Faculty Motivation, Human Resource Development, And Wellbeing: A Scoping Review

Truus Poels

Business and Management, Webster University, Leiden, Netherlands and Rectorate LUT, LUT University, Lappeenranta/Lahti, Finland
truus.poels73@webster.edu (truus.poels@lut.fi)

Abstract— This abstract provides an overview of research on faculty motivation, human resource development, and wellbeing within the academic community. Over the past decades, scholars have sought to understand the factors influencing faculty motivation and productivity. While traditional mechanisms such as promotion and sabbaticals play a role, individual motivation is paramount. Studies reveal differences in satisfaction levels among faculty, influenced by factors like salary, infrastructure, and research opportunities. Understanding faculty motivation is complex, with two main approaches: the work context perspective focusing on human resource development and the health perspective emphasizing wellbeing. Interdisciplinary research is crucial to bridge gaps between these perspectives. A scoping review was conducted to map existing knowledge, identifying topics like intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, and sources of motivation. However, the sheer volume of literature poses a challenge to in-depth analysis. Nonetheless, this review aims to inform evidence-based interventions to enhance faculty motivation, aligning with the United Nations' (UN's) Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all. This goal emphasizes the importance of health and wellbeing, which are crucial for maintaining a motivated and productive faculty. Ultimately, integrating insights from both perspectives can facilitate the development of tailored interventions to promote faculty motivation and wellbeing in higher education institutions.

Keywords— Faculty Motivation, Human Resource Development, Job Satisfaction, SDG 3, Wellbeing.

I. *INTRODUCTION*

Faculty members are central to the functioning of colleges and universities. For nearly 50 years, researchers have attempted to understand the factors that motivate faculty to work and how to keep them invigorated and productive within the academic community. Traditional mechanisms such as faculty promotion, tenure evaluations, and occasional sabbatical leaves play a role, but faculty often rely on personal motivation to remain vibrant in their teaching and research [1]. Differences in satisfaction levels among faculty members are influenced by variables such as salary, infrastructure, and research opportunities. For example, engineering faculty need access to laboratories and leisure time to work in their specialized fields. Providing such motivation can inspire faculty to showcase their talents, benefiting both themselves and their institutions [2].

Faculty motivation is often associated with human resource development (HRD) and wellbeing. Although research into faculty motivation is widespread, differences exist in how this topic is conceptualised and researched. The two main approaches are the work context perspective, focusing on HRD, and the health perspective, emphasizing wellbeing. HRD involves frameworks for helping employees develop their skills, knowledge, and abilities, thereby improving an organization's effectiveness. Wellbeing, on the other hand, is often defined and measured in terms of employee engagement, job satisfaction, or in contrast, in terms of burnout [3]. Therefore, knowledge gaps exist in integrating these different contributors to faculty motivation.

Interdisciplinary research is necessary to consolidate current knowledge existing from both perspectives. Within each perspective, literature reviews are common, although there is little crossover between the two. Consequently, a scoping review has been conducted to examine and map the work context perspective with the framework of HRD and the health perspective considering the context of wellbeing.

This scoping review aims to highlight dominant trends and significant gaps in understanding faculty motivation. It will also propose practical implications for the HRD field and suggest avenues for future research on faculty motivation [4]. This work connects faculty motivation and wellbeing to broader societal goals, particularly the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 3 (SDG 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all). By fostering motivated, supported, and healthy academic staff, universities not only enhance engagement and performance but also contribute to global health and sustainable work conditions. Integrating insights from HRD and wellbeing research is therefore both an academic and strategic imperative, ensuring that interventions are effective, measurable, and sustainable while advancing the educational and societal missions of higher education.

II. *METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW*

This scoping review aims to provide a framework to identify knowledge gaps and construct evidence-based interventions. This scoping review is conducted, following the framework of Munn, Peters, and Stern [5], which is well-suited for identifying and mapping characteristics and concepts across diverse sources. Scoping reviews are particularly beneficial in interdisciplinary research, helping to identify overlapping concepts that may use different terminology across fields. The systematic review procedure described by Briner an Denyer [6] was also utilized, which includes five stages: planning and scoping, undertaking a structured search, evaluating search results against agreed criteria, extracting evidence from the included items, and developing findings for dissemination.

