible disabilities and received accommodations from her institution. Blue had worked at her current university for over five years. She primarily taught undergraduate classes and large introductory classes, but also smaller and more topical courses. Blue said that she is also a researcher who helped create a group within an international society of scholars in her field of study.

Cyan. Cyan is a non-tenured assistant professor in humanities. She had disclosed her invisible disabilities and received accommodations from her institution. She had worked at her current university for over three years. She had been an assistant professor since the beginning and had taken two leaves of absence for disability-related reasons.

Ford. Ford is a tenured associate professor in the medical/health field. He disclosed his invisible disabilities and received accommodations from his institution. He had worked at his current university for over 10 years. The last semester he was in

graduate school, he received a call from his current institution. After he graduated, he accepted a position, and he still held that job at the time of the interview.

Green. Green is a non-tenured assistant professor in a non-tenured position in a field closely related to STEM. He also had an administrative role. He had disclosed his invisible disabilities. Green did not receive accommodations from his institution. He had served at his current university for over five years. Green described his roles as an ever-evolving split permanent staff-faculty, not visiting, and not on a tenure track. At the time of the interview, he coordinated a major program on campus while teaching in his field of study.

Megan. Megan is a tenured associate professor in the social sciences. She had disclosed her invisible disabilities and received accommodations from her institution. Megan had served at her current university for over 10 years. She described committee work and chairing vital projects, including at the university level. Megan also consulted with the student counseling center on her campus and mentored new faculty members about teaching and advising.

Ned. Ned is a full, tenured STEM professor. He had disclosed his invisible disabilities, although he did not receive accommodations from his institution. Ned had worked at his current university for over 40 years. He was hired as an assistant professor and, subsequently, was promoted to associate and then full professor. Ned was exceptionally accomplished and had earned one of the highest distinctions at his university.

Sarah. Sarah is a full, tenured professor in the social sciences. She had disclosed her invisible disabilities and received accommodations from her institution. Sarah had

worked at her current university for over 10 years. She started as an assistant professor and became a full professor a couple of years before the interview.

Zack. Zack is a non-tenured assistant professor in the humanities. He disclosed his visible and invisible disabilities, and he received accommodations from his institution. He had worked at his current university for over five years. At the time of the interview, he directed a social-justice initiative off campus while teaching in his field of study.

Participant Consent, Confidentiality, and Protection

Before I began, this research was reviewed and approved by the University of Minnesota's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects (Appendix F). The faculty members who participated in this study were emailed the informed consent statements before completing the demographic form and partaking in the interviews. I used pseudonyms to preserve the participants' confidentiality for all phases of this research. Each faculty member's name, email address, and pseudonym were secured in an isolated, password-protected folder. To protect against a possible breach in confidentiality, direct identifiers were destroyed upon a participant's request or 12 months after the data collection began. No data associated with the research, including the consent form, were put in the faculty members' university medical, professional, or scholarly records. I was the sole person with access to all data associated with this research. All the data related to this research were stored in a password-guarded data-management application.

All the obtained data were secured and protected in the university's Google applications system. There were no physical records with names and contact information

for the faculty members. I complied with federal, state, and University of Minnesota policies with regard to securing private data on a laptop (i.e., password protected, encrypted data, etc.). I ensured that all research activities complied with federal regulations; state laws; and university policies, including the Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources policy (<https://policy.umn.edu/it/itresources>) as well as the policies and standards related to it, including the Securing Private Data standard.

Every recording associated with this study will be deleted once the research has concluded. The research conducted with this study created limited risks for the participants. Still, disability can be a private identity and sensitive matter. Reflecting on one's disabilities may be uncomfortable. To alleviate the discomfort, I did all I could to protect participants' identities and allowed the faculty members to determine where we conducted the interviews. Additionally, phone interviews were offered to those faculty members who preferred that method of communicating.

Data Collection

With a focus on ensuring the highest-quality research possible, preliminary data-collection techniques were piloted with one faculty member who had disabilities. I collaborated with disability-resource staff to identify and to recruit the faculty member who had self-identified as having disabilities. The intention for the pilot study was to refine my interview protocol in order to ensure that the questions were understandable to the participants and yielded the data I was seeking. The pilot study's faculty member completed study forms, provided comments and suggestions regarding the study forms, participated in the interviews, and provided feedback about aspects of my methods. That

feedback informed the final data-collection strategies. Finalized versions of the interview protocol were submitted to the IRB as a modification to the approved submission.

Before every interview, I reviewed each faculty member's website and curriculum vitae to become acquainted with his/her/their professional paths and expertise. The insight developed from this review was valuable while organizing data and building a summary for each faculty member. I emailed the interview protocol, including the research and interview questions (Appendix G), to participants several weeks before our discussions. Supplying the participants with the interview protocol and the interview questions ahead of time may have strengthened the data by providing participants with time to process the materials. The interview protocol focused on faculty members' journeys to their current roles as well as how they believed that disabilities and relationships with colleagues related to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors. To ensure that each faculty member's thoughts and feelings were recalled verbatim, conversations to collect data were recorded and transcribed. I asked each faculty member to participate in an initial non-recorded and non-transcribed introductory meeting as well as an inductively focused interview. I asked each faculty member to allow me to audio record and to take notes during the conversations as well as to consider further participation in an individual follow-up interview that was focused on clarifying concepts which came up during the inductive interview and asked additional questions that emerged from the analysis, if requested. Following the interviews, I completed a reflection (within 30 minutes of concluding the interviews) and shared a copy of the interview transcripts with each participant, asking

the participants to add to or clarify the participants' remarks. The interviews lasted between 45 minutes and an hour.

I member checked my findings by asking faculty participants to review the summary of their interviews to make sure that their thoughts and feelings were depicted in ways that represented their experiences and beliefs. All but two of the participants provided feedback or clarifications for their summaries. While maintaining a commitment to constructivism, co-construction, and mutually interpreting the data, I incorporated the faculty members' reactions in the analysis of the study results.

Data Analysis

Shuck and associates' (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) definitions of employee engagement directed the development of my research questions, the creation of the interview questions, and the research design. During the analysis, I utilized a constant comparison to recognize themes aligned with the engagement constructs offered by Shuck and associates. Feedback from the faculty members was evaluated as obtained in line with qualitative research standards and constant comparative analysis (Harding, 2013). Complementing a constructivist approach, I utilized the following three steps, provided by the constant comparative method, to analyze the data collected:

- Make a list of similarities and differences between the first two cases to be considered.
- Amend this list as further cases are added to the analysis.
- Identify research findings once all the cases have been included in the analysis. (Harding, 2013, p. 66)

Table 2 outlines the data-analysis plan by utilizing the essential constructs provided by Harding (2013).

Table 2. *Data-Analysis Plan*

Step Progression	Tasks
1	Isolate one section of one transcript
2	Identify the research objective(s) to which that section of the transcript is most relevant
3	Decide which pieces of information or opinion are most relevant to this objective
4	Decide which details do not need to be included in the summary
5	Decide where (if at all) there is a repetition that needs to be eliminated
6	Based on these decisions, write brief notes
7	Complete summaries: complete steps 1-6 for all sections of all transcripts
8	Look at my first two interviews and summaries
9	Create a simple, straightforward t-chart in Google Sheets
10	Create a list of what is similar between the first two interviews
11	Create a list of what is different between the first two interviews
12	Address the question about if everyone expressed an opinion or had experience and, if so, to count this occurrence as a similarity
13	Address the question about if most (75%) had expressed a view that should be viewed as a consensus
14	Address how the responses were different
15	Address the overall themes that I can see in the data
16	Add a third column for the third interview
17	Complete steps 7-14 by looking at all three interviews
18	Complete steps 7-14 for the remaining interviews

Note. Source: Harding, 2013, pp. 57 & 66.

Coding

According to Saldaña (2015), “a code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 3). To ensure clear direction and connection to the research questions, the following predetermined codes were utilized:

- engagement,
- disability,
- professional academic relationships,
- support and resources,
- disclosure, and
- accommodation seeking.

Elements from the interviews were continuously compared and sorted directly into the preliminary codes.

The codes were continuously generated and modified to match the participants' feedback. I searched for unforeseen, as well as anticipated, themes from the relevant scholarship while developing the codes (Saldaña, 2015). I detected various intrinsic connotations from the participants' feedback. I distinguished phenomena by utilizing brief illustrative comments and identified the codes' connection to each other.

When launching these phases, I utilized many codes. I gradually integrated the codes towards themes that I grouped by the investigation's overarching elements. I contemplated how the codes were connected to engagement; disability; professional, academic relationships; support; resources; disclosure; and accommodation seeking as well as related to the higher-education faculty members' journeys. Finally, a constant comparative analysis, in line with a constructivist inquiry, directed this research while establishing further insight about how the disability and relationships with colleagues affected the employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors of faculty members who were serving in higher education. Table 3 illustrates the steps that I used for coding, identifying conceptual themes, and building theory, utilizing the essential constructs provided by Harding (2013).

Table 3. *Utilizing Codes, Identifying Conceptual Themes, and Building Theory*

Step Progression	Tasks
1	Identify initial categories based on reading the transcripts
2	Write codes alongside the transcripts
3	Review the list of codes
4	Revise the list of categories
5	Decide which codes should appear in which category
6	Complete a list of codes used in relation to the predetermined codes
7	Look for themes and findings in each category
8	Collect codes from different illustrative issues into the category
9	Create sub-categories to reflect different elements of the conceptual theme
10	Utilize the conceptual theme to explain the relationships between different parts of the data
11	Utilize the conceptual theme to build a theory

Note. Source: Harding, 2013, pp. 83 & 113.

Trustworthiness

Member checking and peer debriefing were employed to ensure that the results were trustworthy. I emailed the participants with the preliminary result from their feedback and asked them to comment on the result if they chose. These member checks helped to ensure that the participants' perspectives were precisely depicted throughout the results. I ensured transferability by

provid[ing] sufficient detail of the context of the fieldwork for a reader to be able to decide whether the prevailing environment is similar to another situation with which . . . [the reader is] familiar and whether the findings can justifiably be applied to the other setting. (Shenton, 2004, p. 63)

I connected with colleagues who possessed similar backgrounds and were well acquainted with the scholarship surrounding this study to critique the methods, coding, and results.

Contextual Considerations

While measures were employed to provide trustworthiness for the results, this research was approached in a way that affected the results. First, with an acknowledgement that qualitative research is typically not generalizable, this study's purpose was to construct an account focused on how the faculty-member participants believed that their disabilities and relationships with colleagues related to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors. Thus, when compared to quantitative research, the results from my work may provide descriptive versus generalizable findings. Second, my identity as an aspiring faculty member with disabilities shaped my interpersonal connections with faculty members I aspire to be like as well as our conversations about and my understanding of the feedback they provided from their journeys. During this research, I recognized how my disabilities and journey attributed to my subjectivity. I strove for a synopsis that was attained through robust insight about the diversity of ways that disabilities relate to the employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors of scholars who are serving in higher education.

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative study was to better understand how faculty members with disabilities believed that their disabilities and relationships with university administration, department chairs/heads, other faculty members, staff, and students related to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking. In this chapter, I described how I utilized one-on-one, semi-structured interviews to investigate my research questions. I presented the questions, a constructivist study design, the study's context, participant-selection tactics, and a portrayal of the participants. I described the procedures for acquiring participant consent while maintaining the participants' confidentiality, data collection, constant comparison data analysis, and coding techniques. I explained the methods for establishing trustworthiness and the contextual considerations. Finally, I strove for research that adds to the broader conversation encompassing how disabilities and relationships with colleagues relate to the employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors of faculty members who have disabilities and serve at institutions of higher education.

In the following chapters, I introduce the findings about the engagement of faculty members who have disabilities. Specifically, I identify themes across the study's four general aspects: disabilities and engagement; relationships and engagement; support, and resources, and engagement; and engagement and disclosure and accommodations. All participants described unique contexts, experiences, and disabilities. At the same time, each participant shared perspectives that addressed how he/she/they understood his/her/their disabilities as affecting his/her/their local and broader scholarly engagement;

how he/she/they developed relationships with others; and how those relationships affected performance, production, and well-being.

These findings also address the participants' understanding of the barriers to their engagement and subsequent career success along with what institutions can provide for faculty members with disabilities. Finally, how, and how much the participants had disclosed, accommodations, as well as the risks and benefits of being open about their disabilities were considered.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

In this chapter, I discuss themes associated with all the research questions. As stated earlier, Shuck, Osam, et al. (2017) operationally defined employee engagement as “a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy” (p. 269). In the next sections, I address how faculty members with disabilities believe that their disabilities, university and disciplinary relationships, support, and resources at their institutions relate to their employee engagement. I also examine how the employee engagement for faculty members with disabilities relates to their decisions to disclose and to receive accommodations.

