



Faculty Satisfaction in their Trifocal Tasks Teaching, Research, and Services: A Gender and Designation Wise Comparison

Ammara Syed¹, Javed Iqbal²

1. PhD Scholar, Department of Education Hazara University Mansehra, Pakistan, 21300
Email: ammarasyed158@yahoo.com
2. Associate Professor, Department of Education Hazara University Mansehra, Pakistan
21300, Email: zahidulhq_73@yahoo.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.71145/rjsp.v4i1.525>

Abstract

The present study aimed to explore the faculty's satisfaction level in their trifocal tasks (teaching, research, and administrative services) and their gender and designation wise comparison in universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The research design of the study was descriptive for which survey method was adopted to collect data from 320 faculty members of six public sector universities of KP selected by using multistage sampling technique. Data was collected from 218 male and 102 female faculty members out of which 17 were professor, 41 associate professor, 143 assistant professor and 119 were lecturer from different social and natural sciences departments. Questionnaire regarding faculty's satisfaction level in teaching, research, and administrative services was used for data collection. Results reveals that

Keywords: Faculty Satisfaction, Trifocal Tasks, Gender Differences

Introduction

This study is examining faculty satisfaction in the three primary core areas of teaching, research, and service. The trifocal tasks are consisting of teaching, research and institutional services provides deep insight into faculty well-being, and institutional loyalty. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are expected to be creative, incentive, and initiate break out that can improve their job performance (Askandar & langguyuan, 2013). Satisfaction varies across these areas widely, impacted by institutional resources and extensive academic expectations. According to Khanna (2020) job satisfaction is an employee positive attitude toward work. The employee feels happy and secure when they satisfied with their working environment. Faculty satisfaction with teaching involves commitment with students, courses and the ability to see students' academic growth. Faculty members feel high satisfaction levels when they feel supported by their institutions. The balance between teaching, research, and service responsibilities significantly affects satisfaction. Positive collegial relationships, effective communication, and a sense of belonging contribute to job satisfaction, whereas a competitive or toxic environment can have the opposite effect (Smith & Garcia, 2023). A supportive and collaborative work environment enhances faculty satisfaction. Faculty satisfaction in research is a vital component. Bess and Dee (2012) highlight the importance of institutional environments that foster collaboration and provide sufficient resources for research activities. Furthermore, the availability of external funding sources can significantly impact faculty satisfaction, as financial support enables faculty to pursue innovative projects and contribute to their fields. Higher education institutions have active research faculty as those

who frequently publish books, articles, bulletins and reviews, in peer-review journals, present and refereed seminars, received scholarship Blume & Candela, (2018). Faculty member's satisfaction is also tied to the association with research interests with institutional priorities. According to a study by Heggestad et al. (2019), faculty members are more satisfied when their research aligns with the mission and goals of their institution, as this alignment fosters a sense of purpose and belonging. Faculty members can manage effectively their professional responsibilities with family commitments. Work-life balance remains a critical factor; faculty members who manage to balance their research responsibilities with teaching and personal life report higher satisfaction levels Griffith et al., (2018). This environment not only enhances satisfaction but also fosters a sense of belonging and community within the institution, contributing to a more positive and productive academic atmosphere. Service is considered as the least recognized third task together with teaching and research. Many researchers Griffith, (2020) differentiate among internal and external dimension of services. The difference in time allocation among male and female faculty members significantly impacts their academic. Research indicates that women faculty tends to spend more time on teaching and service responsibilities compared to their male colleagues, who often dedicate a larger proportion of their time to research activities Baker et al., (2020). The difference occurred in amount of time spent of teacher who served in administrative positions and who did not work in administration. The statistical results illustrated those university professors who were working in administration spent more time that is average 12.3hours per week on service duties, 10.7 hours per week on teaching and 8.1 hours per week on research duties. While faculty members who were not serving administrative duties spend 7.8 hours per week on service duties, 11.1 on teaching and 9.0 on research services Chen, (2016). However, the average time spent is 40% on research, 20% on service and 40% for teaching Mueller, (2018). Reward system is one of the main reasons to this situation as at higher education based on the product of research O'Meara et al., (2019). The female faculty members' increased before contribution in university committee work compared to their male. Porter (2007) found that female faculty at doctoral universities served on approximately 50% more committees work than male faculty and dedicated 15% more hours to committee work. The heightened contribution of female faculty in university committee work reflects the cumulative effect of increased service commitments leads to higher level of satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