We searched the following databases Business Source Complete (EBSCO), APA PsycInfo (EBSCO), CINAHL (with Full Text), Environment Complete, ERIC – Education Resources Information Center (EBSCO), Family & Society Studies Worldwide, Humanities International Complete, Professional Development Collection, and SocINDEX. The search terms focused on faculty and motivation, human resources development (HRD) higher education, and wellbeing. The scoping review utilises multiple search strategies to capture research from the work-related perspective with the framework of human resource development and the health perspective considering the context of wellbeing, yielding 1,047 results from 2013-2023. The most relevant information was extracted and summarised. The results included academic journals (English language, full-text and peer-reviewed). Thesaurus terms as motivation (psychology), wellbeing, psychology, employee motivation, health behavior, job satisfaction, academic achievement, personnel management, emotions, satisfaction, self-efficacy, work-environment, experience, psychosocial factors, leadership, personality, mental health, corporate culture, psychological burnout, mental depression, university faculty, job stress, work-life balance and organizational behavior were found, as for subjects the terms structural equation model, motivation (psychology), theory, well-being, intrinsic motivation, employee psychology, higher education, academic motivation, achievement motivation, cognition, emotions, mental health, organizational performance, psychological stress, psychological well-being, autonomy (psychology), confidence, emotional intelligence, extrinsic motivation, individual development, psychology, psychosocial factors, self-efficacy, social

psychology, academic achievement, psychological disengagement and self- control were used. After applying subject criteria and filtering for relevance, the results were narrowed down to 79 articles. The subject criteria were selected in the planning and scoping stage.

Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, employee engagement as well as sources of motivation (related to task and/or related to individual needs) were identified as topics of wellbeing. For individual needs the topics of competence, autonomy, belongingness (relationship with university, relationship with supervisor, relationship with peers and relationship with students), and self-esteem were found. HRD topics focused mainly on increasing the knowledge, skills, and the capacities of faculty.

A limitation of this review is the large number of included search results; it limits the depth of analysis that can be reached. This review aims to provide an overarching view of the work context related perspective with human resource development and the health perspective considering the context of wellbeing, although this may lead to a loss of detail in explaining the relationships.

In line with the UN's SDG Goal 3 "Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all" (United Nations, 2020), this scoping review focuses on the outcome of faculty motivation, human resource development and wellbeing. By understanding both the work context related perspective with the framework of human resource development and the health perspective considering the context of wellbeing, tailor-made, evidence-based interventions can be developed within universities to increase faculty motivation.

This scoping review is a research synthesis or evidence synthesis in which the process of combining the results of multiple primary research studies aims to map the key concepts and gabs related to the topics of faculty motivation, HRD, and wellbeing.

III. *KEY CHARACTERISTICS OR FACTORS RELATED TO THE FRAMEWORK OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND THE HEALTH PERSPECTIVE*

In this scoping review focusing on the outcome of faculty motivation, HRD, and wellbeing, several characteristics were identified:

1. Motivational Factors: These include identifying intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that influence faculty members' engagement and productivity. This includes the drive and enthusiasm that university faculty members have toward their teaching, research, and other professional responsibilities. Motivation is a dynamic process driven by the interaction of personal, sociopsychological, and contextual factors [7]. It is a joint function of internal psychological processes and environmental factors that can be adequately analysed only if the characteristics of a person and the context within which the action happens are considered [8] [9].

Engagement can be influenced in various ways, e.g. by identifying the optimal approach for motivating faculty to adopt teaching innovation is important, given that broad-scale initiatives can utilize an inordinate amount of time and resources [10] [11].

Most research found in this literature review is not related to the specific situations of academic life for faculty, but for example civil air traffic controllers in Malaysia [12]. The results of these studies are however highlighting the importance of the level of contributions of work environment; work conditions, decision demand, human resource primacy, learning demand and quantitative demand towards employee wellbeing. The

research in this literature review related to the specific situations of academic life for faculty includes several specific topics related to the motivational factors, e.g. salary, motivation for presenting papers, financial benefits for research related contributions, performance, student's self-support and their progression, learning and evaluation techniques, infrastructure, governance leadership and management, training [13] [14]. Richardson and McKenna describe faculty motivation as a complex and holistic mechanism driven by multiple goals, including adventure, learning, family, and change [15]. Personal characteristics (intrinsic motivation) and stressors outside the workplace (for example lack of support) contribute significantly to faculty burnout, and in turn, having consistent adverse consequences for performance [16].