Disability and Employee Engagement

In this section, I discuss themes associated with the initial research question: How do faculty members with disabilities believe their disabilities relate to their employee engagement? I address how fatigue, mobility, and reframing and overcoming the obstacles related to disability affected the participants’ engagement on their campuses and in their scholarly fields.

Disability, Engagement, and Fatigue

Many participants pointed to the fatigue associated with their disability and described how fatigue influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. The experiences and the nature of how the disabilities and fatigue affected each faculty member’s employee engagement varied.

Each participant shared a unique story about how his/her/their fatigue influenced his/her/their engagement. In the stories, I found more similarities than discrepancies. For

example, many people shared how stress, fatigue, illness/injury, and their disability related to their abilities to be present on campus and to participate in certain types or amounts of research, teaching, and service, thus influencing their engagement. For example, Andrew, Audrey, Green, Cyan, Azure, Blue, Megan, Ned, Sarah, and Zack all commented that faculty members with disabilities experience different job-based stressors and fatigue than faculty members without disabilities. Ned noted, “Because they [faculty members with disabilities] are not operating on an even basis every day, so to make up for what they are supposed to do, they are under more stress” and, consequently, experience more fatigue.

Some participants described how their disability meant that they could not teach or be on campus for more than a prescribed number of hours at a time. For example, Audrey, Ford, Cyan, Azure, and Blue commented that they could only work for specified amounts of time each week. Blue noted, “I am only good at 75%. I am not good at 100%.” What a disability prevented faculty members from doing while on the job also varied. For example, Audrey, Ford, Cyan, Azure, Blue, and Sarah all explained how their disabilities had prevented them from extended work time. Ford stated, “Now that I am experiencing the [a disability and related problems], I simply cannot work those extended hours because I cannot tolerate the intensity.”

For some participants, the only influence that the disability had was the extra time and energy it took them to self-accommodate to be a successful academic. For example, Andrew, Ford, and Green commented about how exhausted they were due to overcoming structural issues. In faculty meetings and other committee meetings, Andrew found communicating to be stressful and physically exhausting if the group could not

communicate efficiently. “If I had to go to meetings all day long, where I had to communicate in all of the meetings, I would be done by the end of the day.” Like Andrew, Green stated that his disability influenced his engagement during meetings and social events. He described having to put more effort into communicating. Green shared, “Sometimes, it’s just exhausting, and then, there’s less energy to do other things.”

For others, the production windows were smaller, and the well-being routines needed to induce this production were unforgivingly necessary. For example, Andrew, Audrey, Green, Cyan, Blue, Megan, Ned, and Sarah mentioned that their disabilities influenced their fatigue and explained how they had to be overly focused on their daily routines and energy. Megan noted how her habits and systems required more time and energy in order to complete academic work. She loved collaborating, but interactive tasks utilized her time and energy. She felt that balancing her collaborations, time, and energy was part of her adaptation and how she did her work as efficiently as possible in all the other areas of her life.

For Audrey, Ford, Cyan, Azure, Blue, and Sarah, their disability and fatigue were related to having had an injury or illness, and the time required to take care of themselves limited the time which they had for other aspects of work and life. For example, Azure commented:

I had to always factor disability-related treatments into my schedule. To be at work on time, I have to get up at 5:30. Scheduling with my disabilities in mind and getting up early has become second nature. The hours necessary to take these medications limited the amount of academic work.

Fatigue was an overarching theme in this study that intersected with other aspects of the engagement for faculty members with disabilities. As many participants explained, fatigue often resulted from stress, illness/injury, and other aspects of their disability, such that they had to be selective and efficient with their time as well as their engagement.

Disabilities, Mobility, and Employee Engagement

All participants described how their limited mobility was a challenge to their university and disciplinary engagement, regardless of whether those disabilities were visible or invisible, acute, or long term. While each participant shared a unique story about how mobility influenced engagement, several themes emerged in the stories. Some scholars shared how travel was difficult due to an injury/illness and limited their abilities to be present and to participate in certain types or amounts of scholarly engagement. For example, Ford, Cyan, Azure, and Sarah all commented that an injury/illness influenced their travel and limited their ability to go to conferences or to conduct fieldwork. Sarah shared that she had to be careful about traveling because she becomes sick so easily. Her immune system is depleted from her disabilities. Every time she flies, she picks up an illness. When she travels, people on the other end do not always understand that she cannot work all day long without breaks.

I can't, you know, be at the conference and then go to dinner and then do this. I have to have time to just be still and, you know, keep warm and sleep. I can't burn myself out because I will immediately get sick, and that's happened the last few times.

Like Sarah, Andrew, Ford, Green, and Cyan all commented that their mobility limited their conference attendance. Andrew stated that he does not travel to conferences

much anymore. “It’s sometimes hard to function, and so I’ve dropped out of that lately, even though my department head really wants me to step up and go to more conferences.” Mobility also limited Andrew and Ford’s fieldwork. Ford noted that he could do the cognitive, academic part of his work, but, like Andrew, the central part of his job under normal circumstances was field-based work. Because his disability influenced his energy and focus levels, Ford could not travel and participate in field-based work. The hardest part of his situation was that the field-based work was very much tied to his identity. The loss of his identity as a professor who was deeply involved with fieldwork also meant that Ford’s academic lifestyle changed.

On campus, these scholars faced challenges with their engagement when the terrain and the physical structure affected their mobility. For example, Azure, Audrey, and Andrew all commented that terrain issues limited their mobility and engagement. Azure noted how she had limitations when going on long walks with colleagues due to the likelihood of finding uneven terrain. Unlike Azure, who had a long-term issue with terrain, Audrey had an acute problem with the probability of finding rough terrain. She had never noticed how inaccessible her campus was until she broke her ankle and was on a scooter. Like Azure, having a physical disability, although acute, increased the amount of planning for Audrey and limited her mobility in ways that affected her engagement. Andrew had never noticed how inaccessible his campus was until he tore his Achilles tendon. He could not walk for a while, and like Audrey, he had to use a scooter to move around. Instead of riding his bike to work, he was driving, and he used a disability tag and parked in front of his building. Before he started using the disability tag, he had to park in the visitors’ lot. If a person is in the visitors’ parking lot, there are accessible

stalls for cars, but there is no ramp for the lot. If someone is in a wheelchair or on a scooter that he/she/they could not lift, the only way out is to go the way the cars are going, which seems unsafe.

Like fatigue, mobility concerns intersected with other themes relating to how faculty members who have disabilities were engaged with their campuses and scholarly communities. Having a disability meant that faculty members had to be honest with themselves about their capacities, obstacles, and efficiency as well as their engagement.

Reframing and Overcoming Obstacles Related to Disability

Many participants pointed to how their awareness and acceptance of invisible disabilities influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. For example, Andrew, Audrey, Ford, Cyan, Azure, Blue, Megan, Ned, and Sarah commented that there was a unique nature about their perspective for their academic work as people with invisible disabilities. Cyan noted, “There is heightened awareness around how the faculty members carry their [invisible] disabilities in their work and into the classroom.” Her engagement was positively affected by her disability, particularly as her disability manifests in her interactions with students in her classroom. Cyan continued:

I’m more aware of trauma. I’m more aware of how to deal with the students, how to take care of students better. Where to refer them. Pay way more attention to all those things. And I also have done a good job in terms of knowing where I shouldn’t refer students, and I’ve done the legwork on that.

For Andrew, Ford, Cyan, Azure, Blue, Megan, Ned, and Sarah, acceptance of their own disabilities influenced how they reframed and overcame obstacles related to invisible disabilities and their disciplinary engagement. Megan described getting to a

place where she accepted and owned her disability, and she was aware that the disability is a part of her. She acknowledged that she would not be who she is today if she did not have her disability; she accepted and was not ashamed of her invisible disability.

Reaching that place of awareness and acceptance, Megan thought, had helped her to navigate the obstacles related to invisible disabilities and her disciplinary engagement, but the journey took a long time. For Megan and Audrey, reframing and overcoming also meant finding ways to self-accommodate by taking notes, asking for materials ahead of time, and asking others to clarify.

Like Megan, several others commented that reframing and overcoming meant being aware of and accepting their invisible disabilities as well as being transparent about their struggles with colleagues and students. Blue shared how she had students come to her and say that they were inspired when she was transparent about her disabilities. After hearing Blue's story, the students believed that they could be successful because her story made them think they could thrive with disabilities, too.

Andrew, Audrey, Ford, Green, Cyan, Azure, Blue, Megan, Ned, Sarah, and Zack all commented that they were aware of how their perspectives as faculty members with invisible disabilities showed up in their work and connections with others. Most of these scholars took the opportunity to advise individuals with invisible disabilities who were considering a career as a higher-education faculty member. Ned noted how being aware brought him more insight and acceptance of others' challenges. While he did not provide specific examples of how this insight influences his engagement, he said that he uses his awareness and acceptance of his own experience to strengthen his relationships with

others. Ned was serious about “being there” and showing people his heart as a way to help others.

Like mobility, participants were clear that their awareness and acceptance of their own disabilities shaped their interactions with others and, therefore, their engagement. For all of these scholars, reframing and overcoming obstacles meant letting go of the fear and shame associated with invisible disabilities, with a clear focus on the positives in their lives. They could then translate that positive focus into supporting others who were struggling in some way.

Relationships and Engagement

In this section, I begin my discussion of the themes associated with the second research question: How do faculty members with disabilities believe that relationships with university and disciplinary colleagues relate to their employee engagement? I address how friendships and relationships with university and disciplinary colleagues, a passion for their work and love for their journeys, and networks can strengthen the engagement of faculty members with disabilities.

Building Friendships that Support Engagement

Many participants described how friendships and building relationships influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. While each participant shared a unique story about how friendships and building relationships with other faculty members influenced his/her/their engagement, several themes emerged in the accounts. Many scholars shared that they had friendships on campus. For example, Megan noted how she was engaged on her campus through friendships and interactions related to face-to-face conversations, emails, meetings, and social gatherings in all aspects of her

environment. She appreciated how her office was set up with similar people located close to each other. If she had a question, she would pop in and talk to another friendly colleague. Overall, she interacted with her colleagues on many different levels. She believed that her friendships helped encourage her dedication to social justice. Megan attended a writing group with friends who would meet one evening a month to encourage one another's writing. She also participated in campus and community events with colleagues. Megan enjoyed these friendships because they helped her focus her energies on these types of engagement.

Many participants reported having off-campus friendships. For example, Andrew, Azure, Blue, Ford, Green, and Sarah commented that they had friendships off their respective campuses. Blue described how friendships with others in her field and discipline affected her performance, productivity, and well-being. She believed that it means a lot to have people in her area who are supportive and affirm what she is doing. For Blue, being a scholar with only two individuals in her unit prompted her to look for a bigger field elsewhere. She had a friend who works away from her campus and who had been supportive of her work. She also had colleagues and friends at the university where she previously worked who still encouraged her. This assistance served as motivation for her to perform and to be productive. She explained, "It also helps when friends say, 'Oh that's a good idea; you should try to do something with it.'"

When it came to her well-being, Blue agreed that her relationships had influenced the construct. She gave an example of an off-campus friend who came to visit. Blue described how the friend read her book manuscript. Blue also illustrated how she went for long walks and talked about her work with this friend.

Very supportive and made me think, yes, it actually is a book. So in that sense, [friendship] does mean a lot both for my productivity—for all of them actually. So in that sense, the colleagues are very important, but they are not here.

Many participants reported friendships related to collaborating on issues. For example, Andrew, Audrey, Azure, Blue, Ford, Green, and Sarah all commented that they had friendships connected to collaborations related to salient issues in their work and that of their counterparts. Green noted that most of the people he ended up connecting with were spread out. He did not know how many international collaborators he had, but Green had collaborated all around the country. Green talked to these people regularly. He described how he maintained these friendships as a mix, too. Green shared how, sometimes, they connected over Google Hangouts, and sometimes, communication was over the phone. He commented on how he and his scholar friends would plot how they can go to conferences together at various places. He stated that these get-togethers could be on his campus or his colleagues' campuses. His last book came from these get-togethers.

My collaborators and I attended a conference in Glasgow that seemed interesting. We knew the organizer and pitched an idea and then went to the conference. We put together the skeleton of the book and then worked on the text for the next year.

Green pointed out that becoming a successful faculty member involves building friendships and research relationships as well as maintaining communication with people who work within one's community of scholars. He believed that, within every research area, there is a community of people who are thinking about a common problem. Green

explained, “A faculty member must get to know the people in their community and have conversations with them.”

