Exploring Lecturer Commitment in the Digital Era: Value, Affective, Continuance, and Normative Dimensions

Putu Gede Subhaktiyasa*
Program Studi Teknologi Laboratroium Medis, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan Wira Medika Bali,
Jl. Kecak No 9A Gatot Subroto Timur, Denpasar, 80239. Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: pgs@stikeswiramedika.ac.id

Abstract: Digital transformation has increased the complexity of higher education dynamics, affecting various aspects, including lecturers' commitment to the institution. This study aims to analyze lecturers' commitment, including value, affective, continuance, and normative commitments, in the face of changes triggered by digitalization. This study used a descriptive quantitative approach, with data collected through a standardized questionnaire from 336 lecturers selected using a proportional random sampling technique. Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted with SPSS. The results showed that value and affective commitment had the highest levels, reflecting the alignment of lecturers' values with the institution's vision and their emotional attachment to higher education. However, continuance commitment showed variation, with some lecturers considering external factors such as other job opportunities and financial benefits in their decision to stay. Meanwhile, normative commitment tends to be low, indicating that not all lecturers feel morally obligated to their higher education institution. The findings emphasize the importance of institutional strategies in improving lecturers' welfare, continuous professional development, and incentive policies to strengthen their long-term commitment.

Keywords: lecturer commitment, digital transformation, higher education, academic engagement, professional development

INTRODUCTION

The rapid digital transformation in higher education has significantly reshaped teaching methodologies, institutional structures, and the professional roles of lecturers. The increasing adoption of online and blended learning models, particularly accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has necessitated a reassessment of pedagogical strategies and digital competencies among lecturers (Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022; Schalk et al., 2022). As higher education institutions continue integrating digital technologies into instructional practices, lecturers face heightened expectations to develop digital literacy, innovate their teaching approaches, and adapt to the evolving landscape of higher education (González et al., 2023; Laufer et al., 2021). While digitalization has facilitated broader accessibility and instructional flexibility, it has also introduced significant challenges, including increased workloads, disparities in digital competencies, and the need for continuous professional development. These factors affect lecturers' teaching efficacy and have profound implications for their organizational commitment and long-term engagement with higher education institutions (Conrad et al., 2022; Watermeyer et al., 2020).

Lecturers' organizational commitment reflects their psychological attachment to their institutions, influencing job satisfaction, engagement, and overall academic performance (Amoah et al., 2021). However, the shift to digital learning environments has challenged this commitment in various ways. Many lecturers report increased stress and a lack of institutional support in navigating digital pedagogies, which can contribute to burnout and disengagement (Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022; Sang et al., 2023; Watermeyer et al., 2020). The digital divide remains a critical issue, as disparities in access to technology and internet infrastructure create uneven teaching experiences, limiting lecturers' ability to engage with students effectively (Deacon et al., 2022; Starkey et al., 2023). Additionally, the decline in face-to-face interactions has altered lecturers' professional dynamics, potentially weakening their sense of belonging and emotional connection to their

institutions (Koh & Daniel, 2022). These challenges highlight the need for higher education institutions to develop institutional strategies that address both technological and emotional aspects to foster more substantial lecturer commitment in the digital era.

Despite extensive research on organizational commitment in higher education, there remains a limited understanding of how digital transformation influences lecturers' commitment across multiple dimensions. Prior studies have examined various factors affecting lecturer commitment, such as digital competencies, psychological contract breaches, research engagement and the broader impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on academic work (Amoah et al., 2021; Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022; Watermeyer et al., 2020; Lifang Zhang & Xie, 2022). However, these studies primarily focus on external influences rather than providing a descriptive analysis of how digital adaptation reshapes lecturers' organizational commitment at a deeper level. While some scholars have investigated challenges in emergency remote teaching and digital tool integration, findings emphasize pedagogical and institutional adjustments rather than systematically exploring how technological transitions influence lecturer commitment (Sum & Oancea, 2022; Truss et al., 2024). Additionally, research on digital education's impact on lecturer performance and digital competencies does not explicitly examine how technological adaptation relates to different commitment forms (Koh & Daniel, 2022; Turner et al., 2023). Furthermore, studies on sustainability and institutional values in higher education lack direct examinations of how these elements influence lecturers' commitment in digital contexts (Aung & Hallinger, 2022; Ghasemy et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023). These limitations indicate the need for research that systematically explores how digital transformation shapes lecturers' value commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment, offering more profound insights into their engagement with higher education institutions.