Teaching, research, and services are the main tasks assigned by university administration to their university faculty members but in Pakistan most of universities faculty members focus on teaching and research while they have little concern in the services (internal/external). Teaching was the very first purpose in several famous universities after spread the function of research. However, teaching is a first priority for every faculty member while for the sake of promotion they have to show their performance in research in the form of publications. It is noticed that some faculty instead of teaching and research prefer to enjoy administrative position, due authoritative power and monetary benefit associated with these positions. Furthermore, most of universities do not allow their faculty to work on administrative posts but it is observed that in most of the newly established universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa majority of the administrative posts are filled by the senior faculty members due which badly affect their performance in teaching and research. Moreover, due to heavy workload at administrative posts their research students suffered and deprived from their research expertise. This study aims to establish a comparison between teaching, research, and services (within campus) rendered by universities and satisfaction level in public universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. There have been substantial researches on the two main tasks (teaching and research) of the faculty but very scarce research is available on services of university faculty. In Pakistan it was a first attempt to explore simultaneously all three important tasks of the

university faculty in term their satisfaction level. Therefore, researcher intended to explore the comparative situation of university faculty satisfaction in all three main tasks with respect to different demographic variable (gender and designation) which are responsible for their preferences in these tasks (teaching, research, and services tasks)

Objectives of the study

1. To examine the level of satisfaction among faculty members in their teaching, research, and services in public universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
2. To find gender and designation wise comparison of the faculty satisfaction in teaching, research, and services in universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Literature review

Effective teaching, scholarly research contribution and institutional services are the prime responsibilities of teaching faculty. Faculty of university has vital role in society. University faculty members could play an important role in character building of their student's underpinned value and ethical leadership from which professional innovation and entrepreneurship can emerge Taysum, (2022). They pass on their expertise to students through teaching and play variety of role in society. Faculty satisfaction is intricately linked to innovation and research productivity within academic institutions. Satisfied educator is more inclined to engage in scholarly pursuits, collaborate with peers, and pursue external funding opportunities (Jung & Choi, 2020). The faculty members become more open to collaborative opportunities with colleagues, manipulating diverse expertise to enhance their work. The majority of faculty members remain passionate about teaching. Cengage (2024) Faculty report reveals that a majority (82%) of educators remain satisfied in their roles, with teaching continuing to be their primary source of joy. The teacher who suggests him or herself as a researcher gets more funding from outside sources, more opportunities to be an advisor, more opportunities for rewards, and is more satisfied with his/her job (Chi Yusn, 2015). Faculty members are often rewarded more frequently through professional recognition which further affirms their contributions and expertise. Faculty members often face heavy workloads, balancing teaching, research, administrative duties, and personal life. Satisfaction in research may be influenced by the amount of time and resources allocated to research activities (Sonner, & Holton, 1995). Time spent on research has decreased, particularly affecting four-year institution faculty who cite research as a top driver of job satisfaction. Du (2002) conducted a more quantitative assessment, revealing that faculty members generally spend around 50% of their time on teaching and 40% on research, with time allocation influenced by rank and career stage. For instance, the professors tend to focus more on research, demonstrating increased productivity and achievements in this area compared to junior faculty or lecturers, who typically focus on teaching. A hierarchy in academic tasks, professors significantly invests more time in research, whereas subordinate faculty dedicates more time to teaching. Chang (2012) found that 47% of professors spend more time on teaching than on research (34%) and on service (17%). The emphasis on teaching over research and service varies by institutional type. The female faculty members have increased in past years in academia in still a male-dominated profession. Although women publish and present at similar rates as men, their colleagues tend to overlook their research achievements due to gender bias (Rosser, 2004). The women in academia publish same as comparable to their male colleagues but their contributions are often undervalued due to gender bias. Female faculty have heavier teaching loads than men faculty and devote more time to teaching-related involvements (Misra et al., 2011). The female faculty members a greater quantity of time and efforts dedicate to teaching responsibilities and related activities. The female faculty tends to feel a greater sense of obligation for instructional services. The female faculty tends to be more service-oriented with their involvements than