2. Human Resource Development (HRD) Initiatives: Characteristics related to professional development opportunities, training programs, and initiatives aimed at enhancing faculty skills and capacities. In other words, HRD consists of the process of improving organizational performance by enhancing the skills, knowledge, and abilities of employees. In the context of universities, this includes professional development, training programs, and other initiatives aimed at supporting faculty members. For this the academic culture is a crucial component of belonging. HRD can be described as the "process for developing and unleashing human expertise through organization development and personnel training and development for the purpose of improving performance" [17]. Hamouche and Chabani (2021) concluded that the labor market due to the COVID-19 outbreak generated new workforce patterns that represent a significant challenge for HRD professionals in organizations [18]. According to Hastings, Boden, Thorne, Roundtree, May, & Pomeroy [19] creating an inclusive and supportive culture involves acknowledging the distinct characteristics of faculty roles, including research, teaching, and service responsibilities. Ideal academic environments value diverse contributions and recognize the varied pathways to success within academia. Belonging is fostered through collaborative research and interdisciplinary work. Universities can promote opportunities for faculty to engage in cross-disciplinary projects, fostering a sense of community and shared purpose [20].

Practitioners and scholars in HRD have long argued that we are in a unique and important place to impact the span of the human continuum – from the individual to our global community. This is evidenced by the dynamic expansion of HRD from individualized coaching to the inclusion of HRD in the global planning and implementation by the United Nations. The scale and scope of these developments introduce significant challenges in aligning contributions with a dynamic world of work, community, citizenship, and our own development, and simultaneously striving to humanize our communities through carefully considering broad social issues of inequity, historical oppression, and systematic biases [21].

Egan, Akdere and Kim [22] highlight the growing disconnect between HRD research and the realities faced by organizations and employees in dynamic work environments. They call for more integrative and socially responsible HRD approaches that recognize the interdependence of learning, motivation, and wellbeing. This call underscores the importance of examining faculty motivation through both HRD and wellbeing lenses, as these dimensions jointly shape engagement and performance in academic contexts.

3. Wellbeing Indicators: These encompass measures of job satisfaction, work-life balance, stress levels, and overall mental and physical health among faculty members. In the literature review, different results were found which are usable to give content also

for indicators of wellbeing of faculty, but specific research about the connection between faculty and wellbeing indicators was not found. According to Walker, Druckman, Cattaneo [23] in a research about understanding the (non-)Use of Societal Wellbeing Indicators in National Policy Development, three distinct discourses emerged: one that was concerned about the consequences of ignoring natural, social and human capital in decision making; one that emphasised opportunity and autonomy as key determinants of well-being; and one that focused on the technical aspects of measuring societal well-being. Each of these discourses has direct implications for the way in which we integrate societal wellbeing into policy making and highlights the potential benefits of including end-users in indicator development and strategy.

A survey in Forbes magazine reports benefits from the Great Resignation, the importance of hybrid work and skills-based hiring, and the new employee value proposition that had altered the roles of HRD leaders and practitioners [24]. The Great Resignation refers to the widespread voluntary departure of employees from their jobs during the post-pandemic period, reflecting changing expectations around work, wellbeing, and organizational support. This can be framed as a structural shift in employee expectations, a signal of misalignment between organizations and employees and a challenge to traditional HR, leadership, and retention models. This raises concerns for universities about faculty and staff retention, workload intensification and burnout, and the need for stronger HRD, wellbeing, and motivational strategies.

4. Interventions and Strategies: Characteristics of interventions and strategies implemented to address faculty motivation and wellbeing, such as mentorship programs, wellness initiatives, and organizational policies. In a study conducted by Montero-Marin, Taylor, Crane, Greenberg, Ford, Blakemore and Kuyken [25], are two different mindfulness training formats compared with a sample of secondary school teachers. The results of this study suggested that teachers' well-being was increased in both formats of delivery and both generated similar expectancy and engagement with the mindfulness practice; but the instructor-led format appeared to be more credible and effective and was also able to reduce teachers' stress, anxiety, depressive symptomatology, and burnout. In contrast, the self-taught program might be useful for those teachers who cannot access or commit to an instructor-led program, provided they engage with mindfulness practice. This study suggests two forms for teachers to learn mindfulness, instructor-led and self-taught, to support well-being, each with its own advantages. Interventions aiming to boost faculty research productivity have rarely focused on motivation as a mechanism to yield change [26].

As mentioned in characteristic 3, these developments highlight concerns for universities related to faculty motivation, workload intensification and burnout, and the need to reinforce HRD, wellbeing, and motivational strategies.