Friendship intersected with other themes related to how faculty members who have disabilities were engaged with their campuses and scholarly communities. The participants’ experiences with friendship varied, although most people acknowledged the importance of nurturing a friendship. They kept pushing themselves while finding, developing, and maintaining friendships. At the same time, additional job tasks need to be considered. Another important work aspect was passion and love, which is discussed in the next section.

Following Their Passions While Building Relationships

Many participants pointed to how a passion for the work and a love of the academic journey influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. For example, all participants commented that they loved being a higher-education faculty member. Cyan described how she loved to engage in active, creative conversations, including critical discussions about what is going on in the world. She loved to experiment and to play as an academic. She liked expanding, exploring, and engaging in theoretical, philosophical, and political debates. She appreciated her ability to “interface with others, with the potential to be liberatory.” Cyan had a therapeutic aim while completing her work. She was focused on finding a sense of healing. Cyan was passionate about finding ways to envision the politics of change. She wanted to find alternatives to unknown systems. She enjoyed being able to question and to imagine what else can exist. She believed that being an academic was a great role for her.

Nearly every participant described a passion for and enjoyment from teaching and the influence on students. For example, Zack noted, “Teaching was what I loved most about my journey.” Like Zack, Ned said that his engagement was focused on the relationships with his students. Ned also loved teaching and was passionate about “being around young people while serving in a faculty member role.” He found the experience to be exciting when he saw how his work affected the students he encountered. Ned described having worked with a lot of graduate students. He took pride in them. Ned thought of these students as his legacy, and numerous master’s theses and doctoral dissertations were humbly, yet proudly, displayed in his office.

Most participants reported a passion for their on-campus service or leadership work. For example, Ford noted how he was passionate about collaborating and completing cross-disciplinary work with other programs and majors on his campus. He could figure out a way to link any topic or major to his field of study. Ford gave an example of this collaboration with scholars in a different department. He was passionate about figuring out curriculum logistics, planning new content, innovating things, and following and updating standards.

Just over half of the participants reported a passion for the scholarly work that they did off-campus. Andrew noted, “I have always enjoyed my research, having been all over the country collecting data in nearly every state.” Like Andrew, Cyan described loving her off-campus relationships and engagement:

The profession itself, including all those great people I work with and learn from at conferences. I’m a co-editor on a book series. I’m a co-editor on a special journal issue. Sometimes, it’s stressful, but damn! It’s also extremely enjoyable

pleasurable, especially when you are meeting with people who are also concerned about the issues you are concerned with. They're also activist scholars, so that is a part that keeps me in the job.

Like friendship, participants were clear; they loved being faculty members. They were passionate about teaching and having strong relationships, especially with students. On and off their campuses, these passions drove them and, therefore, increased their engagement.

Networks

Many participants pointed to how their networks influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. For example, Audrey, Blue, Ned, and Sarah received encouragement from their campus networks, which motivated them. Audrey noted her experience with imposter syndrome. The syndrome was interfering with her university engagement. She worked through this negative mindset, with her networks, after being invited to a leadership class for faculty members who her administration expected to take future leadership positions. She commented that the one thing which helped her get over the imposter syndrome was realizing that her “work is bigger than her.” She was more willing to put herself out there in a situation where she felt socially awkward because she was “taking one for the team. It was a little bit awkward, but was worth it to me, as long as there was an outcome for which I was hoping.”

Audrey's position could be overwhelming. She believed that people could learn from their networks and mentors. She explained how she had an official mentor assigned to her.

I find my mentor to be terrific. Although pretty much anyone else on my campus is willing to provide mentoring informally or formally. There are many opportunities to sit down and talk to people casually, where one could realize the person they are connecting with is interested in similar topics.

Cyan, Megan, Ned, Sarah, and Zack commented that their off-campus networks motivated them. Cyan noted how her off-campus networks had been overwhelmingly positive. She noticed a common theme. The people in these networks with whom she wrote and collaborated for conferences, papers, and book series, as well as being speakers off campus, were people she knew, for certain, also had disabilities.

Similar to following their passions, participants were clear about the importance of being open to networks and how their interactions with others shaped their engagement. For all of these scholars, building community meant pushing themselves to take the initiative to find, develop, and maintain their networks. With an understanding of how people's relationships affect engagement, I discuss support and resources in the next sections.

Support, Resources, and Engagement

In this section, I begin my discussion of the themes associated with the third research question: How do faculty members with disabilities believe that the support and resources at their institutions relate to their employee engagement? I address how work environments, limited resources, stigma, ableism, and a lack of communication regarding disability affected the participants' engagement on their campuses and in their scholarly fields.

Work Environments

Many participants pointed to how their work environments influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. Each participant shared a unique story about how his/her/their work environment influenced his/her/their engagement. In the stories, I found more similarities than discrepancies. For example, Andrew, Azure, Blue, Cyan, Ford, Green, Ned, and Sarah commented that they had experienced obstacles related to their work environments. Sarah noted that, when it came to her work environment and engagement on her campus, she believed there were a few sticking points with a shared governance system which made it easy for one or two people to “railroad initiatives.” These issues related to how shared governance had been, at least for her as a junior faculty member, “awkward and awful.” She had not been engaged at the system level, yet she could see, now, that she was moving upward towards system-level work. She noticed how the system works. Sarah described her work in the department as being “a lot.” Her work environment and her job’s intensity had influenced her relationships and her engagement on campus. She did not receive compensation or instructional release for efforts that were supposed to be rotating but, often, did not alternate. She was one of a few tenured faculty members, and one person was on the brink of retirement. For many years, her institution did not ask an untenured person to take on leadership-related tasks. Sarah knew that she was not being forced into this role; she was trying to be a decent human being because she could not have anyone else in the department do it. She did, however, share that, as soon as one of her colleagues received tenure, she would happily pass the duty along to that coworker.

What Sarah believed added to this situation was having a shared governance system on her campus and an intense service load. All faculty members advised students while conducting research. The research expectations were not quite as much as would be expected on other campuses, but the faculty members on her campus had active research profiles. There was great service pressure on her campus. Caring faculty members at an underfunded small campus were some reasons for this pressure. Sarah described how serving on her campus was like working at the edge of a crisis for years. The resources were pulled; positions were pulled; and the students would suffer if faculty did not step up and fill the gap.

Sarah believed that this unhealthy academic situation affects all faculty members. In particular, the situation on her campus has had an effect on faculty members who could not do the work anymore but wanted to be able to stay. The situation had certainly affected them. To Sarah, the situation was not that one person would ever say someone should do more or that someone's help does not matter. Members of the administration say the right things. They all say that [faculty members] need to take time; they need to take care of themselves; they need to be healthy; they need to set a model. But then they all call on the people who do a good job when they need something done. They say to each other, "You would be so good at this task." They ask if they are sure when they cannot help out.

Sarah also called herself out for having done these things. There was an environment on her campus where faculty members show up and did not say no. On the one hand, they knew they cannot do everything. On the other hand, the situation was difficult when people stay on campus and put down roots. People like Sarah were

susceptible to statements like, “The students need it. What about the students? If the system will not pay for it, or if administrators cannot make it happen if another colleague will not step up.” She found it challenging to do all of these things on her campus.

Like Sarah, Andrew, Azure, Blue, Cyan, Ford, Green, and Ned commented that they experienced obstacles related to their work environments at their respective campuses. Cyan noted, “My work environment is toxic and hostile.” She was getting professional help to cope with this environment. An advocate working for Cyan described Cyan’s relationship with her department as having an “abusive partner.” She was in a “battering system, out of a textbook, in a domestic-violence scenario where the mechanisms are at hand for victims and survivors to be made to feel like they are crazy.” Additionally, she was in a dynamic “where one is made to feel that the abuse is routine and also made to feel like, because there have been some good times, those good times will counteract the overarching negativity of the situation.” Cyan was in an environment likened to a relationship “where one holds on longer because they love the abusive partner in the relationship and recall the good times shared.” She described a situation where her attachment to her colleagues was shaped by her belief that, while the relationships were abusive, her colleagues were “not . . . an abuser 100% of the time.” Cyan’s experiences were also related to and influenced by her struggles with invisible disabilities.

Azure experienced obstacles related to her off-campus work environments. She stated that the community associated with one of her fields of study had “not been great due to a difference in people’s professional orientations.” Azure believed that this obstacle was within the nature of what she does as an academic.

There are obviously some really smart, bright people doing research in my field, but I just do what I can. I do not care who these bright people are. If they are smart, good people, then I will work with them.

Azure stated that, if she does not get what she wants from colleagues in her field, she will branch out and try to find somebody else with whom to work. She does not solely rely on herself to get things done.

In terms of serving in supportive work environments that were generally positive, the participants' responses were mixed. For example, Andrew, Blue, Ford, Sarah, and Zack described environments that were both supportive and positive as well as unsupportive and generally negative. Ford noted that the environment where he worked was "on a spectrum of pluses and minuses." When he first started at his campus, there was not adequate office space for him and his team to work, which he found is not uncommon on a college campus. During his first year, his work environment was splintered across campus. He had an office that was as far as possible away from where he taught and advised. Two other faculty members in his department had offices in a building with another department. One of them had an office in a closet somewhere, which was so small that others could not enter that office.

Ford described how this work environment was challenging for his team to be connected. He believed that collaboration, whether one liked working with the people or not, is critical because there are so many things a team of faculty members needs to talk about weekly. Ford believed that always having to walk across campus made his work environment extremely challenging. He commented about how his institution was set up in order to make it possible to navigate from one end of campus to the other without

going outside. Ford stated that his institution had this structure because of the cold weather, but he believed the situation was more like being in a giant, crowded high school where it could take 25 minutes to walk across campus. He explained how, “when someone takes this path both ways three or four times a day, the time adds up.”

Ford described a positive environmental aspect which he appreciated. He commented that there was an old hallway that the institution remodeled into a set of office suites. The institution placed his entire educational team in that new set of offices so that they could be together. Ford explained how lucky he was to have a beautiful office with a window. He turned his office into a mini-apartment with a couch, coffee maker, posters, and decorations. Ford was grateful for his workspace because there were people who had been at his institution for 15 years who did not have an office with a window.

Ford also interpreted his work environment through the lens of how his team collaborated. He had worked with two teams. On one of the education teams, his primary job duties were to teach three or four classes per semester, to research, to do service, and to advise undergraduates. He was also an adviser and thesis chair for graduate students in the master’s programs. He could see, on paper, why the administration structured his work environment in this manner because the institution needed all of those tasks filled.

Green and Ned described environments that were supportive and positive. Ned’s department was congenial, in the sense that he could work independently because everyone stayed away from each other and liked it that way. He described his work environment as flexible because he could choose to work as hard as he wanted. He believed that there were consequences for not doing as he was supposed to, but his work

environment was flexible. Ned commented about how people left him alone because there was a great deal of autonomy, which he thought was a good thing.

Azure and Cyan described environments that were unsupportive and negative. Azure noted that she served in a small department with limited opportunities to get involved. She appreciated her departmental colleagues, but Azure believed that her lack of relationships and disengagement came from differing orientations related to people's scholarship. Qualified help was also a challenge that Azure faced with her work as a faculty member. The need to have enough qualified people in her lab affected her engagement.

Having many resident wannabees that want to work in the lab, but they have no clue about what is involved, takes so much training. Lab work is not something one simply can step into, so I do much training, which gets old.

Her experience was influenced by serving in a field that was “cutting edge and a little controversial.”

Work environments were an overarching theme in this study that intersected with other aspects of engagement for faculty members with disabilities. As many participants explained, navigating unsupportive and negative work environments influenced their engagement. Another factor which affects engagement was limited resources, which is discussed in the next section.

Limited Resources

Many participants shared how navigating limited resources influenced their engagement. For example, Andrew, Azure, Ned, Sarah, and Zack all commented that the need to secure grant funding influenced their engagement due to lost time and increased

stress and uncertainty. Andrew believed that, in some ways, faculty members were independent contractors because they are obligated to go out and to find funds. Andrew relied on external funds to support graduate students, undergraduates who work in his lab, and other aspects of his research. He commented that writing grants can be challenging because attaining grants is so boom-and-bust focused. In years when Andrew was flush with funds, there were sometimes many grants and too many accounts to track. He found this task to be challenging, but he also believed that, when he did not have a grant, his situation was hard because he did not have money. Andrew found funding to be one of his biggest challenges.

Some people shared how limited financial resources influenced their engagement. Like Azure, Sarah, and Zack, Green thought that his low pay had limited his academic possibilities and engagement. He simply did not have the financial resources to advance many of the academic endeavors he would have liked to initiate. Green stated, “Relatively low pay is the biggest challenge I face in my work.”