men (Jackson, 2004; Misra et al., 2011). Female faculty members tend to take on a higher share of tasks related to institutional service than their male colleagues.

Research Methodology

This study was descriptive in nature for which quantitative research design was adopted. Educational researcher uses quantitative methodologies to examine generalizable correlation trends or causal mechanism in phenomena and behaviors. This study aimed to explore the faculty satisfaction in their trifocal tasks teaching, research, and institutional services within university campuses in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The population for this study was 1858 teacher of five universities from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The questionnaire was prepared in the light of research objectives and handed over to the expert to judge the face content validity of the item and review process. To check the reliability of the scale, the questionnaire was pilot tested on the teachers not included in the study sample. Cranach's alpha was used to measure the reliability and inter-consistency among the item of the questionnaires. The Cranach's alpha value for the whole scale was 0.897. The researcher personally visited the universities and collects the data from 320 teachers through stratified random sampling technique. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS-22.

Results

Table-1 Faculty Satisfaction about their Tasks Teaching, Research, and Institutional Services

Tasks	Factors	Number of Items	Mean score
Teaching	Time spent in teaching	1-5	4.3
	Distribution of work load	6-10	4.0
	Courses taught	11-15	4.0
Research	Time spent in research	16-19	3.6
	Funding for external funding	20-24	3.1
Institutional services	Focus of research	25-29	3.3
	Time spent on services	30-35	3.5
	Numbers of committees	36-41	3.6
	Distribution of responsibilities	42-45	3.4

Mean score 0.0 - 2.50 low level 2.51 - 3.50 Moderate level 3.51-5.00 high level

Results in the above table-1 reveals that majority of the faculty satisfaction level falls in the Mean scores categories (3.50-5.00) which means that they were highly satisfied in their teaching tasks which are time spent on teaching, distribution of teaching work load and courses taught in department. They were also highly satisfied in time spent in research tasks and with the number of committees in institutional services but they showed moderate level of satisfaction in getting grants for external funding, focus on research and the distribution of responsibilities for the institutional services task.

Table-2 Gender-wise Comparison of Faculty Satisfaction in their time Spent on Teaching

Variable	Group	N	Mean	St. Dev	t	df	P. value
Time spent in teaching	Male	218	4.30	.512	.248	318	.805
	Female	102	4.34	.552			
Distribution of Work load	Male	218	3.99	.736	.048	317	.961
	Female	102	3.99	.800			
Courses taught	Male	218	4.01	.759	.258	218	.797
	Female	102	3.99	.782			

The value is significant if $p \leq 0.05$

Table-2 shows the comparative analysis of male and female faculty members' perception about their satisfaction in time allocation for teaching. Results shows that No significant difference ($0.80 > 0.05$) was found between male and female perception about their time spent on teaching, distribution of teaching load and courses taught in teaching.

Table-3 Gender wise Comparison of Faculty Satisfaction in their Time Spent on Research

Variable	Group	N	Mean	St. Dev	T	Df	P. value
Time spent on research	Male	218	3.24	.938	.078	318	0.938
	Female	102	3.24	.991			
Expectation for External funding	Male	218	3.23	.959	1.169	318	2.43
	Female	102	3.13	.095			
Focus of research	Male	218	3.52	.937	1.625	318	.105
	Female	102	3.33	1.048			

p-value is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Table-3 shows the comparative analysis of male and female faculty members' perception about their satisfaction in time spent in research. Results shows that No significant difference ($0.80 > 0.05$) was found between male and female perception about their time spent on research, expectation for finding external funding and focus of research.