5. Institutional Context: Understanding the contextual factors within academic institutions that impact faculty motivation and wellbeing, including organizational culture, leadership styles, and support systems. A development of internationalization within universities is also of importance to understand faculty motivation. According to Schwietz [27] organizational climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Schwietz investigated the attitudes, beliefs, experiences, and involvement related to internationalization by faculty members at a group of universities in the United States. Faculty expect also that leadership will provide support and uphold academic traditions and values that imbue the working lives of faculty members, such as excellence

in teaching and research, academic freedom, collegial governance, and autonomy [28]. According to Li and Khattak [29] the faculty internationalization is under-researched and data of 229 faculty members in the context of China indicated that overall faculty motivation exerts a direct and indirect (faculty engagement) positive effect on work performance. Leask, Whitsed, de Wit, and Beelen [30] state that faculty's work performance is emotionally engaging and personally demanding. Engagement in international, intercultural, and global dimension researching and teaching activities requires faculty to put more work-related effort, including, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions.

The World Economic Forum [31], elaborated on several Global Drivers of Change, which they defined under two categories: Demographic and Socio-economic and Technological. These drivers have important implications for HRD – from emerging markets and climate change to artificial intelligence and robotics. It is important that the HRD research and practice agendas actively reflect these key issues in ways that are generative, elaborative, predictive and that address power and social responsibility. In demographic and socio-economic drivers are included: changing work environments and flexible working arrangements, climate change, natural resource constraints, and the transition to a greener economy, rising geopolitical volatility, longevity and aging societies, and women's rising aspirations and economic power. In Technological drivers of change are included: mobile internet and cloud technology, processing power and big data, robotics, and artificial intelligence. These drivers directly impact the future of each of our jobs and the ways organizations, communities, and even nations are impacted across all sectors [31].

6. Outcome Measures: Identifying specific outcomes or indicators used to assess the effectiveness of interventions aimed at improving faculty motivation and wellbeing. Measuring on faculty motivation and wellbeing focuses heavily on mitigating burnout and enhancing autonomous motivation through psychological and institutional support. For broad motivation interventions based on Self-Determination Theory (SDT) significantly improved faculty engagement, though results varied based on whether the study was randomized or quasi experimental. Systematic review in PMC evaluated the efficacy of mental health programs for university staff, concluding that mindfulness and cognitive-behavioral strategies show consistent promise in reducing stress. Stupnisky, BrckaLorenz, Nelson Laird [32] described that faculty who feel a sense of 'internal value' for their work have higher research productivity and lower burnout.

The Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale measures Job satisfaction, Work-related stress and Quality of working life factors relevant to wellbeing [33]. Although not specific to faculty, the WRQoL scale is widely used to evaluate workplace wellbeing outcomes and can be adapted for academic staff to assess effects of organizational or HRD interventions. Broader measures such as the Work-Related Quality of Life scale can also be adapted to assess changes in work satisfaction, stress, and overall wellbeing following HRD and organizational interventions.

7. Barriers and Challenges: Identifying barriers and challenges faced by faculty members in achieving optimal motivation and wellbeing, such as workload, institutional bureaucracy, and lack of support resources. Faculty motivation is a comprehensive phenomenon encompassing engaging factors like increasing research output, acquiring academic resources, and establishing an academic reputation. Researchers identified objective factors such as work assignment, promotion policy, platform, and outside

support) and subjective factors such as positive attitude, interest, knowledge and skills, and academic network [34].

Several studies underscore the barriers that faculty encounter in achieving optimal motivation and wellbeing. Qualitative evidence shows that work–life imbalance, high workloads, and unmet support needs contribute to disengagement and burnout among academic staff, particularly in health sciences settings [35] . This work of Koster & McHenry identified barriers from work-life imbalance with excessive workload and stress, unmet support needs and lack of community, insufficient institutional support and flexibility. The study highlights that high workload and lack of collegial support are major contributors to disengagement and exhaustion among faculty, and that enhanced administrative support and workload management could mitigate these effects.

Aloka's conceptual overview reports that higher education workplaces often create high occupational stress due to organizational barriers and low levels of institutional support, undermining wellness and productivity. This work identifies broader organizational and environmental barriers that constrain work wellness in higher education, pointing to the need for more transparent policies and institutional support mechanisms [36].