Like work environments, limited resources were an overarching theme that intersected with other aspects of engagement for faculty members with disabilities. As many participants explained, navigating the limited resources influenced their engagement. Participants were also dealing with stigma on their campuses.

Stigma

Many participants pointed to a stigma associated with their disabilities. People described how this lack of support influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. For example, Audrey, Azure, Cyan, Ford, Megan, and Sarah commented that the lack of support for a stigma was found in other people’s perceptions. Zack

believed that his colleagues and administration saw him as “less than.” Ford noted the administration’s

fears about what [faculty members might] be able to do, or not be able to do, to the extent to which [they’re] going to be a liability; [administrators questioning] if you are going to be safe in the classroom is a significant barrier to a career for faculty members with disabilities.

Many participants also described experiencing disability-related biases. For example, Audrey, Azure, Cyan, Ford, Megan, and Sarah described facing bias related to their scholarly capabilities. Audrey noted that a “big issue” was with the stigma around hiring or opportunities to advance for people with disabilities at a research one institution. She felt that the people in charge of hiring would “think, oh well, that person isn’t going to be able to do it, so let’s not offer this.”

Some participants described a distinct stigma associated with invisible disabilities. For example, Andrew, Azure, Cyan, Green, Megan, and Sarah noted comparisons between invisible disability and visible disability. Azure commented that she felt the stigma around her invisible disability compared to her visible disability.

Pretty much with my department . . . because of my chair, specifically . . . [the chair was] like, “Oh you look great; you’re just great; you must be fine; everything is fine.” I feel like telling my chair, “No, it’s not fine.” My chair has been fairly good about understanding with the [disability] and all, but I don’t feel like there’s been [true understanding]. . . not that . . . [the chair] could get it. I think that’s how it is with disability. People don’t understand how much it can be a detriment unless they themselves are somehow affected by something like that. .

. . . If you don't manifest a physical disability. Like, you're in a wheelchair; you need a cane; you walk with a cane; etc.; people just, they don't get [an invisible disability].

Azure described a few instances where she had a hard time when she took a cane to work. She stated that this situation does not happen very often, but she believed the response to her visible disability was amazing with how she was treated differently, even though the only thing that was different was that she needed a little bit more help that day to make things happen, to get around.

To Azure, the various responses were remarkable to see when there was a physical representation observed by the public. She believed that having a visible disability was a "big difference." To give an example of the stigma around an invisible disability, she described removing a visible medical device.

I didn't like to announce it, 'cause it's not fun, but at the same time, when people would see it, well then their whole attitude towards me was different. They were much more, I don't know what the word is, but, I don't know, maybe "softer"? "Less harsh"? I don't know if that's the right word . . . People . . . [in my department] especially, it's funny, we're all there to help . . . people, but if we ourselves get [ill] . . . well, I don't feel like there's a lot of tolerance for that. Or acceptance.

Like limited resources, stigma was an overarching theme in this study that intersected with other aspects of engagement for faculty members with disabilities. As such, people had to focus on fighting others' perceptions and biases surrounding

disabilities, especially invisible disabilities, in addition to their intensive responsibilities and expectations to be productive and valuable scholars.

Ableism

Many participants described how a lack of institutional support from an ableist culture was a challenge to their university and disciplinary engagement. While each participant shared a unique story about how that lack of support influenced engagement, several themes emerged in the accounts. Some scholars shared how their engagement was influenced when a university expected faculty members to be overloaded, high achievers. For example, Audrey, Blue, Cyan, Ford, Green, Megan, and Sarah commented about their experiences with their universities' focus on productivity and the subsequent issues related to their disabilities and burnout. Blue noted that, in academia, there is an expectation that one is to "work 24/7." She questioned how one's work is reduced by accommodation when she is supposed to "work 24/7." She never thought she could "work 24/7." There was much more expectation to "work 24/7" on her current campus than at the campus where she had previously served, and she thought that expectation was reinforced by a general understanding among colleagues. She described her frustration about this norm.

I don't want to work on the weekends! I have a life. I have a . . . [child]. I have a family. I don't want to work on the weekends. So why will I work on the weekends? Because you have to do your job, but somehow if I can't do my . . . So, I think, a general understanding that academics work all the time is a huge problem when you don't have a whole lot of energy.

Blue acknowledged the difficulty of changing this norm in academia: “You work all the time.” She did not believe that one can ever change this philosophy because there are so many people who have the energy to work all the time, and they would take the jobs of individuals who cannot.

Andrew, Audrey, Blue, Cyan, Green, Megan, and Sarah commented that their universities needed a culture change. Megan believed that an ableist culture of overworking required change. The biggest challenge that she faced with her work as a faculty member was keeping service obligations manageable, learning to say no when she needed to say no, and thinking about where she can have the most influence so that she was not wasting her time and energy. Megan also described making her classes “high impact, without killing” herself as a challenge. She believed that other faculty members wear a badge of honor if they work 60, 70, or 80 hours a week, which she thought was ridiculous because overworking is not healthy. People are going to burn out if they do that. Therefore, she felt that one of the challenges she faced was saying she only put in 40 hours last week, and she felt good about the boundary. Megan was okay with that choice because she was able to spend quality time with her family. She was not going to give other faculty members a badge of honor for burning themselves out. Megan was not going to tell them, “you poor thing.” She was going to ask them, how can you “manage your time better? And sorry, but burning the wick at both ends is not going to get you to that peak level.”

Megan also shared that culture changes away from ableism needed to be made at the systemic level. She believed that her institution must start thinking about how it

incentivizes people to do disability and accommodation work, not just doing the work from the goodness of their hearts.

Like stigma, concerns regarding a lack of support from ableist cultures intersected with other themes relating to how faculty members who have disabilities were engaged with their campuses and scholarly communities. The participants strove to change the cultures around them to be more appreciative of their disabilities and workload boundaries. However, the lack of support meant that people had to be efficient with their time and energy while overcoming ableism and burnout, thus their engagement was influenced. One way to improve some of the noted issues was to communicate with others.

Communication

Many participants explained how a lack of resources to develop communication regarding disability influenced their university and disciplinary engagement. For example, Andrew, Azure, Cyan, Ford, Sarah, and Zack pointed to communication gaps associated with their disabilities. Ford believed that universities and departments could close the communication gap to benefit faculty members with disabilities. He described his frustration about a communication situation with his former department administrator and supervisor. The administrator stated, “There are benefits in the . . . system that will help you with the medical leave. . . . I don’t know what they are or how they work.” Ford believed that it would have been helpful if, at this point, the administrator had stopped right there and clarified. Ford felt like telling the administrator that he/she/they needed to communicate better. “Hey, somebody in your department is navigating that process; it’s your responsibility to know some things about how it works.”

Ford thought that the only way this much-needed communication would happen was if it came from a disability liaison. He believed that department-level administrators should be required to learn about some things happening in the disability liaison's world. "My perceptions were of a communication issue." His response was not meant to be critical of any entity or person. He was simply tired of being the main communication liaison among all the parties involved with his disability-related issues in the academy. "It's my doing that keeps the ball rolling between insurance companies . . . systems, the department, the medical records office. It's a massive amount of work doing all this." Ford described working with a therapist to address his disability and academic-related issues:

[The therapist] gave me an article to read one time, and just in the medical world, in theory, in all these articles that they teach all these practitioners, there's to be one head of the medical team whose responsibility is to communicate with all members of the medical team to keep everybody on the same page. I haven't experienced that, and [the therapist] told me that is a practice that is never put into practice because nobody has the time to do it. It's not allotted any time in anybody's job description.

Ford supported the perception that it is the faculty member's responsibility to know the process of navigating disabilities. Ford also believed that the only way administrators were going to know if the faculty members were navigating processes was through adequate communication.

For Andrew, Azure, Cyan, Ford, and Sarah, a lack of outreach related to their disability influenced their engagement. To Sarah, the "polarizing situations" associated

with a lack of communication regarding disability “were insane.” She believed that faculty members with disabilities would benefit if universities and departments could focus on disability outreach. She had never engaged in conversations similar to the ones during this study’s interviews.

Even just the kind of informal conversation we had last time, you probably picked up on it. Like, I got really teary just . . . just from the release. It’s just a lot of . . . there’s a lot of uncertainty and fear, and you know, for me, some shame around. I don’t know exactly where that comes from. So just the kindness of that outreach.

Andrew, Azure, Cyan, Ford, and Sarah commented about how their engagement would improve if institutions developed more open communication protocols that were intentional about disability. In general, Andrew thought that “universities and departments could listen to what a person has to say, and then, they need to act.” Andrew believed that listening with no action was a waste of everyone’s time: “Listening without action will make the administration feel good for the short term and insult the faculty members when nothing happens.”

Like ableism, concerns associated with a lack of communication intersected with other themes relating to how faculty members who have disabilities were engaged with their campuses and scholarly communities. The participants were clear that their campuses caused barriers for efficient communication about disability and, therefore, their engagement. Many of these scholars had to focus on seeking or creating their resources and opportunities in order to communicate the necessary messages about disabilities. With knowledge about some of the obstacles which participants faced, the next sections explain disclosure and accommodations.

Engagement, Disclosure, and Accommodations

In this section, I begin addressing the themes associated with the fourth research question: How does the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities relate to their decisions to disclose and to receive accommodations? I frame this chapter's data around the employee-engagement construct and the associated energies. I address how engagement influenced disclosure and accommodations.

All participants pointed to engagement that was associated with their disclosure and described how that engagement influenced their disclosure. Most participants explained how engagement influenced accommodation seeking and utilization. All participants disclosed their disabilities, and most individuals sought and utilized accommodations or self-accommodations at some level. Disclosure and accommodations meant various things to different people. The participants shared unique information about how their engagement influenced their disclosure and accommodations. In their stories, I found more similarities than discrepancies.

Engagement in Teaching and with Students

Some people shared how their strong engagement with teaching influenced their disclosure and accommodations. Andrew, Audrey, Blue, and Megan commented about how strong engagement with students positively influenced their disclosure and accommodations. Megan noted how she was open with her students regarding her disabilities. On the first day of class, Megan stated, "I have a disability," typically when she was writing on the board. She also asked her students to tell her the origin of their name, the history of their name, how they got their name, the pronouns they used, and something that may or may not be known about them. "The last question served as a

good entry point to talk about invisible disabilities.” Megan believed that there was a chance for students to perceive her as less-than because she had acknowledged that she has a disability. Fortunately, she did not think that she had ever experienced this negative perception from students. She had never obtained proof of the students’ negative perception on her teaching evaluations.

Like Megan, Blue believed her relationships and passion to connect with students had the most effect on her engagement.

My colleagues do trigger new connections, right, but I think students are the main thing, like, that makes me want to do it. If the students don’t like what we’re doing, then I could just not care . . . The more they are interested, and you can see sparks in them and somehow interest in all the things, then that really drives my engagement. Then, I want to do more.

Similar to Blue, Audrey described loving how teaching is valued.

And students often can end up being colleagues. We all run into each other . . . My students are freaking smart. The ones that are in my . . . often, I send them off after graduation and be like you’re going to be even better. And that’s awesome. You are my future colleagues. And it’s really, really engaging when I want to throw my hands up and be like my research is worthless and everything is terrible. My students, especially, are really rewarding and help with that. They’re so interested in everything . . . Yeah, so that helps a lot with the engagement.

In summary, participants believed that their love for teaching and their positive relationships with students influenced their disclosure and accommodation-seeking

behaviors. Some of these benefits arose from the participants' interactions with disability liaisons.

Engagement with a Disability Liaison

Some participants described their engagement with a disability liaison. For example, Azure, Blue, Ford, and Sarah explained how that engagement positively influenced their disclosure and their accommodation-seeking behaviors. Azure described her engagement with her disability liaison to help navigate disclosure and accommodations.

The one thing I did, the biggest thing when I came back from my . . . surgery, was working with [a disability liaison], and they were great. [The liaison I worked with] is like no other [person] in the office there. [They] had brought me some stuff in [their] truck, not a university truck. They got it out for me. They brought me a special mat; they brought me a table . . . so I could work at home, and then, they came and picked it up. I just feel like [the liaison I work with] . . . just gets it done, you know? [They] don't wait around for five levels of approval to make something happen. [They] also got me a desk that goes up and down at work as well. So that was great. That was great.

Blue also believed that her engagement with a disability liaison influenced her disclosure and accommodations.

The liaison I work with was clear that my department did not need to see my disability-related paperwork. I won't say anything about anything. But I've told my chair, my mentor, everyone in the meeting; I tell them what the issues are. I

don't have any hesitation saying I have [issues related to my disabilities], so I don't have any problems saying that to anyone.