This study provides a novel contribution by offering a descriptive exploration of lecturers' commitment in the digital era, focusing on the aforementioned value, affective, continuance, and normative dimensions. While previous research has examined digital adaptation in teaching and lecturer performance, few studies

have systematically analyzed its relationship with lecturer commitment. Understanding how lecturers' value alignment, emotional engagement, career stability, and institutional loyalty evolve in response to digital transitions is essential for developing effective strategies to sustain lecturer well-being and institutional resilience (Turner et al., 2023). By capturing lecturers' lived experiences and perceptions, this study provides an empirical foundation for developing policies and interventions supporting lecturer adaptation to digital environments, enhancing their professional satisfaction and long-term engagement. This research is particularly relevant as higher education institutions worldwide continue navigating the complexities of digital transformation, necessitating evidence-based approaches to maintain a committed and resilient academic workforce.

This study aims to examine how digital transformation influences lecturers' commitment across four key dimensions: value commitment (alignment with educational values), affective commitment (emotional connection to students and colleagues), continuance commitment (decisions to remain in their roles despite external pressures), and normative commitment (moral obligation to their institutions). By employing a descriptive research approach, this study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how these dimensions manifest in the digital era. The findings will inform institutional strategies to enhance lecturer engagement, improve teaching quality, and guide policy decisions in digital education. Furthermore, this study contributes to the academic discourse on organizational commitment by offering empirical insights into the intersection between digital adaptation and lecturer retention, thereby supporting future research and policymaking in higher education.

METHOD

This study employs a quantitative descriptive research design to examine lecturer commitment in the digital era by analyzing its value, affective, continuance, and normative dimensions. A descriptive approach provides a systematic way to investigate the characteristics and patterns of lecturer commitment without manipulating variables, allowing the study to generate empirical insights into how digital transformation influences higher education

professionals. The research targets lecturers from various higher education institutions in Bali, including universities, institutes, polytechnics, colleges, and academies. The study defines its accessible population as 1,293 permanent lecturers who hold a national lecturer identification number and have obtained national lecturer certification. Using Krejcie and Morgan's formula, the study determined a minimum sample size of 296 lecturers. The study increased the final sample size to 346 lecturers using Warwick & Linenger's formula to strengthen the reliability of the findings and address potential nonresponses (Subhaktiyasa, 2024c). The study applied proportional random sampling to ensure a fair representation of lecturers from diverse institutional backgrounds.

The data collection process involved administering a self-reported questionnaire based on the Lecturer Organizational Commitment Scale developed by (Subhaktiyasa, 2024d). The questionnaire consists of 36 items, categorized into four dimensions: value commitment (9 items), affective commitment (9 items), continuance commitment (9 items), and normative commitment (9 items). Respondents rated their agreement on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The study ensured validity and reliability by conducting rigorous testing. A panel of experts applied Gregory's framework to assess the instrument, producing a content validity index of 0.944, which confirmed its strong validity (Subhaktiyasa, 2024a). The study also examined item validity through Pearson's Product-Moment correlation, which verified that all questionnaire items were valid, as correlation coefficients exceeded the threshold of 0.159 at $p < 0.05$. The reliability test, performed using Cronbach's Alpha, produced a coefficient of 0.937, indicating high internal consistency in measuring lecturer commitment.

The study applied descriptive statistical analysis to systematically identify trends and variations in lecturer commitment across different dimensions. Researchers computed mean scores, standard deviations, and frequency distributions to provide a comprehensive overview of the data (Subhaktiyasaa et al., 2025). The analysis utilized SPSS to ensure accuracy and efficiency in processing statistical results. The research adhered to ethical principles to protect participants' confidentiality and voluntary participation. Before completing the questionnaire, lecturers received a detailed explanation of the study's objectives, significance, and potential benefits. The study required all respondents to provide informed consent, confirming their willingness to participate and acknowledging that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. Researchers ensured that all collected data served only for academic research purposes and complied with ethical guidelines for research involving human participants.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The study distributed 346 questionnaires, and 336 respondents (97%) completed and returned them. The collected data underwent thorough verification for missing values and outliers using boxplot analysis. The demographic analysis revealed that 57.7% of respondents were female, with the majority aged 30–39 (43.8%). Most respondents (73.5%) held a master's degree, while 26.5% had obtained a doctoral degree. Regarding teaching experience, 40.2% of lecturers had worked 6–10 years, while 18.2% had 11–15 years of experience. The smallest group consisted of lecturers with 21–25 years of experience (2.7%). Regarding academic rank, 63.1% held the position of Senior Lecturer, making up the majority. The study found that only 19.7% of respondents were Associate Professors, while 1.5% were Professors.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis of research variables