Narrative reviews further emphasize how heavy administrative, teaching, and research demands, coupled with insufficient resources and autonomy, deplete faculty wellbeing and hinder motivation. This review synthesizes evidence on faculty mental health, showing that structural workload demands and a lack of supportive academic cultures are critical obstacles to wellbeing and motivation [37].

The challenges, facing faculty motivation and wellbeing cannot be addressed through isolated interventions. Instead, universities must adopt an integrated approach that aligns human resource development, institutional culture, and wellbeing strategies. By balancing job demands with adequate resources, fostering supportive academic environments, and embedding evidence-based HRD practices, higher education institutions can enhance faculty motivation, resilience, and sustainable performance.

These characteristics provide a comprehensive framework for assessing the outcomes of faculty motivation, HRD, and wellbeing within the context of this scoping review. The challenges facing faculty motivation and wellbeing can be addressed through integrated strategies that balance workload, strengthen HRD, and foster supportive academic cultures. An overview of the used literature is included in Table 1.

TABLE I KEY CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO HRD AND HEALTH PERSPECTIVE AND MAIN REFERENCES

	Main Topic	**Literature References**
1.	Motivational Factors (intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that influence faculty members' engagement and productivity)	Lechuga & Lechuga (2012) [1]; Ingle (2017) [2]; Kanfer, Chen, and Pritchard (2012) [7]; Kozlowski (2012) [8]; Hendijani, Bischak, Arvai, Dugar (2016) [9]; Averill and Major (2020) [10]; Sidhu and Gage (2021) [11]; Tharikh, Ying, Hamzah (2018) [12]; Renapurkar and Ingle (2017)

		[13], Andoh, Owusu, Annan-Prah, Boampong (2022) [14]; Richardson, McKenna, (2003) [15]; Sabagh, Hall, Saroyan, 2018) [16]
2.	Human Resource Development (HRD) Initiatives: characteristics related to professional development and training	Kowalski & Loretto (2017) [3]; Bailey, Yeoman, Madden, Thompson, Kerridge, (2019) [4]; Swanson, Holton, E., and Holton, E.F (2001) [17]; Hamouche and Chabani (2021) [18]; Hastings, Boden, Thorne, Roundtree, May & Pomeroy (2023) [19]; Trower (2012) [20]; United Nations (2013) [21]; Egan, Akdere, and Kim (2022) [22]
3.	Wellbeing Indicators: job satisfaction, work–life balance, stress, mental & physical health	Walker, Druckman, Cattaneo (2020) [23]; Forbes magazine (2021) [24]
4.	Interventions and Strategies: to address faculty motivation and wellbeing, such as mentorship programs, wellness initiatives, and organizational policies	Montero-Marin, Taylor, Crane, Greenberg, Ford, Blakemore and Kuyken (2021) [25]; Smith, Stoop, Young, Belou & Held (2017) [26]
5.	Institutional Context: that impact faculty motivation and wellbeing, including organizational culture, leadership styles, and support systems	Schwietz (2006) [27]; Davies (2015) [28]; Li and Khattak (2022) [29]; Leask, Whitsed, de Wit, and Beelen (2020) [30]; World Economic Forum (2022) [31]
6.	Outcome Measures: to assess the effectiveness of interventions aimed at improving faculty motivation and wellbeing	Stupnisky, BrckaLorenz and Nelson Laird (2019) [32]; Edwards, Van Laar, and Easton (2009) [33]
7.	Barriers and Challenges: faced by faculty members in achieving optimal motivation and wellbeing, such as workload, institutional	Xu, Wang and Zhu, 2018 [34]; Koster & McHenry, 2023 [35]; Aloka (2022) [36]; Hammoudi Halat, Soltani, Dalli, Alsarraj, and Malki (2023) [37]

	bureaucracy, and lack of support resources	

The reviewed literature demonstrates that faculty motivation, human resource development (HRD), and wellbeing are deeply interconnected and mutually reinforcing constructs within higher education. Faculty motivation emerges as a dynamic process shaped by intrinsic drivers, extrinsic conditions, and the broader institutional context. However, motivation cannot be fully understood in isolation from HRD practices or wellbeing outcomes, as professional development opportunities, organizational culture, and health-related factors jointly influence faculty engagement and productivity.