Like Blue, Ford believed that his use of accommodations could be attributed to his engagement with a disability liaison. There were accommodations which he did not know were available. Ford described a situation where he had a realization about his disability accommodations.

I never even thought of this until my body couldn't feel comfortable. They did a full ergonomic setup of my work station. So it involved raising the desk up, getting a new chair that actually fits my body. I never, in . . . years, had a chair that fits me. I just didn't think too much of it. I mean, and it wasn't just like, "Oh, this isn't quite right." This was miserably off base. I just didn't realize it. The [person] who came to evaluate it, [he/she/they was] like, "What is your problem? What is your deal? What are you doing? Why have you worked like this for so long?" And I'm like, "I don't know. This is what they gave me, so I just kind of went along." Raised the same desk, but facilities built these blocks to put under it to raise it. And I got a new chair.

Ford also noted that, at first, he disclosed too much about his disabilities. "I didn't know better. I had a[n] . . . injury, and I was pretty out there." Since then, he chose not to disclose very much at all. Like others, the disability liaison with whom Ford worked had been a good guide for him about disclosure and accommodations.

[The liaison] told me, especially if there are certain people that you know well enough, you could tell them a couple of things. But don't be spreading the news

around about exactly what happened or how it's affecting you because somebody's going to document that and use it against you at some point.

Ford followed the liaison's advice. If Ford disclosed at all, he was careful about what he said. "I have not disclosed the deep details of the medical stuff. My supervisors don't even know what appointments I go to, really. Like who I see. They're not legally entitled to know who my practitioners are, actually."

Like many others, Sarah described taking the step of engaging with a disability liaison. Around the time that her interview took place, she talked with her disability liaison and sought reassurance for the ongoing medical condition with which she struggles. She believed that this reassurance made it easier to use the flexibility which she had as a faculty member in order to self-accommodate and to engage.

Concerns associated with disclosure and accommodation intersected with other themes relating to how faculty members who have disabilities were engaged with their campuses and scholarly communities. The participants were clear; their teaching and engagement with students positively influenced their disclosure and accommodations and, therefore, their engagement. When participants were engaged with a disability liaison, their disclosure and accommodations were positively affected.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the themes associated with the initial research question: How do faculty members with disabilities believe their disabilities relate to their employee engagement? Navigating fatigue meant that faculty members had to be selective and efficient with their time and engagement. They acknowledged that there were limitations they experienced because of that fatigue and the need to overcome

obstacles that faculty members without disabilities might not experience. These barriers included internal obstacles, such as fear and shame, as well as external obstacles associated with mobility. These internal and external challenges affected the engagement for faculty members with disabilities by limiting their ability to spend time on campus and/or disciplinary interactions. Having a disability meant that faculty members had to be honest with themselves about their capacities and to be efficient with their engagement. At the same time, when participants were able to reframe and to overcome the obstacles associated with their disabilities, they found ways to support others in the university community (often students) who were experiencing struggles in their lives.

I also examined the themes associated with the second research question: How do faculty members with disabilities believe that relationships with university and disciplinary colleagues relate to their employee engagement? Building and nurturing friendships that supported engagement meant that faculty members had to push themselves. Simultaneously, when participants were able to, they found ways to develop and to maintain friendships. The participants were clear; they loved being faculty members. They were passionate about teaching and having strong relationships, especially with students. On and off their campuses, these passions drove them and increased their engagement. At the same time, participants were clear about the importance of being open to networks and how their interactions with others shaped their engagement. These scholars pushed themselves while finding, building, and maintaining their community.

I further considered the themes associated with the third research question: How do faculty members with disabilities believe that the support and resources at their

institutions relate to their employee engagement? Participants acknowledged that they experienced limitations with their engagement because of unsupportive and hostile work environments. Participants also explained how navigating limited resources, related to grant funding and their compensation, influenced their engagement. Navigating unsupportive work environments and limited resources meant that faculty members had to be efficient with their time and energy. Like unsupportive environments and limited resources, stigma meant that faculty members had to be selective with their engagement. The participants acknowledged that they experienced limitations because of that stigma which faculty members without disabilities might not encounter. These obstacles included overcoming other people's perceptions and biases about scholarly capabilities, especially when a faculty member experienced an invisible disability. The barriers also included communication gaps and a lack of outreach. These challenges affected the campus and/or disciplinary engagement for faculty members with a disability by limiting their abilities because they had to use their energy to fight the stigma and biases surrounding the disability. As scholars, the participants had intensive responsibilities for research, teaching and service. Having a disability meant that they had to fight for a culture change away from stigma and ableism while being efficient with their engagement. When participants could, they found ways to support the development of communication regarding disabilities for their university communities.

Finally, this chapter discussed the themes associated with the fourth research question: How does the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities relate to their decisions to disclose and to receive accommodations? The participants were clear; their teaching and engagement with students positively influenced their disclosure

and accommodations. When participants were engaged with a disability liaison, their disclosure and accommodations were positively affected.

In sum, this chapter illustrated how faculty members with disabilities believe that fatigue and challenges to mobility limit their engagement and how reframing and overcoming obstacles can strengthen engagement. The chapter also presented findings suggesting that friendship, a passion for their work, love for their journeys, and building networks can strengthen the participants' engagement. Faculty members with disabilities pointed to an unsupportive work environment and a lack of support and resources addressing stigma and ableist cultures as negatively influencing their engagement. The chapter showed how improved communication with academic leaders and disability liaisons can strengthen participants' engagement as well as their disclosure and accommodation-seeking behaviors.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Distinct from prior employee-engagement studies at higher-education institutions, my research focused on the engagement of faculty members with disabilities. I strove for research that adds to the broader conversation encompassing how disabilities and relationships with colleagues relate to the employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behaviors of faculty members who have disabilities and serve at institutions of higher education. Using Shuck, Osam, et al.'s (2017) definition of employee engagement as “a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy” (p. 269), my research illustrated how faculty members with disabilities believe that fatigue and challenges to mobility limit their engagement and how reframing and overcoming obstacles can strengthen engagement. The research also presented findings suggesting that friendship, a passion for their work, love for their journeys, and building networks can strengthen people’s engagement. Faculty members with disabilities pointed to an unsupportive work environment and a lack of support and resources, along with stigma and ableist cultures, as negatively influencing their engagement. The study showed how improved communication with academic leaders and disability liaisons can strengthen participants’ engagement as well as the disclosure and accommodation-seeking behaviors.

In this chapter, I address my findings as well as how my findings align with or strengthen existing theory. I offer suggestions for future research that is necessary to better understand the experiences of faculty members with disabilities. I describe what

my findings suggest for practice and what higher education professionals can do differently to support the engagement of faculty members with disabilities.

Implications for Theory and Research

In an ideal scenario, the professional journey of faculty members with disabilities is mapped in five phases (Franke et al., 2012). The first step, self-acceptance, was supported by Megan's description of getting to a place where she accepted and owned her disability, and she was aware that the disability is a part of her. She acknowledged that she would not be who she is today if she did not have her disability; she accepted and was not ashamed of her invisible disability. The next step, connecting, building trust, and creating a healthy working relationship and a bond with colleagues and administrators, was endorsed by Green. He pointed out that becoming a successful faculty member involves building friendships and research relationships as well as maintaining communication with people who work within one's community of scholars. Green believed that, within every research area, there is a community of people who are thinking about a common problem. The third step, creating transparency while bringing up disabilities to colleagues and administrators, as well as the fourth step of working with colleagues and administrators to define the essential work goals and functions that are needed in order to achieve academic objectives, were reinforced by Ford's account. He described how he was open about how he could do the cognitive, academic part of his work, but the central part of his job, under normal circumstances, was field-based work. Because Ford's disability influenced his energy and focus levels, he was transparent about his disability and worked with his colleagues and administrators regarding issues with travel and participating in field-based work. Blue's description of how she arrived at

a point of peace about only working for specified amounts of time each week supported the fifth step. After working with colleagues and administrators, faculty members with disabilities should map out the necessary accommodations.

Non-inclusive cultures, power, unearned privilege, and microaggressions all influence employment relationships as well as employee engagement. Self-acceptance of a disability can be daunting for anyone, but that self-acceptance is a unique challenge for individuals who are striving to create a career in a competitive academic environment. Sarah's description of others in the academy failing to understand that she has to limit travel and cannot work without breaks supports Evans et al.'s (2017) assertion:

Structural norms, as well as formal organizational policies and practices, can be barriers to the full inclusion and success of staff and faculty with disabilities.

Some of these are institution-level concerns; others play out across institutions and are discipline or job category concerns. (p. 206)

Audrey's description of the stigma around opportunities to advance for people with disabilities reinforces the existence of misconceptions from administrators, colleagues, staff, and students related to limitations and reasonable accommodations. The stigma she described makes the self-acceptance, trust, connection, building of transparency, and defining-goals portions of the journey even more arduous for faculty members with disabilities.

Several of my participants experienced favorable circumstances after disclosure. However, most faculty members are fearful of unfavorable academic consequences that result from their disclosure. Stigma and privacy are prevalent concerns associated with disclosure. With the exclusion of disclosing to human resources, most faculty members

believe that disclosure is worthwhile. Faculty members who disclosed to students experienced positive interactions.

To encourage familiarity with disability resources, campuses must institute the infrastructure for dialogue regarding disability accommodations. Systems for accommodating faculty members with disabilities are nebulous; as such, academic issues related to disabilities are commonly managed by using an individualized approach. Facilitating communication about issues related to disability in higher education must entail establishing novel and uniform guidelines. Azure's description of how she felt the stigma around her invisible disability compared to her visible disability supported Price et al.'s (2017) assertion:

[W]hen the attitude toward mental disability is uncertain or unclear, faculty members may be more conservative concerning sharing their mental disabilities with others. Wider attention to such issues among faculty—that is, systemic attention to making workplaces more accessible for mental disabilities—is a necessary step toward reducing the stigma associated with such disabilities. (p. 3)

Andrew and Cyan's descriptions of loving their relationships and engagement showed how, with support, faculty members with disabilities had overcome obstacles along their journeys.

While faculty members are required to disclose a disability prior to receiving formal institutional accommodations, power and unearned privilege are revealed when faculty members are required to disclose their disabilities. Zack's belief that his colleagues and administration saw him as "less than" as well as Ford's description of how an administrator was fearful about safety issues related to his disability and teaching

supported Shuck et al.'s (2016) assertion: "As employees disclose their disability . . . co-workers may view them as different, and with diminished capabilities, despite any earned privilege they may have, such as education or rank" (p. 214). Ned's description of how faculty members with disabilities "are not operating on an even basis every day, so to make up for what they are supposed to do, they are under more stress" and, consequently, experience more fatigue reinforced how faculty members with power and unearned privilege are not required to travel the same path as people who experience disability. Thus, people with power and unearned privilege may be able to engage at their workplace more easily.

Several additional questions are associated with how universities can better develop faculty members to self-accommodate and to manage time, energy, and well-being routines while effectively communicating, interacting, and building and maintaining scholarly connections. What remains to be answered, with clarity, is how universities can better support faculty members who have disabilities to overcome mobility and the associated constraints, such as conferences and fieldwork. Scholars should investigate how universities can support faculty members with establishing mindsets which are focused on people's self-acceptance and mindfulness as well as eliminating self-doubt when being transparent about their struggles.

Future research should also explore how universities can better assist faculty members with disabilities to find mentors, feedback loops, and disability advocacy opportunities while navigating tenure and promotion, the associated time and energy to overcome issues related to relationships with colleagues, and the obstacles related to organizational dynamics. Additionally, scholars should investigate how universities can

better equip faculty members who have disabilities to overcome struggles with the stigma associated with comparisons made between invisible disabilities and visible disabilities as well as the time it takes to create the support to overcome ableism and other types of discrimination. Another research area is how universities can better prepare faculty members with disabilities to transcend overt and subtly coded discrimination, a lack of support from discriminatory cultures, classism, homophobia, racism, and sexism at the personal, structural, and systemic levels.

Further research should analyze the university's historical, quantitative employee-engagement data which are aligned with the five quadrant fields: health/medical; humanities; science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM); social sciences; or other. A contextual analysis is necessary to examine the participants' academic experiences over time, as exemplified in the surveys and associated with the data derived from the qualitative interviews.

Implications for Practice

My participants described the fatigue that they experienced as they engaged in various aspects of their work. In order to support faculty in managing that fatigue, universities should support multiple ways of contributing to and engaging in faculty work. They could offer support for faculty members to develop systems to overcome the concerns associated with travel, fieldwork, and conference-attendance issues. For example, rather than requiring travel to conferences, virtual meetings with colleagues could be recognized and rewarded. This study illustrates that universities can directly benefit from faculty members with disabilities who support students and others who are striving in some way to overcome those struggles. In this way, institutions may be able to

support the engagement of faculty members with disabilities because those faculty members would be explicitly valued for what they bring to their university contexts.