Organization Commitment Dimensions	Statistics					
	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance
Value commitment	17	28	45	38.96	3.87	14.88
Affective commitment	18	27	45	38.26	3.85	14.84
Continuance commitment	33	12	45	35.37	4.66	21.73
Normative commitment	17	28	45	37.55	3.88	15.05

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistical analysis of lecturers' organizational commitment dimensions. Value commitment records the highest mean score (38.96) with a standard

deviation of 3.87, indicating that most lecturers strongly align their values with their institution's. Affective commitment follows with a mean of 38.26 and a standard deviation of 3.85, reflecting lecturers' strong emotional attachment to their workplace. In contrast, continuance commitment has a lower mean (35.37) and the highest standard deviation (4.66), suggesting more significant variability in lecturers' perceptions of the benefits of remaining at their institution, likely influenced by external opportunities. Meanwhile, normative commitment shows a mean of 37.55 with a standard deviation of 3.88, indicating that many lecturers feel a moral obligation to stay affiliated with their institution. These findings emphasize that value and affective commitments are the primary drivers of lecturers' organizational loyalty, while the more significant variability in continuance commitment suggests that external factors play a crucial role in their retention decisions.

Table 2. Respondents' responses to organizational commitments

Organizational commitment dimensions	Respondents' perceptions (%)					Average (%)
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Value Commitment	0.00	0.13	3.57	59.52	36.77	4.33
Affective Commitment	0.00	0.23	6.02	62.14	31.61	4.25
Continuance Commitment	0.26	1.28	18.53	60.02	19.90	3.93
Normative Commitment	0.00	0.13	8.73	64.81	26.32	4.17

Table 2 shows that value commitment has the highest level of agreement, with 59.52% of lecturers agreeing and 36.77% strongly agreeing, resulting in an average score of 4.33. These findings suggest that most lecturers align their values with the institution's vision and mission, reinforcing their loyalty and engagement. Similarly, affective commitment shows strong agreement, with an average score of 4.25, indicating that lecturers develop a strong emotional attachment to their institution, which enhances motivation and job satisfaction. In contrast, continuance commitment exhibits more significant variability, with an average score of 3.93, reflecting that some lecturers consider external factors, such as career opportunities or financial benefits, when deciding whether to remain. Normative commitment presents a positive trend, with a mean of 4.17, showing that most lecturers feel a moral and professional obligation to stay. These results highlight that value and affective commitment play a dominant role in sustaining lecturers' organizational loyalty, while external considerations influence continuance commitment.

Table 3. Categories of organizational commitment scores

Indicator Organization Commitment	Category (%)				
	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Low	Very Low
Value commitment	36.3	15.8	42.6	3.6	1.8
Affective commitment	28.6	16.7	44.0	8	2.7
Continuance commitment	32.1	52.7	13.4	1.5	3
Normative commitment	24.7	10.7	48.5	14.3	14.3

Table 3 indicates that value commitment is mainly in the moderate category (42.6%), followed by excellent (36.3%), with a small proportion in the low category. Affective commitment shows a similar pattern, predominating the moderate category (44.0%) and a small proportion in the low category. Continuance commitment has a different distribution, with 52.7% in the good category and 32.1% in excellent, suggesting that many lecturers stay at the institution due to external considerations. Meanwhile, normative commitment was dominated by the moderate category (48.5%) but had a sizable proportion in the low and very low categories (14.3% each), indicating that not all lecturers felt a strong moral responsibility towards the institution. This finding indicates that lecturers tend to have high-value alignment and emotional attachment but consider external factors in their continuance commitment. In addition, the significant proportion in the low category on normative commitment emphasizes the need for institutional strategies to strengthen lecturers'

engagement through improving job welfare, strengthening academic culture, and creating a professional environment that supports the sustainability of educators in higher education.