Table-4 Gender wise comparison of faculty satisfaction in their institutional services

Variable	Group	N	Mean	St. Dev	T	df	P. value
Time spent Services	Male	218	3.61	.860	.502	318	.616
	Female	102	3.56	.824			
Numbers of Committees	Male	218	3.64	.880	1.818	318	.070
	Female	102	3.44	.993			
Distribution of Responsibilities	Male	218	3.43	.956	1.517	318	.130
	Female	102	3.24	1.120			

Table-4 shows the comparative analysis of male and female faculty members' perception about their satisfaction in their institutional services. Results shows that No significant difference

($0.80 > 0.05$) was found between male and female perception about their time spent institutional services, numbers of committees and distribution of responsibilities.

Finding of the study

University faculty satisfaction in time spent in teaching

Faculty members with (Mean= 4.5) were highly satisfied with their time spent on teaching while fewer satisfied with time dedication for their teaching tasks Ninety-two percent (Mean = 4.4) of faculty members highly satisfied with time dedication for teaching that allow them to well engaged with their students while less faculty members were not satisfied with time allocation for instructional practices with their students. More than eighty percent (Mean= 4.3) university faculty members highly satisfied with adequate time for lesson planning before teaching while fewer faculty members were not satisfied with time for lesson planning before teaching (table 4.2). More than eighty percent (Mean = 4.1) of faculty members highly satisfied with balance in teaching tasks and other responsibilities whereas the fewer faculty members were not satisfied with balance in teaching activities and responsibilities. Less than half percent (Mean= 3.3) faculty member satisfied on time spend on teaching for improving outcomes of students while moderate level of faculty members in time dedication for enhancing student's outcomes

Distribution of teaching load

Seventy-nine percent (Mean=4.1) university faculty were highly satisfied with the distribution of assigned teaching tasks whereas fewer faculty members were not satisfied with teaching assigning responsibilities. Seventy-seven percent (Mean= 4.0) majority of faculty members were satisfied with assigning duties according to strength of individual teacher are considered while they less satisfied in process of assigning tasks given individually. Less than half percent (Mean=3.3) reflect moderate level of faculty members were satisfied for equal distribution of teaching load and other responsibilities whereas others shows low satisfaction in equal distribution of faculties responsibilities. Seventy-nine percent (Mean=4.1) majority of faculty members were satisfied regarding communicated teaching assignment transparency while less level of not satisfied. Seventy-one percent (Mean=4.8) university faculty were satisfied with opportunities about teaching assignment tasks which reflect the high level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction in courses taught

Seventy-five percent (Mean=4.3) faculty were satisfied about teacher's contributions in required number of courses which indicates their high level of satisfaction. Seventy-six percent (Mean=3.9) university faculty were satisfied with size of class for effective teaching which shows high level of faculty satisfaction. Seventy-four percent (Mean=4.0) faculty members were satisfied with accessibility of digital resources for effective teaching which indicates their high satisfaction level. Eighty percent (Mean= 4.8) faculty members were satisfied with the courses taught for fulfilling their teaching experiences, which illustrates the high level of satisfaction. Seventy-six percent (Mean= 4.7) university faculty members were satisfied with manageable grading assignment which indicates high level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction in time spent in research

Seventy-one percent (Mean=3.9) faculty members were satisfied with opportunities for professional development through research, which reflect the high level of satisfaction. Seventy-four percent (Mean=3.9) university faculty were satisfied with adequate research time to keep balance between in teaching, which shows high level of satisfaction. Fifty-four percent (Mean=3.8) faculty members were satisfied with sufficient time to work actively with colleagues in research projects, which indicates the high level of satisfaction. Less than half

(Mean=3.2) faculty members satisfied with their research output timely rewarded and recognized, which reflects their moderate level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction in expectations for finding for external funding