My study underscores the need for universities to recognize the relationships which faculty members with disabilities might experience as they engage in various aspects of their work. A university could encourage faculty members to develop friendships, passions, a love for the work, and networks. To the extent possible, universities should also foster multiple ways of supporting faculty members with disabilities to further engage in and contribute to the community. For example, rather than maintaining a focus on individualistic performance and production, which might lead to isolation, more systemic ways of valuing collaboration and collective accomplishments could be developed and implemented. In this way, individual performance and university-wide productivity would increase.

This study identifies how universities should recognize the unsupportive work environment which faculty members with disabilities might experience as they engage in various aspects of their work. These findings also indicate that universities should increase the support and the resources which address the stigma and ableism which faculty members with a disability might experience while participating in various work functions. Universities could offer support for faculty members to develop systems to work through the challenging work environments and issues associated with a lack of communication and outreach. To the extent possible, universities should provide multiple resources to support the faculty members' work.

Rather than maintaining a focus on individualistic performance, production, and isolation, which might lead to unsupportive and hostile work environments, universities

should focus on stopping the perpetuation of stigma and systems that do not value the different ways in which faculty members with disabilities perform academic work. Instead of ignoring/failing to address the stigma around a disability, as well as the academy's tendency to support overloaded ableist cultures, universities could be more open to and intentional about acknowledging the unique journey that faculty members with disabilities travel. Disability could be seen through a similar lens as other marginalized and underrepresented identities in higher education. To this end, administrators could take steps towards balancing two objectives: (a) moving their institutions/departments towards universal design "environments to be [better] usable by people of all ages and abilities to the greatest extent possible" (Connell et al., 1997, para. 1) and (b) the right of passage all faculty members must complete. Much like the initiatives targeting employee engagement, these campaigns will be nebulous. However, if administrators can find a middle ground, this newly found space will further energize/empower scholars with disabilities in order to address stigmas and ableism. Universities could offer support for faculty members with disabilities and the people who supervise them; these resources should focus on creating open and honest communication. These findings illustrate how universities can directly benefit from positive and uplifting work environments. Spaces that are focused on outreach that is aimed at developing resources and opportunities which foster openness, as well as cultures that are focused on communication that supports faculty members with disabilities. In this way, there may, eventually, be increased individual performance and productivity, which faculty members with disabilities bring to their university contexts.

Thus, engagement will increase, and the loss of unseen human capital that faculty members with disabilities have to offer might be reduced.

This study identified how universities should recognize that engaging faculty members who have disabilities might increase the levels of disclosure and accommodation-seeking behaviors. Universities have strong systems/departments that enforce the Americans with Disabilities Act. However, institutions could offer additional support for faculty members with disabilities and their supervisors/evaluators in order to develop systems to disclose and to utilize accommodations. Finally, these results imply that universities can directly benefit from faculty members who engage with students and a disability liaison. The faculty members' disclosure and accommodation seeking behavior will increase because they are connected with someone who energizes and raises them in the university context. In this way, disclosure and accommodation seeking behaviors would increase, and universities would benefit even further from the strengths of all their faculty members.

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative study was to better understand how faculty members with disabilities believe that their disabilities and relationships relate to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking. I explored the collegial relationships that faculty members with disabilities have with university administration, department chairs/heads, other faculty members, staff, and students. I used Shuck, Osam, et al.'s (2017) definition of employee engagement: "a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive,

emotional and behavioral energy” (p. 269). Specifically, I focused on how faculty members believe that collegial relationships relate to their engagement.

A deeper understanding of the employee engagement for higher education faculty members with disabilities was necessary to ensure that research and practice related to engagement within academic communities are inclusive of the experiences for a diverse group of scholars. Increased insight about faculty members’ possible apprehension to disclose a disability and to receive accommodations was also critical to ensure that people who are in positions that can influence disability disclosure and accommodation seeking are strategically focused on connecting with and meeting the needs of scholars who have disabilities.

Overall, employee engagement is important to improve people’s well-being, performance, and production (Flaherty, 2015). This research aimed to understand how faculty members with disabilities experience and are engaged in their academic environments. This study also sought to appreciate the faculty members’ perceptions regarding disclosure and accommodation seeking.

My study helped scholars and practitioners better understand the employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking of faculty members with disabilities. I utilized the components of engagement provided by Shuck and associates (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) to frame my research. I focused on Shuck and associates’ (Shuck, Adelson, & Reio, 2017; Shuck, Nimon, & Zigarmi, 2017) definition which had yet to be utilized while investigating the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities. My own life experiences and worldview, centered on equity, diversity, and inclusion, shaped this study, undoubtedly

influencing my insight about the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities and my perceptions of the collected data (Kaye et al., 2011). With such approaches, this research produced valuable contributions to the study of higher education, disabilities, and human resource development. By affecting interventions, actions, and programs related to faculty members with disabilities, this study led to results that may influence theory, practice, and organizational and academic policy. Ultimately, I hope that my study will improve levels of well-being, performance, production, employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation-seeking behavior at higher education institutions.

Based on my research, it is clear that universities must bolster support, target the development of resources, and develop training that enables faculty members to overcome the stigma which they experience related to their disabilities. The educational opportunity should also explain how to navigate tenure and how to effectively work with a disability liaison. A faculty member's hesitancy to disclose is warranted, and it is not clear that all contexts will be safe for people to disclose right away. It would be ideal if institutions could get to a point where the training could focus on disclosing, possibly during the first day of class each semester. However, institutions would need to evolve in order for higher education to be at that ideal.

Universities need to foster organizational cultures that support disability accommodations. Like disclosure, universities must educate faculty members about how to work with disabilities while navigating accommodations and the accommodation process. Initiatives which focus on achieving these clear goals will enhance employee engagement, therefore leading to increased disclosure and accommodation-seeking

behavior from faculty members with disabilities who are working in higher education.

These campaigns must balance two ideas: (a) strengthening faculty members to be confident while overcoming obstacles about being taken seriously after disclosing and receiving accommodations as well as (b) changing the institutions that perpetuate stigma and the systems that do not value different ways of performing academic work. The initiatives must help people with disabilities feel strong enough to come forward and to advocate for their community, taking stigma on with all of their energies. Finally, my data suggest the value to higher education of including faculty with disabilities. The inclusion of faculty members with disabilities is not just the right thing to do for equity's sake; it also benefits the institution when faculty members bring additional awareness, sensitivity, and perspective to their interactions with students and their research and service.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, U. A., & Bhargava, S. (2013). Effects of psychological contract breach on organizational outcomes: Moderating role of tenure and educational levels. *Vikalpa*, 38(1), 13-26.
- Anaza, N. A., & Rutherford, B. (2012). How organizational and employee-customer identification, and customer orientation affect job engagement. *Journal of Service Management*, 23(5), 616-639.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 31-53.
- Bakibinga, P., Vinje, H. F., & Mittelmark, M. B. (2012). Self-tuning for job engagement: Ugandan nurses' self-care strategies in coping with work stress. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 14(1), 3-12.
- 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., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review Organizational Psychology Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 389-411.
- 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), 274-284.

- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations, 65*(10), 1359-1378.
- Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2013). Creativity and charisma among female leaders: The role of resources and work engagement. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(14), 2760-2779.
- Bal, P. M., Kooij, D. T., & De Jong, S. B. (2013). How do developmental and accommodative HRM enhance employee engagement and commitment? The role of psychological contract and SOC strategies. *Journal of Management Studies, 50*(4), 545-572.
- Bargagliotti, L. (2012). Work engagement in nursing: A concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 68*(6), 1414-1428.
- Barnes, D. C., & Collier, J. E. (2013). Investigating work engagement in the service environment. *Journal of Services Marketing, 27*(6), 485-499.
- Bartlett, K. R. (2001). The relationship between training and organizational commitment: A study in the health care field. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(4), 333-352.
- Bartlett, K. R., Quast, L. N., Paetzel, M. D. W., & Aroonsri, M. P. (2017). *The influence of engagement and self-directed learning on job performance for managers in six Asian countries and the US*. Retrieved from https://carlsonschool.umn.edu/sites/carlsonschool.umn.edu/files/faculty/publications/ahrd_asia_2017_bartlett_et_al_v20.docx

- Basas, C. G. (2009, June). *Lawyers with disabilities add critical diversity to the profession*. Paper presented at the second National Conference on Lawyers with Disabilities, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/disability/PublicDocuments/09report.authcheckdam.pdf>
- Batista-Taran, L. C., Shuck, M. B., Gutierrez, C. C., & Baralt, S. (2013). *The role of leadership style in employee engagement*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1143&context=sferc>
- Bezuijen, X. M., van den Berg, P. T., van Dam, K., & Thierry, H. (2009). Pygmalion and employee learning: The role of leader behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 35(5), 1248-1267.
- Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J. (2013). Mediator analysis of employee engagement: Role of perceived organizational support, PO fit, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Vikalpa*, 38(1), 27-40.
- Bledow, R., Schmitt, A., Frese, M., & Kühnel, J. (2011). The affective shift model of work engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1246-1257.
- Blizzard, R. (2004). Engagement vs. satisfaction among hospital teams. *Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing*, 1-3. Retrieved from <http://www.pcpci.org/sites/default/files/webinar-related/Engagement%20vs%20Satisfaction%20Gallup%20Paper.pdf>
- Brault, M. W. (2012). *Americans with disabilities: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.

- Brummelhuis, L. L., Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., & Keulemans, L. (2012). Do new ways of working foster work engagement? *Psicothema, 24*(1), 113-120.
- Buys, C., & Rothmann, S. (2010). Burnout and engagement of reformed church ministers. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(1), 1-11.
- Cech, E. A., & Blair-Loy, M. (2014). Consequences of flexibility stigma among academic scientists and engineers. *Work and Occupations, 41*(1), 86-110.
- Chalofsky, N. (2003). An emerging construct for meaningful work. *Human Resource Development International, 6*(1), 69-83.
- Chaudhuri, S., & Bartlett, K. R. (2014). The relationship between training outsourcing and employee commitment to the organization. *Human Resource Development International, 17*(2), 145-163.
- Chen, Z. J., Zhang, X., & Vogel, D. (2011). Exploring the underlying processes between conflict and knowledge sharing: A work-engagement perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(5), 1005-1033.
- Cheng, J. W., Lu, K. M., Chang, Y. Y., & Johnstone, S. (2013). Voice behavior and work engagement: The moderating role of supervisor-attributed motives. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 51*(1), 81-102.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 89-136.
- Cogin, J. A., & Fish, A. (2009). An empirical investigation of sexual harassment and work engagement: Surprising differences between men and women. *Journal of Management & Organization, 15*(1), 47-61.

- Cole, M. S., Walter, F., Bedeian, A. G., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2012). Job burnout and employee engagement: A meta-analytic examination of construct proliferation. *Journal of Management, 38*(5), 1550-1581.
- Collins, J. C., & Rocco, T. S. (2018). Queering employee engagement to understand and improve the performance of gay male law enforcement officers: A phenomenological exploration. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 30*(4), 273-295.
- Connell, B. R., Jones, M., Mace, R. Mueller, J., Mullick, A., Ostroff, E., . . . & Vanderheiden, G. (1997). *The principles of universal design (Version 2.0)*. Raleigh: North Carolina State University. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_ud/udprinciplestext.htm
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: Advances in research and applications*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 834-848.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Czarnowsky, M. (2008). *Learning's role in employee engagement: An ASTD research study*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Davies, I. A., & Crane, A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in small-and medium-size enterprises: Investigating employee engagement in fair trade companies. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 19*(2), 126-139.

- De Braine, R. D., & Roodt, G. (2011). The Job Demands-Resources model as predictor of work identity and work engagement: A comparative analysis. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 37*(2), 52-62.
- Del Líbano, M., Llorens, S., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). About the dark and bright sides of self-efficacy: Workaholism and work engagement. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 15*(2), 688-701.
- Deligero, J. C. L., & Laguador, J. M. (2014). Work engagement among employees and its relationship with work units' performance of a higher education institution. *International Journal of Management Sciences, 3*(12), 909-917.
- Demerouti, E., & Cropanzano, R. (2010). From thought to action: Employee work engagement and job performance. *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research, 65*, 147-163.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(1), 35-47.
- Dollard, M. F., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Psychosocial safety climate as a precursor to conducive work environments, psychological health problems, and employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*(3), 579-599.
- Drisko, J., & Maschi, T. (2015). *Content analysis: Pocket guides to social work research methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Egan, T. M., Yang, B., & Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*(3), 279-301.

- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Evans, N. J., Broido, E. M., Brown, K. R., & Wilke, A. K. (2017). *Disability in higher education: A social justice approach*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive: Consensus and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 270-291.
- Flaherty, C. (2015, October 23). Going through the motions? The 2015 survey of faculty workplace engagement. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/going-through-motions-2015-survey-faculty-workplace-engagement>
- Fleming, J. H., & Asplund, J. (2007). Where employee engagement happens. *The Gallup Management Journal*, 3(1).
- Fletcher, L. (2016). Training perceptions, engagement, and performance: Comparing work engagement and personal role engagement. *Human Resource Development International*, 19(1), 4-34.
- Franke, A. H., Bérubé, M. F., O'Neil, R. M., & Kurland, J. E. (2012). Accommodating faculty members who have disabilities. *Academe*, 98(4), 1-13.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 359(1449), 1367-1377.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Joiner, T. (2002). Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. *Psychological Science*, 13(2), 172-175.

- Fuecker, D., & Harbour, W. S. (2011). UReturn: University of Minnesota services for faculty and staff with disabilities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2011(154), 45-54.
- Gan, T., & Gan, Y. (2014). Sequential development among dimensions of job burnout and engagement among IT employees. *Stress and Health*, 30(2), 122-133.
- Gonzalez, K., & Jones, J. (2016, September 22). Study makes the case for employee engagement in higher education institutions. *Cornerstone*. Retrieved from <https://www.cornerstoneondemand.com/company/news/press-releases/study-makes-case-employee-engagement-higher-education-institutions>
- Grigely, J. (2017, June 27). The neglected demographic: Faculty members with disabilities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Neglected-Demographic-/240439>
- Hakkola, L., & Ropers-Huilman, R. (2018). A critical exploration of diversity discourses in higher education: A focus on diversity in student affairs and admissions. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 417-468). New York, NY: Springer.
- Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "Same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist*, 11(2), 119-127.
- Harding, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis from start to finish*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Harpur, P. D. (2014). Combating prejudice in the workplace with contact theory: The lived experiences of professionals with disabilities. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 34(1).

- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279.
- He, H., Zhu, W., & Zheng, X. (2014). Procedural justice and employee engagement: Roles of organizational identification and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Business Ethics, 122*(4), 681-695.
- Hendricks, D. J., Batiste, L. C., Hirsh, A., Schartz, H., & Blanck, P. (2005). Cost and effectiveness of accommodations in the workplace: Preliminary results of a nationwide study. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 25*(4), 12.
- Høigaard, R., Giske, R., & Sundsli, K. (2012). Newly qualified teachers' work engagement and teacher efficacy influences on job satisfaction, burnout, and the intention to quit. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(3), 347-357.
- Hu, Q., Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2011). The Job Demands-Resources model: An analysis of additive and joint effects of demands and resources. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(1), 181-190.
- Inoue, A., Kawakami, N., Tsuno, K., Shimazu, A., Tomioka, K., & Nakanishi, M. (2013). Job demands, job resources, and work engagement of Japanese employees: A prospective cohort study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 86*(4), 441-449.
- Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2015). College and university faculty workplace engagement. *Inside Higher Education, 1-27*.

- Jenkins, S., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Context matters: Examining “soft” and “hard” approaches to employee engagement in two workplaces. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2670-2691.
- Judge, T. A., Van Vianen, A. E., & De Pater, I. E. (2004). Emotional stability, core self-evaluations, and job outcomes: A review of the evidence and an agenda for future research. *Human Performance*, 17(3), 325-346.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kaye, H. S., Jans, L. H., & Jones, E. C. (2011). Why don't employers hire and retain workers with disabilities? *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 21(4), 526-536.
- Kerschbaum, S. L., O'Shea, A. M., Price, M., & Salzer, M. S. (2017). Accommodations and disclosure for faculty members with mental disability. In S. L. Kerschbaum, L. T. Eisenman, & J. M. Jones (Eds.), *Negotiating disability: Disclosure and higher education* (pp. 311-326). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J., & Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2), 301-313.
- Kühnel, J., & Sonnentag, S. (2011). How long do you benefit from vacation? A closer look at the fade-out of vacation effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1), 125-143.

- Langford, P. H. (2010). Benchmarking work practices and outcomes in Australian universities using an employee survey. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 32*(1), 41-53.
- Lee, C. (2015, November 23). UCLA staff respond to systemwide engagement survey. *UCLA Newsroom*. Retrieved from <http://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/ucla-staff-respond-to-systemwide-engagement-survey>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 3-30.
- Mache, S., Danzer, G., Klapp, B. F., & Groneberg, D. A. (2013). Surgeons' work ability and performance in surgical care: Relations between organizational predictors, work engagement and work ability. *Langenbeck's Archives of Surgery, 398*(2), 317-325.
- Madden, A., & Bailey, C. (2017). Engagement: Where has all the "power" gone? *Organizational Dynamics, 46*(2), 113-119.
- Martínez-Domínguez, S., Penadés, R., Segura, B., González-Rodríguez, A., & Catalán, R. (2015). Influence of social cognition on daily functioning in schizophrenia: Study of incremental validity and mediational effects. *Psychiatry Research, 225*(3), 374-380.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). Maslach Burnout Inventory: Third edition. In C. P. Zalaquett & R. J. Wood (Eds.), *Evaluating stress: A book of resources* (pp. 191-218). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 397-422.

- Matthews, C. K. (1994). *To tell or not to tell: The management of privacy boundaries by the invisibly disabled*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western States Communication Association, San Jose, CA.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
- Mendes, F., & Stander, M. W. (2011). Positive organization: The role of leader behavior in work engagement and retention. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 37(1), 1-13.
- Menguc, B., Auh, S., Fisher, M., & Haddad, A. (2013). To be engaged or not to be engaged: The antecedents and consequences of service employee engagement. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(11), 2163-2170.
- Meyer, J. P. (2017). Has engagement had its day: What's next and does it matter? *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 87-95.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., & Minichiello, V. (1990). *In-depth interviewing: Researching people*. London, UK: Longman Cheshire.
- Munger, K. M., & Mertens, D. M. (2011). Conducting research with the disability community: A rights-based approach. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2011(132), 23-33.

- Muyia-Nafukho, F., Roessler, R. T., & Kacirek, K. (2010). Disability as a diversity factor: Implications for human resource practices. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 12*(4), 395-406.
- Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., & Hulin, C. L. (2010). Job attitudes and employee engagement: Considering the attitude "A-factor." In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *The handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research, and practice* (pp. 43-61). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., Sparkman, T. E., & Carpenter, N. C. (2011). Invited reaction: The work cognition inventory: Initial evidence of construct validity. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 22*(1), 37-47.
- Nimon, K., Shuck, B., & Zigarmi, D. (2016). Construct overlap between employee engagement and job satisfaction: A function of semantic equivalence? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 17*(3), 1149-1171.
- Olkin, R. (2011). Academic leaders with disabilities: How do we know if we are winning when no one is keeping score? In J. L. Martin (Ed.), *Women as leaders in education: Succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges* (pp. 201-217). Santa Barbara, CA: American Bibliographical Center and Clio Press.
- Olney, M. F., & Brockelman, K. F. (2005). The impact of visibility of disability and gender on the self-concept of university students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 18*(1), 80-91.
- Ouweneel, E., Le Blanc, P. M., Schaufeli, W. B., & van Wijhe, C. I. (2012). Good morning, good day: A diary study on positive emotions, hope, and work engagement. *Human Relations, 65*(9), 1129-1154.

- Price, M. (2011). *Mad at school: Rhetorics of mental disability and academic life*. Lansing: University of Michigan Press.
- Price, M., Salzer, M. S., O'Shea, A., & Kerschbaum, S. L. (2017). Disclosure of mental disability by college and university faculty: The negotiation of accommodations, supports, and barriers. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 37(2), 3
- Rana, S., Ardichvili, A., & Tkachenko, O. (2014). A theoretical model of the antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: Dubin's method. *The Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26(3-4), 249-266.
- Rees, C., Alfes, K., & Gatenby, M. (2013). Employee voice and engagement: Connections and consequences. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2780-2798.
- Reio, T. G., & Callahan, J. L. (2004). Affect, curiosity, and socialization-related learning: A path analysis of antecedents to job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(1), 3-22.
- Reio, T. G., & Sanders-Reio, J. (2011). Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility really matter? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 462-478.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Rickard, G., Lenthall, S., Dollard, M., Opie, T., Knight, S., Dunn, S., . . . & Brewster-Webb, D. (2012). Organizational intervention to reduce occupational stress and turnover in hospital nurses in the Northern Territory, Australia. *Collegian*, 19(4), 211-221.

- Rocco, T. S., Bowman, L., & Bryant, L. O. (2014). Disability, health and wellness programs, and the role of HRD. In N. E. Chalofsky, T. S. Rocco, & M. L. Morris (Eds.), *Handbook of human resource development* (pp. 299-313). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rocco, T. S., & Delgado, A. (2011). Shifting lenses: A critical examination of disability in adult education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2011(132), 3-12.
- Rocco, T., & Fornes, S. (2010). Perspectives on disability in adult and continuing education. In C. Kasworm, A. Rose, & J. Ross-Gordon (Eds.), *The handbook of adult and continuing education* (pp. 379-388). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rothmann, S., & Jordaan, G. M. E. (2006). Job demands, job resources and work engagement of academic staff in South African higher education institutions. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 32(4), 87-96.
- Rurkkhum, S., & Bartlett, K. R. (2012). The relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior in Thailand. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(2), 157-174.
- Rurkkhum, S., & Bartlett, K. R. (2018). Organizational citizenship behaviour for collectivist cultures: Instrument development and human resource development implications. *Human Resource Development International*, 21(2), 107-124.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Saks, A. M. (2008). The meaning and bleeding of employee engagement: How muddy is the water? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 40-43.

- Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 155-182.
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1), 116-131.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Sambrook, S. (2016). Autoethnography: A novel way to study HRM. In K. Townsend, R. Loudoun, & D. Lewin (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods on human resource management: Innovative techniques* (pp. 42-57). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sardeshmukh, S. R., Sharma, D., & Golden, T. D. (2012). Impact of telework on exhaustion and job engagement: A job demands and job resources model. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 27(3), 193-207.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2011). Work engagement: On how to better catch a slippery concept. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 39-46.

- 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., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the Job Demands-Resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In G. Bauer & O. Hämmig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp. 43-68). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Selmer, J., Jonasson, C., & Luring, J. (2013). Group conflict and faculty engagement: Is there a moderating effect of group trust? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1), 95-109.
- Seppala, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(4), 459-480.
- Shapiro, B. K., & Gallico, R. P. (1993). Learning disabilities. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 40(3), 491-505.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63-75.
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., Kubota, K., & Kawakami, N. (2012). Do workaholism and work engagement predict employee well-being and performance in opposite directions? *Industrial Health*, 50(4), 316-321.

- Shirom, A. (2007). Explaining vigor: On the antecedents and consequences of vigor as a positive affect at work. In D. L. Nelson & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Positive organizational behavior* (pp. 86-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review, 10*(3), 304-328.
- Shuck, B. (2019). *Employee engagement: A research overview*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Shuck, B., Adelson, J. L., & Reio, T. G. (2017). The employee engagement scale: Initial evidence for construct validity and implications for theory and practice. *Human Resource Management, 56*(6), 953-977.
- Shuck, B., Collins, J. C., Rocco, T. S., & Diaz, R. (2016). Deconstructing the privilege and power of employee engagement: Issues of inequality for management and human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review, 15*(2), 208-229.
- Shuck, B., & Herd, A. M. (2012). Employee engagement and leadership: Exploring the convergence of two frameworks and implications for leadership development in HRD. *Human Resource Development Review, 11*(2), 156-181.
- Shuck, B., Nimon, K., & Zigarmi, D. (2017). Untangling the predictive nomological validity of employee engagement: Partitioning variance in employee engagement using job attitude measures. *Group & Organization Management, 42*(1), 79-112.
- Shuck, B., Osam, K., Zigarmi, D., & Nimon, K. (2017). Definitional and conceptual muddling: Identifying the positionality of employee engagement and defining the construct. *Human Resource Development Review, 16*(3), 263-293.