Discussion

The study results provide an understanding of the high perception of lecturers towards value, affective, continuance and normative commitments that emphasize the importance of lecturer commitment to higher education management (Subhaktiyasa, Arisusana et al., 2024; Subhaktiyasa, Mustari, et al., 2024). Values-based lecturers can reduce counterproductive work behaviors that impact the overall productivity of the higher education institution (Subhaktiyasa & Sintari, 2024). The analysis illustrates that value commitment has the highest level of perception compared to other dimensions. Most lecturers feel that their values are aligned with the institution's vision and mission, reflecting a strong identification with their higher education. This alignment strengthens lecturers' loyalty and engagement with the institution, especially in the face of changes triggered by digitalization (Aung & Hallinger, 2022; Rögele et al., 2022). Highly committed lecturers tend to be more proactive in adopting pedagogical innovations and contributing to sustainable educational practices (Diehl & Golann, 2023; Karnopp, 2022). In addition, this commitment creates a strong academic culture where lecturers feel valued and encouraged to actively participate in achieving college goals (Roos et al., 2022). The research findings align with previous studies showing that value commitment is often higher than other commitment dimensions due to institutions' increasing focus on sustainability and ethics in higher education (Aung & Hallinger, 2022; Nousheen & Tabassum, 2024). When institutions embed such values in their operational policies and practices, lecturers tend to have a more profound sense of attachment, increasing their loyalty and driving innovation in learning (Amoah et al., 2021; Bookbinder et al., 2024). This high-value commitment also includes strengthening professional development, where lecturers are more encouraged to improve their skills in digital technology and innovation-based learning methods (Renfors, 2024; Yang et al., 2023). Therefore, value commitments strengthen academic integrity and catalyze a higher education environment oriented towards sustainability and academic excellence in the digital age (Rushton & Reiß, 2020).

Affective commitment among lecturers in the digital age reflects their emotional attachment to the institution, which is crucial in enhancing their dedication to higher education. Digital transformation has strengthened this attachment, as lecturers with high affective commitment are more likely to embrace innovation and adapt their teaching methodologies to integrate digital technologies (Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022). Their willingness to engage with technological advances increases job satisfaction and strengthens relationships with students and the academic environment (Almenara et al., 2021). Moreover, the continuous development of digital competencies is positively perceived by lecturers with strong affective commitment, who view these changes as opportunities for professional growth rather than mere challenges (Starkey et al., 2023). This commitment also encourages collaboration between lecturers, creating a more cohesive academic community, especially during significant shifts such as the transition to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic (Conrad et al., 2022; Williamson, 2020). Previous studies support these findings, demonstrating that lecturers who feel emotionally connected to their institutions are more engaged in adopting digital pedagogies and improving their skills (González et al., 2023). In addition, community and shared goals within the academic environment strengthen affective commitment, improving teaching effectiveness and educational retention (Nienhusser & Connery, 2021; Yang et al., 2023). The implications of strong affective commitment go beyond individual professional growth, fostering academic collaboration, promoting teaching innovation, and increasing institutional resilience in navigating the complexities of digital education (Santos et al., 2023; Viberg et al., 2024).

In contrast to the previous two dimensions, the results suggest that lecturers' continuance commitment in the digital era is highly variable, with many lecturers considering external factors, such as other job opportunities and financial benefits, in their decision to remain at the institution. Changes in the educational landscape due to technological advances and increased competition for educators have prompted lecturers to reassess their loyalty, not only based on emotional attachment but also pragmatic

considerations related to career stability and financial prospects (Benden & Lauermann, 2022; Johnson et al., 2021). Previous studies have shown that work flexibility and work-life balance are key factors influencing the sustainability of lecturers' commitment, especially amid digital transformation changing work expectations in the higher education sector (Abedini et al., 2021; Lockee, 2020). As academic competition increases, higher education institutions must adjust their retention strategies by offering competitive compensation, professional development opportunities, and a supportive work environment to retain qualified educators (Kortemeyer et al., 2023; Weidlich & Kalz, 2021). In addition, external factors, such as the rise of digital-based employment opportunities and new competency certifications, have led lecturers to increasingly consider alternative career prospects outside traditional academic institutions (Chen & Vanclay, 2021; Khan et al., 2024). Therefore, an institution's success in retaining lecturers depends on its strong organizational culture and ability to respond to labor market dynamics and adapt institutional strategies to lecturers' individual needs (Yu-peng & Yu, 2023; Li Zhang & Hwang, 2023). By understanding the complexity of factors that influence continuance commitment, higher education institutions can develop adaptive policies to create a stable and sustainable academic environment amid changes triggered by digital transformation.