Less than half (Mean= 3.2) university faculty members were satisfied with their clarity and transparency of institution's expectations for external funding, which indicates their moderate level of satisfaction. Less than half (Mean= 2.9) faculty members were satisfied with institutional support services in getting research projects from external sources (HEC, UNO, British council etc.), which reflects moderate level of satisfaction. Less than half (Mean=3.2) university faculty members were satisfied with support of department chair for external funding opportunity, which indicates their moderate level of satisfaction. Less than half (Mean= 3.1) faculty members were satisfied with institution adequately equipped with resources to meet the expectations for external funding, which shows their moderate level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction in their focus of research

Less than half (Mean= 3.2) faculty members were satisfied with adequate support from institutions in identifying the research topics, which indicates their moderate level of satisfaction. Less than half (Mean= 3.3) university faculty members were satisfied with the collaboration of faculty for research, which shows moderate level of satisfaction. Less than half (Mean=3.3) faculty members were satisfied with institution provides the essential administrative support to keep focus on research, which show the moderate level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean= 3.5) university faculty members were satisfied with the availability of research collaboration opportunities within the campus, which indicates the moderate level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction in their time spent on institutional services

More than half (Mean= 3.4) university faculty members were satisfied with amount of time that spend while serving in different departments, which reflects their moderate level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean= 3.6) faculty members were satisfied with time assigned to student advising and mentorship, which indicates their high level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean= 3.5) university faculty member were satisfied with the time spent on professional development activities other than teaching and research, which shows their moderate level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean= 3.7) faculty member were satisfied with the time allocated for department service (committees) responsibilities, which illustrates the high level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean=3.5) university faculty members were satisfied with the time gave to reviewing scholarships and proposals, which reflects their moderate level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction on their numbers of committee's work

More than half (Mean= 3.6) faculty members were satisfied with the balance of workload from the different committee's work, which shows their high level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean=3.5) university faculty were satisfied with the well-utilized in the committees whenever involved in, which indicates their high level of their satisfaction. More than half (Mean=3.5) faculty members were satisfied with committees provide the opportunities for leadership roles within the campus, which reflects their moderate level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean=3.6) university faculty were satisfied with the sufficient resources and support to fulfill my responsibilities in the committees more efficiently, which shows their high level of satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction in distribution of responsibilities

More than half % with (Mean=3.5) faculty members were satisfied with the distribution of tasks ensures an unbiased load for all faculty members, which reveals their moderate level of satisfaction. More than half (Mean=3.5) university faculty were satisfied with the distribution of tasks ensures an unbiased load for all faculty members, which illustrates the moderate level of their satisfaction. Less than half (Mean=3.4) faculty members were satisfied with the access to a variety professional development opportunities equally distributed among faculty members, which indicates their moderate level of satisfaction. Less than half (Mean=3.3) university faculty members were satisfied with the impartial distribution of responsibilities positively contributes to departmental outcome, which reflects their moderate level of satisfaction.

Gender wise time spent in teaching

No significant difference was found ($p=.838 > 0.05$) among male and female perceptions about time spent in teaching ($M = 4.30$ to $M = 4.34$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about time spent in teaching. No significant difference was found ($p=.961 > 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about distribution of teaching load ($M = 3.99$ to $M = 3.99$) Mean score of male and female shows similar opinions about distribution of work load. No significant difference was found ($p=.797 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about courses taught ($M = 4.01$ to $M = 3.99$). Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about courses taught. No significant difference was found ($p=.938 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about time spent in research ($M = 3.24$ to $M = 3.24$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about time spent in research. No significant difference was found ($p=.243 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about expectation for external funding ($M = 3.27$ to $M = 3.13$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about expectation for external funding. No significant difference was found ($p=.105 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about focus of research ($M = 3.52$ to $M = 3.33$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about focus of research. No significant difference was found ($p=.616 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about time spent in institutional services ($M = 3.61$ to $M = 3.52$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about time in institutional services. No significant difference was found ($p=.070 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about number of committees ($M = 3.64$ to $M = 3.44$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about number of committees. No significant difference was found ($p=.130 \geq 0.05$) between male and female perceptions about distribution of responsibilities ($M = 3.43$ to $M = 3.24$) Mean score of male and female shows same opinions about distribution of responsibilities.