HRD serves as a critical institutional mechanism through which motivation can be supported and sustained. By enhancing faculty skills, knowledge, and professional capacity, HRD initiatives directly influence motivational processes while indirectly shaping wellbeing through increased autonomy, competence, and belonging. The literature suggests that HRD efforts are most effective when they are embedded within supportive academic cultures that recognize diverse faculty roles, encourage collaboration, and align professional development with individual career trajectories. In this sense, HRD acts as a structural bridge between organizational goals and individual motivation.

Wellbeing functions both as an outcome and a precondition of faculty motivation. Indicators such as job satisfaction, work–life balance, stress, and mental and physical health are closely linked to motivational states, yet empirical research integrating these dimensions remains limited. While wellbeing is often examined through the lens of burnout and stress reduction, fewer studies explicitly explore how wellbeing interacts with motivation and HRD initiatives over time. This gap highlights the need for more holistic frameworks that capture the reciprocal relationships among motivation, professional development, and health.

Interventions and institutional strategies further illustrate the interdependence of these constructs. Evidence shows that wellbeing-oriented interventions, such as mindfulness and mentoring programs, can enhance motivation and engagement, particularly when supported by organizational policies and leadership commitment. Conversely, interventions focused solely on performance or productivity frequently overlook motivation as a key mechanism, limiting their long-term effectiveness. Integrating motivational theory—such as Self-Determination Theory—into HRD and wellbeing initiatives appears especially promising for fostering sustainable faculty engagement.

The institutional context plays a decisive role in shaping how motivation, HRD, and wellbeing intersect. Leadership practices, organizational culture, internationalization processes, and support systems influence faculty perceptions of autonomy, recognition, and value. When these contextual factors are misaligned, they contribute to increased stress, disengagement, and burnout; when aligned, they create conditions that enable both professional growth and wellbeing. Faculty expectations regarding academic freedom, collegial governance, and institutional support further reinforce the importance of context-sensitive HRD and wellbeing strategies.

Overall, the literature indicates that faculty motivation cannot be effectively addressed without simultaneous attention to HRD and wellbeing. Treating these domains as separate risks fragmented interventions and missed opportunities for impact. This integrated perspective aligns with broader sustainability goals, including the promotion of healthy working lives in academia. Consequently, research and practice should move toward interdisciplinary models that explicitly link motivational processes, HRD frameworks, and wellbeing indicators, providing a comprehensive foundation for evidence-based interventions in higher education.

IV. *CONCLUSIONS*

Faculty members are central to the functioning and sustainability of higher education institutions, and understanding the factors that motivate them remains a critical concern for both researchers and practitioners. This scoping review set out to map the existing body of knowledge on faculty motivation by examining two dominant yet largely disconnected perspectives in the literature: the work context perspective, primarily operationalized through human resource development (HRD), and the health perspective, with a focus on wellbeing. The findings demonstrate that faculty motivation is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon that cannot be sufficiently explained by traditional institutional mechanisms such as promotion, tenure, or sabbatical policies alone. While these structures remain relevant, individual motivation, contextual conditions, and perceived support play a decisive role in sustaining long-term engagement and productivity.

The review highlights substantial variation in faculty satisfaction and motivation across disciplines, institutions, and national contexts. Factors such as salary, access to infrastructure, research opportunities, workload, and time autonomy significantly influence faculty experiences. These findings underscore the inadequacy of uniform approaches to faculty development and point to the need for tailored, context-sensitive strategies that acknowledge disciplinary and institutional differences. In particular, the literature suggests that when basic professional and material needs are not adequately met, motivation and wellbeing are compromised, ultimately affecting institutional performance.

A key conclusion of this review is that research on faculty motivation remains fragmented. HRD-focused studies emphasize professional development, skill acquisition, and organizational effectiveness, whereas wellbeing-oriented research concentrates on job satisfaction, engagement, stress, and burnout. Although both perspectives address critical dimensions of academic work, they are rarely integrated within a single analytical framework. This separation has limited the development of comprehensive models capable of capturing dynamic interplay between professional development and health-related outcomes. As a result, important knowledge gaps persist regarding how HRD initiatives influence wellbeing, and conversely, how wellbeing conditions shape motivation and professional growth.

The findings of this scoping review underscore the importance of interdisciplinary research to bridge these conceptual and empirical divides. Integrating HRD and wellbeing perspectives offers a more holistic understanding of faculty motivation and provides a stronger foundation for evidence-based interventions. Such integration is particularly relevant considering increasing pressures on academic staff, including intensified performance demands, resource constraints, and organizational change. Addressing

faculty motivation through isolated interventions risks overlooking the interconnected nature of professional development, health, and organizational context.