The results found that lecturers' normative commitment in the digital era tends to be low, indicating that not all lecturers feel morally obligated to remain at their higher education institutions. The changing dynamics of work in higher education, especially after COVID-19, have shifted the professional orientation of lecturers, where the decision to stay in the institution is influenced more by external factors than moral-based loyalty (Renfors, 2024; Li Zhang & Hwang, 2023). Labor market flexibility, increased digital employment opportunities, and changing professional expectations have diminished educators' normative commitment (Griffioen, 2020; Lewohl, 2023). As technology in education evolves, lecturers increasingly consider career prospects and personal development as key factors in their decision to remain at the institution or seek other opportunities (Cabral et al., 2023; Luederitz & Etzion, 2024). This situation has significant implications for higher education institutions, as low normative commitment can lead to decreased lecturer engagement, increased turnover rates, and reduced stability of the teaching force (Lechuga et al., 2023). Therefore, institutions must develop strategies to increase lecturers' sense of belonging and loyalty, such as supportive and spiritually-based leadership, clear career paths, and continuous professional development programs (Datu et al., 2022; Olivier et al., 2024; Subhaktiyasa, 2024b; Subhaktiyasa et al., 2024). Without these efforts, institutions may have difficulty retaining qualified educators, ultimately impacting the quality of learning and the student experience (Voet & Wever, 2020). In addition, low normative commitment may hinder collaborative efforts in achieving institutional goals, especially in the face of digitization challenges that require value alignment and shared commitment from all academic personnel (Ojedokun, 2021; Qiao et al., 2022). Thus, higher education institutions must build an inclusive and supportive academic culture to enhance lecturers' moral responsibility towards their institutions.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that value and affective commitment are crucial in fostering lecturers' loyalty to higher education institutions, while external factors influence continuance and normative commitment. Most lecturers exhibit strong value alignment with institutional missions and emotional attachment, positively impacting motivation and job satisfaction. However, the variation in continuance commitment indicates that some lecturers consider financial stability and alternative job opportunities in their career decisions. Additionally, the high proportion of lecturers with low normative commitment highlights the need for institutional strategies to strengthen their moral responsibility towards the institution. These findings emphasize the importance of institutional policies in improving lecturers' well-being through strengthening academic culture, providing incentives, and promoting continuous professional development. A supportive work environment and recognition of academic contributions are crucial in enhancing lecturers' commitment. Despite its contributions, this study has limitations. The focus on a single region limits the generalizability of the findings, and the reliance on a quantitative approach may not fully

capture the complexity of lecturers' commitment. Future research should expand the geographical scope and incorporate qualitative methods to gain deeper insights into the factors shaping lecturers' commitment. Moreover, further exploration of how digital transformation influences long-term academic engagement and retention strategies in higher education is needed.

REFERENSI

Abedini, A., Abedin, B., & Zowghi, D. (2021). Adult Learning in Online Communities of Practice: A Systematic Review. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *52*(4), 1663–1694. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13120

Almenara, J. C., Guillén-Gámez, F. D., Ruiz-Palmero, J., & Palacios-Rodríguez, A. (2021). Teachers' Digital Competence to Assist Students With Functional Diversity: Identification of Factors Through Logistic Regression Methods. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *53*(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13151

Amoah, V. S., Annor, F., & Asumeng, M. (2021). Psychological Contract Breach and Teachers' Organizational Commitment: Mediating Roles of Job Embeddedness and Leader-Member Exchange. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *59*(5), 634–649. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-09-2020-0201

Aung, P. N., & Hallinger, P. (2022). Research on Sustainability Leadership in Higher Education: A Scoping Review. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 517–534. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-09-2021-0367