Discussion

The current research looked into the exploring university faculty satisfaction and engagement in their three main tasks teaching, research and institutional services in universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In the teaching tasks the respondents were asked to give their perception about their satisfaction in time spent in teaching, distribution of teaching load and courses taught in teaching. The results showed that the university faculty had high level (Mean category 4.3-4.0) of satisfaction about time spent in teaching, distribution of teaching load and courses taught in teaching. Teaching was the first purpose and priority of teaching higher than other tasks. This result is in line with the findings of Chen CY (2015) who found the teachers spend most of time teaching and spend their time in preparing courses, advising students, correcting assignments and improving student's outcomes. Finding of this study shows moderate satisfaction of faculty member with Mean score 3.3 that on the time spent on teaching to improve students learning outcome. Results of the prior study by Ranieriet al., (2018) are in line with current study that teaching centered activities that require allocation of time on

instructional development such as teaching-learning, classroom-technology integration improves students learning outcome and lack of work balance among faculty members can lead dissatisfaction with work and a perceived inability to achieve other responsibilities. Finding of the study also revealed that faculty members have high level of satisfaction with Mean score 4.1 with their distributions of assigned teaching tasks within the department. Prior research shows that balance between teaching assigned tasks and other responsibilities are important among faculty (Tourangeau et al., 2014). Finding of this study illustrates that the faculty members were satisfied with assigning duties according to strength of individual teacher. This finding also support the current study of KerryAnn and Omeara (2013) that the administrators and faculty colleagues can help other faculty to feel that their work is valued. Finding of this study shows high level of satisfaction with Mean score 4.1 that the faculty members were satisfied regarding communicated teaching assignment transparency. This study results in line with the finding of Corbin (2014) found that communication openness, a construct related to transparency, positively associated with intent to stay and found importance of transparency in teaching assignments among faculty members in higher education. Another results of this study revealed that faculty members were highly satisfied with Mean score 3.8 with the opportunity given to teachers regarding teaching assignment tasks. This study in line with the finding of Simon Cadez (2017) found that opportunities in teaching experiences enhance teaching quality and effective teachers are assigned a higher teaching load. Finding of the study this indicates that faculty members were highly satisfied (Mean 4.03) with their contributions regarding teaching the required number of courses.

This study in line with finding of Hawk (2020) examine that the relationship between faculty, course, and institution characteristics and pedagogical practices as well as emphasis of higher order learning. The results reveals that faculty has high level of satisfaction Mean 4.0 with the accessibility to the digital resources for effective teaching. Finding of the Anderson, (2016) also endorse the result of this study who concluded that the advancement of technology allows information to be at the tips of an individual's fingertips thus, faculty member must able to filter through all the easily accessible information. A result of this study also reveals that the number of courses taught is positively related to fulfilling the teaching quality. Finding by Maja Zaman Groff, (2017) also in line with current study that number of courses taught is positively related to teaching quality while diversity in teaching experience enhances teaching quality. Finding of this study shows that faculty members are highly satisfied with Mean score 3.9 that the time for research allows to keep them balance between teaching loads. This result is contradicted the study conducted by Zhang (2014), heavy teaching load was mentioned as a major obstacle in being able to accommodate research for all for faculty members. Finding of this study revealed that university faculty has moderate level of satisfaction regarding research output is timely rewarded with mean of 3.2. This result is supported by the results of the prior study of Altinay (2020) faculty promotion and reward relies on frequency and quality of research output.