- Shuck, B., Reio, Jr., T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2011). Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables. *Human Resource Development International, 14*(4), 427-445.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review, 9*(1), 89-110.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2013). *A historical perspective of employee engagement: An emerging definition*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1159&context=sferc>
- Shuck, B., Zigarmi, D., & Owen, J. (2015). Psychological needs, engagement, and work intentions: A Bayesian multi-measurement mediation approach and implications for HRD. *European Journal of Training and Development, 39*(1), 2-21.
- Singh, K., Chang, M., & Dika, S. (2010). Ethnicity, self-concept, and school belonging: Effects on school engagement. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 9*(3), 159-175.
- Soane, E., Truss, C., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2012). Development and application of a new measure of employee engagement: The ISA Engagement Scale. *Human Resource Development International, 15*(5), 529-547.
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Binnewies, C., & Scholl, A. (2008). Being engaged at work and detached at home: A week-level study on work engagement, psychological detachment, and affect. *Work & Stress, 22*(3), 257-276.
- Stone-Romero, E. F., Stone, D. L., & Lukaszewski, K., (2006). The influence of disability on role-taking in organizations. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity* (pp. 401-425). London, UK: Sage.

- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2012). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sulea, C., Virga, D., Maricutoiu, L. P., Schaufeli, W., Zaborila Dumitru, C., & Sava, F. A. (2012). Work engagement as mediator between job characteristics and positive and negative extra-role behaviors. *Career Development International, 17*(3), 188-207.
- Sullivan, B., Bartlett, K. R., & Rana, S. (2015). *The role of strategic HRD in establishing employee engagement initiatives: A case study from higher education*. Retrieved from <https://www.ufhrd.co.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/The-Role-of-Strategic-HRD-in-Establishing-Employee-Engagement-Initiatives-A-Case-Study-from-Higher-Education.docx>
- Swanberg, J. E., McKechnie, S. P., Ojha, M. U., & James, J. B. (2011). Schedule control, supervisor support and work engagement: A winning combination for workers in hourly jobs? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(3), 613-624.
- Tongco, M. D. C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany Research and Applications, 5*, 147-158.
- Torp, S., Grimsmo, A., Hagen, S., Duran, A., & Gudbergsson, S. B. (2013). Work engagement: A practical measure for workplace health promotion? *Health Promotion International, 28*(3), 387-396.
- Townsend, K., Wilkinson, A., & Burgess, J. (2013). Filling the gaps: Patterns of formal and informal participation. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 34*(2), 337-354.
- Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). *Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: Exploring*

- the evidence, developing the theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09585192.2013.798921>
- U.S. AbilityOne Commission. (2016). *People with disabilities*. Retrieved from https://www.abilityone.gov/abilityone_program/who_people.html
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2008). *Notice concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) amendments act of 2008*. Retrieved from <https://www.eeoc.gov/statutes/notice-concerning-americans-disabilities-act-ada-amendments-act-2008>
- Van Bogaert, P., Wouters, K., Willems, R., Mondelaers, M., & Clarke, S. (2013). Work engagement supports nurse workforce stability and quality of care: Nursing team-level analysis in psychiatric hospitals. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 20*(8), 679-686.
- Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H. A. M., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction—A systematic review. *Occupational Medicine, 53*(3), 191-200.
- Van Schalkwyk, S., Du Toit, D. H., Bothma, A. S., & Rothmann, S. (2010). Job insecurity, leadership empowerment behavior, employee engagement and intention to leave in a petrochemical laboratory. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management, 8*(1), 1-7.
- Viljevac, A., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., & Saks, A. M. (2012). An investigation into the validity of two measures of work engagement. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23*, 3692-3709.

- Wang, D. S., & Hsieh, C. C. (2013). The effect of authentic leadership on employee trust and employee engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(4), 613-624.
- Wefald, A. J., Mills, M. J., Smith, M. R., & Downey, R. G. (2012). A comparison of three job engagement measures: Examining their factorial and criterion-related validity. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 4(1), 67-90.
- Wilkinson, D. (2017). *The Oxford review annual 2016/17*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Review.
- Wollard, K. K., & Shuck, B. (2011). Antecedents to employee engagement: A structured review of the literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 429-446.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the Job Demands-Resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(3), 235-244.
- Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., & Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2799-2823.
- Yeh, C. W. (2012). Relationships among service climate, psychological contract, work engagement and service performance. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 25, 67-70.

APPENDIX A**Employee Engagement Scale****Employee Engagement Scale****Cognitive Energy**

- focus
- concentration
- effort
- attention

Emotional Energy

- personal meaning
- sense of belonging
- pride
- belief in missions, purpose, and future

Behavioral Energy

- exceeding expectations
- pushing one's self beyond expectations
- unsolicited extra effort
- a team-based mindset
- a focus on departmental, college and university success

APPENDIX B

Uniqueness and Conceptual Boundaries of Employee Engagement as Compared to Other Associated Constructs

Job Satisfaction

an employee's affective reactions to a job based on comparing desired outcomes with actual outcomes - two motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention

Job Satisfaction centers on contentment - **Employee Engagement** focuses on emotional loyalty while applying discretionary energy

Employee Engagement

a positive, active work-related psychosocial state conceptualized by maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy

Employee Engagement focuses on high levels of individual performance while fulfilling a function with imagination toward innovation - **Organizational Commitment** (buy-in, organizational retention, goals, and effectiveness) align with employee engagement

Organizational Commitment

a person's type and strength of attachment to their institution in three aspects – affective, continuance, and normative

Employee Engagement focuses on production while in work roles - **Organizational Citizenship Behavior**, a seemingly later stage/outcome of employee engagement, centers on the voluntary actions needed to exceed work expectations

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

discretionary job performance that goes beyond formal job requirements, and is increasingly important to the achievement of organizational goals and performance

APPENDIX C

Recruitment Script

Hello, my name is Peter Campion, I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota. As part of my dissertation research, I will be looking at the journeys of faculty members with disabilities in higher education. The purpose of this qualitative study is to discover how faculty members with disabilities believe that their disabilities and relationships with colleagues relate to their behaviors related to engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking.

I am looking for faculty members with a disability working at the [Midwest university] to take part in two 60-minute individual interviews either in person or by phone in the spring of 2019. Participation in this research is strictly confidential and participants are welcome to remove themselves from this research at any time. There is no direct risk associated with engaging in this research. It is my hope that your involvement will improve university strategies and understandings about helping faculty members with disabilities. While there is no immediate advantage to you, you will consider your disabilities and academic journeys and thus aid in enhancing strategies targeting the disclosure, accommodation seeking, and engagement of faculty members with disabilities in higher education.

Please email camp0544@umn.edu if you would like more information about possibly participating in this research.

Thank you for your consideration.

With respect and gratitude,

Peter Joseph Campion

APPENDIX D**Participant Information Form**

The purpose of this form is to collect general information about you. You may choose not to fill in any information that you would prefer not to share.

Name (First name and last initial):

Pseudonym:

Visible or Invisible Disability or Disabilities:

Academic rank:

Tenure status:

Which general area do you feel most associated with?

- Health/Medical
- Humanities (Ancient Languages, Art, Literature, Philosophy, History, Human Geography, Law, Politics, Modern Languages, and Religion)
- Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (Accounting, Computer Programming, Engineering, Life Sciences, and Statistics)
- Social Sciences (Anthropology, Archaeology, Communication Studies, Economics, History, Human Geography, Jurisprudence, Linguistics, Political Science, Psychology, Public Health, and Sociology)
- Other

APPENDIX E

IRB Approval

IRB study no.

The Engagement of Faculty Members with Disabilities in Higher Education

CONSENT FORM

You are invited to participate in a qualitative study to discover how faculty members with disabilities believe that their disabilities and relationships with colleagues relate to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking. Peter Campion is directing this study, a doctoral student in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.

Study Purpose

The purpose of this qualitative study is to understand better how faculty members with disabilities believe their disabilities and relationships with colleagues relate to their employee engagement, disclosure, and accommodation seeking.

Study Procedures

This study is voluntary. Phone interviews are available. If you choose not to engage, it will not influence you in any negative way. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to:

- Complete a brief online participant information form
- Participate in two individual interviews, each lasting between 45 minutes and an hour
- Talk about your experiences as a faculty member at the [Midwest university]
- Allow the researcher to audio record and take notes during the conversations
- Expect to receive and reply to an email from the researcher within 48 hours of the first interview to schedule the second interview
- Review the transcripts of your interviews and offer corrections or additional feedback

Examples of Sensitive Questions You Will Be Asked

- I'm interested in how your disability or long-term medical condition relate to your engagement. How, if at all, does your disability or condition affect how you can engage in the university?
- How much have you disclosed your disability at work? How did you choose to disclose?
- Do you use disability accommodations at work? Were these accommodations through the University?
- Have you ever encountered ableism? Discrimination?

Risks of Study Participation

This study involves no significant risk to you except the loss of the time spent meeting with the researcher and the potential of bringing up painful experiences. You can refuse to answer any question for any reason and stop the interview at any time. Your identifying information will not be used in the dissertation or any subsequent presentations or publications. Your participation in this study is voluntary. There is a small risk that study data will be compromised; however, I will use the highest data protections available and therefore consider this possibility unlikely.

Benefits of Study Participation

There are no tangible benefits to study participation.

Confidentiality

The records of the research will be held private. You will be asked if I may keep your contact information at the end of the individual interview to schedule a follow-up individual interview. Contact and identifying information will be kept separate from your interviews and demographic data and will be destroyed upon your request or 12 months after data collection begins.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with the [Midwest university]. If you decide to participate, you are also free to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships. You can remove yourself by contacting Peter Campion (camp0544@umn.edu).

Contacts and Questions

The sole researcher conducting this study is Peter Campion under the advisement of Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Ph.D. You may ask questions you have now, or if you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact either individual at camp0544@umn.edu or ropers@umn.edu.

To share feedback privately with the Human Research Protections Program (HRPP) about your research experience, call the Research Participants' Advocate Line at 612-625-1650 or go to <https://research.umn.edu/units/hrpp/research-participants/questions-concerns>.

Please retain a copy of this information for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information, and I wish to be a part of this study.

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Participant signature

APPENDIX F

Interview Protocol (Inductive)

Each individual interview will start with introductions and an overview of the research. Faculty members will be asked to review and sign the consent form at this time.

I am investigating the employee engagement, professional academic relationships, support, resources, disclosure, and accommodation seeking of faculty members with disabilities serving in higher education. Thank you for joining me and engaging in this study. Please review the informed consent statement. Do you have any questions?

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How do faculty members with disabilities engage in their academic work?
 1. How do faculty members with disabilities believe their disabilities relate to their employee engagement?
 2. How do faculty members with disabilities believe the relationships with colleagues within their institutions relate to their employee engagement?
 3. How do faculty members with disabilities believe support and resources within their institutions relate to their employee engagement?
4. How does the employee engagement of faculty members with disabilities relate to their decisions to disclose and receive accommodations?

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

1. Tell me about how you ended up working in higher education.
2. How long have you been here at this university? What roles or positions have you had?
3. How would you describe your work environment?
4. What do you love about your work as a faculty member?
5. What challenges do you face in your work as a faculty member?

PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC RELATIONSHIPS

1. I'm interested in your engagement at all levels of your university -- tell me about how you interact with others at the program, department, or university levels.
2. I'm also interested in your engagement in your field or discipline -- tell me about how you interact with others in your professional fields.
3. I'm interested in how your disability or long-term medical condition relate to your engagement. How, if at all, does your disability or condition affect how you can engage in the university?
4. How does your disability or condition affect how you can engage in your field or discipline?

5. I'm interested in your relationships with people at the university. How do your relationships with others (colleagues, students, administration, other) affect your engagement at the university?
6. What have been your experiences in developing relationships with other faculty members?
7. How do relationships with others in your field or discipline affect your performance? Productivity? Wellbeing?

DISABILITY

1. Do you think there is anything unique about the perspective you bring to academic work as a person with a disability? How does that show up in your work?

SUPPORT FOR FACULTY MEMBERS WITH DISABILITIES

1. What are the most significant barriers to a career for faculty members with disabilities?
2. What do you think universities or departments could do or provide that would benefit faculty members with disabilities?

DISCLOSURE AND ACCOMMODATIONS

1. How much have you disclosed your disability at work? How did you choose to disclose?
2. Do you use disability accommodations at work? Were these accommodations through the University?

3. What do you see as the most significant risks or benefits of being open about your disability and using accommodation in academia?
4. Have you ever encountered ableism? Have you ever encountered any other type of discrimination?
5. Do you think faculty members with disabilities experience different stressors than faculty members without disabilities while on the job?
6. What advice would you give to other people with disabilities considering a career as a faculty member in higher education?

Is there anything else you wanted to say about the engagement of faculty members with disabilities?

What would you like your pseudonym to be?

Thank you for participating in this research. I will share a copy of this interview with you once I have transcribed it and would welcome your feedback on whether the transcript accurately reflects your thinking. I will be sure to clarify any questions and comments you may have. I am looking forward to our follow-up interview.