Methodologically, the breadth and volume of the existing literature justify the use of a scoping review approach. Rather than offering an exhaustive synthesis of outcomes, this review maps dominant themes, identifies trends, and highlights underexplored areas, thereby laying the groundwork for more focused systematic reviews and empirical studies. Future research should move beyond descriptive accounts and examine causal pathways linking HRD practices, wellbeing indicators, and motivational outcomes. Longitudinal and mixed-methods designs may be particularly valuable in capturing the evolving nature of faculty motivation over the academic career lifespan.

From a practical standpoint, the conclusions of this review suggest that higher education institutions should adopt integrated strategies that align HRD initiatives with wellbeing-oriented policies. Interventions aimed at enhancing faculty motivation are likely to be most effective when they simultaneously support professional growth and protect mental and physical health. Such approaches not only benefit individual faculty members but also contribute to institutional resilience and performance.

Finally, this work aligns faculty motivation and wellbeing with broader societal objectives, particularly the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 3 (SDG 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all). By fostering motivated, supported, and healthy academic staff, higher education institutions can contribute meaningfully to sustainable development while fulfilling their educational and research missions. Integrating insights from HRD and wellbeing research is therefore not only an academic imperative but also a strategic and ethical one for the future of higher education. Faculty motivation and wellbeing is not only an institutional concern but also a global health and sustainability priority. By reducing burnout, promoting mental health, and creating enabling work environments, universities contribute directly to SDG 3 targets on mental health, wellbeing, and sustainable work conditions. Embedding evidence-based interventions ensures that these efforts are systematic, measurable, and sustainable, ultimately supporting both faculty engagement and institutional excellence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author received no specific funding for this study. The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest to report regarding the present study.

REFERENCES

[1] V.M. Lechuga & D.C. Lechuga. Faculty motivation and scholarly work: Self-determination and self-regulation perspective. The Journal of the Professoriate (ISSN 1556-7699). 2012.

[2] R.M.R.D.S.B. Ingle. Evaluation of HRD practices of NBA accredited colleges in Hyderabad district. International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management. https://ijrcm.org.in/download.php?name=ijrcm-1-IJRCM-1_vol-8_2017_issue-05-art-09.pdf&path=uploaddata/ijrcm-1-IJRCM-1_vol-8_2017_issue-05-art-09.pdf. 2017.

[3] T.H.P. Kowalski & W. Loretto. Well-being and HRM in the changing workplace. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28(16), 2229–2255. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1345205. 2017.

[4] C. Bailey, R. Yeoman, A. Madden, M. Thompson & G. Kerridge. A Review of the Empirical Literature on Meaningful Work: Progress and Research Agenda. Human Resource Development Review, 18(1), 83–113. 2019.
[5] Z. Munn, M.D.J. Peters, C. Stern et al. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 18, 143. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x. 2018.
[6] R.B. Briner & D. Denyer. Systematic review and evidence synthesis as a practice and scholarship tool. In D. Rousseau (Ed.), Handbook of Evidence-Based Management (pp. 328–347). Oxford University Press. 2010.
[7] R. Kanfer, G. Chen & R.D. Pritchard. Work Motivation, Present and Future. Routledge, New York. 2012.
[8] S.W. Kozlowski. The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. 2012.
[9] R. Hendijani, D.P. Bischak, J. Arvai & S. Dugar. Intrinsic motivation, external reward, and their effect on overall motivation and performance. Human Performance, 29(4), 251–274. 2016.
[10] R. Averill & J. Major. What motivates higher education educators to innovate? Exploring competence, autonomy, and relatedness – and connections with wellbeing. Educational Research, 62(2), 146–161. 2020.
[11] R. Sidhu & W. Gage. Enhancing the odds of adopting e-learning or community-focused experiential learning as a teaching practice amongst university faculty. Heliyon, 7(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06704. 2021.
[12] S.M. Tharikh, C.Y. Ying & S.R. Hamzah. Work Environment and Employee Wellbeing (EWB) of Air Traffic Controllers (ATCs) in Malaysia. Global Business & Management Research, 10(3). 2018.
[13] R.M. Renapurkar & S.B. Ingle. Evaluation of HRD practices of NBA accredited colleges in Hyderabad district. International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, 8(5). 2017.
[14] R.P.K. Andoh, E.A. Owusu, E.C. Annan-Prah & G.N. Boampong. Training value, employee internal states and training transfer: examining the web of relationships. The Learning Organization, 29(6). https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-09-2022-0100. 2022.
[15] J. Richardson & S. McKenna. International experience and academic careers: What do academics have to say? Personnel Review, 32(6), 774–795. 2003.
[16] Z. Sabagh, N.C. Hall & A. Saroyan. Antecedents, correlates and consequences of faculty burnout. Educational Research. 2018.
[17] R.A. Swanson, E. Holton & E.F. Holton. Foundations of Human Resource Development. Berrett-Koehler Publishers. 2001.
[18] S. Hamouche & Z. Chabani. COVID-19 and the new forms of employment relationship: implications and insights for human resource development. Industrial and Commercial Training, 53(4). https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-11-2020-0112. 2021.
[19] C. Hastings, C. Boden, D. Thorne, A. Roundtree, M. May & K. Pomeroy. Looking back, looking forward: How the pandemic influenced faculty values. International Journal of Adult Education and Technology, 14(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJAET.332877. 2023.
[20] C.A. Trower. Success on the tenure track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction. JHU Press. https://doi.org/10.1353/book.15132. 2012.
[21] United Nations. SG's report on human resources development agenda item 23-c. https://www.un.org/en/desa/sg's-report-human-resources-development-agenda-item-23-c. 2013.