Likewise, finding of this study concluded that university faculty members moderately satisfied with Mean score 3.2 that the clarity and transparency of the institution's expectations regarding external funding. Finding of the Chi, et al. (2015) also endorse the results of this study and found that universities have obtained the funding set their promotion research requirements higher in order to maintain their bestowed interest and status. Findings of this study the faculty members are low satisfied with mean score 2.9 the availability of institutional support services in getting research projects from external sources. The result of prior study was in line with James Bentley, (2012) external research funding is a key distinguisher between individual faculty members when time pressures are particularly acute external research funding can be the only method for faculty to buy themselves out of other duties and free up time for research

that the universities try to get more funding for research projects and teachers try to publish more papers to get more research funding to meet the accountability requirements from external source.

Moreover, finding of the study indicates that faculty members were moderately satisfied (Mean 3.4) with amount of time that spends while serving in different departments. The results of the study are in line with Reybold and Corda (2011) that the faculty members learned to manage their work responsibilities effectively within department and find balance in their work roles. Finding of the study indicates that faculty members were highly satisfied (Mean 3.7) with amount of time allocation while serving in committee's responsibilities. This result is supported by the study of Miller (2016) that faculty participation in service committees also plays a role in faculty members' perceptions of and satisfaction with participation in service work. Furthermore, result further revealed that faculty members were satisfied (Mean 3.6) balance of workload from the different committees. This finding support by Kerry Ann (2019) in which faculty were satisfied with the amount of work they do on committees. Finding of the study indicates that faculty members were highly satisfied (Mean 3.7) with level of collaboration within the committee. The results are in line with Bensimon et al., (2016) who concluded that the entire faculty department chair and advisory group described the policies and practices they would use to make committee assignments and collaboration.

Similarly, finding of the study reveals the high faculty satisfaction with Mean 3.5 that the distribution of tasks ensures an unbiased load for all faculty members. The results support the Joya Misra, (2019) who concluded that faculty generally perceived the distribution and service work in their department as fair. Another finding of current study shows that access to professional development opportunities equally distributed among faculty members with (Mean 3.4). These findings are supported by the study of Strage and Merdinger (2014) who also found that the institutions create opportunities and contexts that allow faculty members to reflect on their careers, reassess professional goals, and identify deliberate and purposeful actions to accomplish these goals. Gender didn't distinguish the satisfaction level in three tasks of teaching faculty which comprised of time spent in teaching, distribution of teaching load, numbers of course taught, time spent in research, expectation for external funding, focus of research, time spent in institutional services, numbers of committees, and distribution of responsibilities. These findings of the study are in line with the finding of the study of Chen et al., (2015) who stated that faculty members spent most of the time on teaching, then on scholarly work and institutional services. The results are also in line with the findings of the Altinay, (2020) whose result reveals that the faculty member of both genders often evaluated on the perception of their teaching effectiveness, research productivity and their institutional external and internal services. Results of the faculty from both discipline (natural sciences and social sciences) found that no significant difference was observed about their satisfaction, regarding treating them equally, time spent in teaching, distribution of teaching load, numbers of course taught, time spent in research, expectation for external funding, focus of research, time spent in institutional services, numbers of committees, and distribution of responsibilities.

Conclusion

The study aimed to explore the satisfaction levels of university faculty in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa regarding their trifocal tasks of teaching, research, and institutional services. The findings indicate that faculty members are generally highly satisfied with their teaching tasks, including time spent on teaching, distribution of workload, and the number of courses taught. In contrast, satisfaction regarding research tasks and institutional services was moderate, especially in areas such as external funding, research output recognition, and time allocated to institutional service responsibilities. Gender differences in satisfaction levels were not significant across the various

tasks, suggesting that male and female faculty members have similar perceptions regarding their time spent on teaching, research, and services. However, the study also highlighted the need for improved awareness campaigns, better communication of available services, and enhanced institutional support for both teaching and research. Faculty members, particularly in newly established universities, face challenges in balancing their teaching, research, and administrative roles, which often results in a reduced focus on research activities. Furthermore, while faculty members are satisfied with the collaborative environment within committees and the allocation of responsibilities, the study indicates that more resources and better infrastructure are needed to ensure the continuous development of faculty satisfaction in these areas. The study underscores the importance of creating a supportive work environment where faculty members can effectively balance their trifocal tasks while receiving adequate resources, recognition, and professional development opportunities. Additionally, universities should ensure that their faculty members, regardless of gender or designation, are provided with equal opportunities and support to excel in their roles. Although faculty member's express satisfaction with teaching tasks, there is a clear need for improvement in research support, time allocation for institutional services, and the provision of external funding. Institutions should focus on strengthening these areas to enhance overall faculty satisfaction and contribute to the long-term success and growth of the academic environment.