[22] T. Egan, M. Akdere & S. Kim. Extending research and practice in our dynamic world of work. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 33(2), 109–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21475. 2022.
[23] C.C. Walker, A. Druckman & C. Cattaneo. Understanding the (non-)Use of Societal Wellbeing Indicators in National Policy Development. Social Indicators Research, 150, 911–953. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02358-z. 2020.
[24] Forbes. The future of work: Offering employee well-being benefits can stem the great resignation. https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeannemeister/2021/12/16/the-future-of-work-offering-employee-well-being-benefits-can-stem-the-great-resignation/. 2021.
[25] J. Montero-Marin, L. Taylor, C. Crane, M.T. Greenberg, T.J. Ford, S.-J. Blakemore & W. Kuyken. Teachers "Finding Peace in a Frantic World". Journal of Educational Psychology, 113(8), 1689–1708. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000542. 2021.
[26] J.L. Smith, C.D. Stoop, M. Young, R. Belou & S. Held. Grant writing bootcamp: An intervention to enhance the research capacity of academic women in STEM. BioScience, 67(7), 638–645. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix050. 2017.
[27] M.S. Schwietz. Internationalization of the academic profession: An exploratory study of faculty attitudes, beliefs, and involvement at public universities in Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh). 2006.
[28] M. Davies. Academic freedom: a lawyer's perspective. Higher Education, 70, 987–1002. 2015.
[29] H. Li & S.I. Khattak. Towards a parsimonious model of faculty motivation, engagement, and work performance. International Journal of Applied Electromagnetics & Mechanics. 2022.
[30] B. Leask, C. Whitsed, H. de Wit & J. Beelen. Faculty engagement: Moving beyond a discourse of disengagement. In Education Abroad (pp. 184–199). Routledge. 2020.
[31] World Economic Forum. 17 Ways technology could change the world by 2027. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/05/17-ways-technology-could-change-the-world-by-2027/. 2022.
[32] R.H. Stupnisky, A. BrckaLorenz & T.F. Nelson Laird. How does faculty research motivation type relate to success? International Journal of Educational Research, 98, 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j/ijer/2019/08.007. 2019.
[33] J. Edwards, D.L. Van Laar & S. Easton. Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale. 2009.
[34] Z.H. Xu, Q. Wang & J.W. Zhu. Rationality behind passion: why do junior faculty members participate in internationalization at a research university in PR China? Fudan Education Forum, 16(5), 83–90. 2018.
[35] M. Koster & K. McHenry. Areas of work-life that contribute to burnout among higher education health science faculty and perception of institutional support. International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being, 18(1), 2235129. https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2023.2235129. 2023.
[36] P.J.O. Aloka. Barriers to work wellness among academic staff in higher education institutions. In Leadership Wellness and Mental Health Concerns in Higher Education. IGI Global. 2022.
[37] D. Hammoudi Halat, A. Soltani, R. Dalli, L. Alsarraj & A. Malki. Understanding and fostering mental health and well-being among university faculty: A narrative review. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 12(13), 4425. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134425. 2023.