References

Altinay, L. (2020). Faculty satisfaction and institutional support in higher education: A gendered analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 35(2), 45-59.

Anderson, T. (2016). The impact of educational technology on teaching and learning. *Education Policy Analysis*, 34(3), 58-74.

Baker, M., Chang, C., & Jones, D. (2020). Gendered differences in time allocation and career satisfaction among university faculty members. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 74(2), 89-104.

Bensimon, E. M., Polkinghorne, D. E., & Wilson, D. (2016). Assessing faculty engagement in academic committees: A study of participation and leadership. *Journal of Higher Education*, 87(4), 497-510.

Blume, L. E., & Candela, M. (2018). The role of research faculty in higher education institutions: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Research and Innovation*, 21(1), 112-124.

Cengage (2024). Faculty satisfaction report: Teaching remains the primary source of job satisfaction among educators. *Educational Trends*, 34(2), 15-25.

Chen, J. (2016). Time spent on academic duties: A comparative study of university faculty workload. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58(1), 91-105.

Chen, Y., & Lee, W. (2015). Work-life balance and gender differences in academia. *Gender in Education*, 29(1), 42-56.

Chi, Y., & Yusn, A. (2015). The impact of teaching and research workload on faculty satisfaction in higher education. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 10(3), 22-31.

Griffith, J., & Johnson, B. (2020). Gender differences in academic workload and service contributions among university faculty. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 39(5), 75-89.

Heggestad, D. M., & Williams, R. (2019). Aligning research interests with institutional goals: Effects on faculty satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*, 29(4), 200-215.

Jung, J., & Choi, Y. (2020). The relationship between faculty satisfaction and research productivity in academic institutions. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 45(3), 112-130.

Khanna, A. (2020). Job satisfaction and its impact on faculty well-being in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education and Research*, 23(1), 1-12.

Misra, J., & Jackson, C. (2011). Gender differences in teaching load and service responsibilities in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Administration*, 48(3), 255-272.

Mueller, M. (2018). The distribution of academic time: Research, teaching, and service responsibilities in faculty workload. *Higher Education Management*, 40(2), 135-148.

O'Meara, K., & Taylor, R. (2019). Reward systems in higher education: Implications for teaching and research outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(4), 113-127.

Porter, L. (2007). Gender differences in committee work and service duties in academia. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(2), 205-218.

Ranieri, A., & Smith, G. (2018). Balancing teaching and research: The role of institutional support in faculty satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Development*, 21(3), 123-136.

Reybold, L., & Corda, P. (2011). The challenges of balancing academic responsibilities in university teaching. *Educational Leadership Review*, 36(4), 39-45.

Rosser, S. V. (2004). The gendered nature of academic research and publication. *Journal of Women in Higher Education*, 22(2), 44-56.

Smith, J., & Garcia, L. (2023). The role of collegiality in enhancing faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education and Learning*, 33(2), 221-238.

Sonnert, G., & Holton, G. (1995). Time allocation and job satisfaction among university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(5), 341-355.

Taysum, A. (2022). The importance of faculty engagement in institutional service for student development and academic success. *Journal of Academic Leadership*, 16(1), 5-17.

Tourangeau, R., & Darroch, M. (2014). Workload distribution and faculty satisfaction in higher education. *Higher Education Journal*, 28(3), 159-176.

Zhang, Y. (2014). Obstacles to research in academia: Faculty workload and teaching responsibilities. *Journal of Research in Education*, 24(2), 212-230.