Benden, D. K., & Lauermann, F. (2022). Students' Motivational Trajectories and Academic Success in Math-Intensive Study Programs: Why Short-Term Motivational Assessments Matter. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *114*(5), 1062–1085. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000708

Bookbinder, R., Mdee, A., & Roelich, K. (2024). The Possibility of a Theory of Change to Tackle the Climate Crisis in a UK University. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *25*(8), 1929–1944. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-05-2023-0185

Cabral, J. J., Iyer, D. N., & O'Brien, J. (2023). How the Ghosts of Past Experience Haunt Problemistic Search. *Strategic Organization*, *22*(2), 385–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221142554

Chen, C., & Vanclay, F. (2021). Transnational Universities, Host Communities and Local Residents: Social Impacts, University Social Responsibility and Campus Sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *22*(8), 88–107. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-10-2020-0397

Conrad, C., Deng, Q., Caron, I., Shkurska, O., Skerrett, P., & Sundararajan, B. (2022). How Student Perceptions About Online Learning Difficulty Influenced Their Satisfaction During Canada's Covid-19 Response. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *53*(3), 534–557. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13206

Datu, J. A. D., Lee, A., Fung, W. K., Cheung, R. Y. M., & Chung, K. K. H. (2022). Prospering in the Midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Effects of PROSPER-based Intervention on Psychological Outcomes Among Preschool Teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, *94*, 66–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.08.003

Deacon, B., Laufer, M., & Schäfer, L. O. (2022). Infusing Educational Technologies in the Heart of the University—A Systematic Literature Review From an Organisational Perspective. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(2), 441–466. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13277

Diehl, D. K., & Golann, J. W. (2023). An Integrated Framework for Studying How Schools Respond to External Pressures. *Educational Researcher*, *52*(5), 296–305. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x231159599

Ghasemy, M., Elwood, J. A., & Scott, G. I. (2022). A Comparative Study on Turnaround Leadership in Higher Education and the Successful Implementation of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 602–636. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-01-2022-0001

Gómez-Pablos, V. B., Matarranz, M., Casado-

Aranda, L., & Otto, A. (2022). Teachers' Digital Competencies in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00312-8

González, C., Ponce, D., & Fernández, V. M. (2023). Teachers' Experiences of Teaching Online During COVID-19: Implications for Postpandemic Professional Development. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *71*(1), 55–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10200-9

Griffioen, D. M. E. (2020). A Questionnaire to Compare Lecturers' and Students' Higher Education Research Integration Experiences. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *27*(2), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1706162

Huang, T.-C., Ho, S.-J., Zheng, W.-H., & Shu, Y. (2023). To Know, Feel and Do: An Instructional Practice of Higher Education for Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *25*(2), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-11-2022-0355

Johnson, J. B., Reddy, P., Chand, R., & Naiker, M. (2021). Attitudes and Awareness of Regional Pacific Island Students Towards E-Learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00248-z

Karnopp, J. (2022). Structures and Relationships in Organizational Learning for Change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *60*(5), 457–472. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-09-2021-0177

Khan, F., Preeti, & Gupta, V. (2024). Examining the Relationships Between Instructional Leadership, Teacher Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Primary schools in India. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *62*(2), 223–238. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-09-2022-0145

Koh, J. H. L., & Daniel, B. K. (2022). Shifting Online During COVID-19: A Systematic Review of Teaching and Learning Strategies and Their Outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00361-7

Kortemeyer, G., Dittmann-Domenichini, N., Schlienger, C., Spilling, E., Yaroshchuk, A., & Dissertori, G. (2023). Attending Lectures in Person, Hybrid or Online—how Do Students Choose, and What About the Outcome? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00387-5

Laufer, M., Leiser, A., Deacon, B., Brichambaut, P. P. d., Fecher, B., Kobsda, C., & Hesse, F. W. (2021). Digital Higher Education: A Divider or Bridge Builder? Leadership Perspectives on Edtech in a COVID-19 Reality. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00287-6

Lechuga, M. L., Cifuentes-Faura, J., & Martínez, Ú. F. (2023). Teaching Sustainability in Higher Education by Integrating Mathematical Concepts. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *25*(1), 62–77. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-07-2022-0221

Lewohl, J. M. (2023). Exploring Student Perceptions and Use of Face-to-Face Classes, Technology-Enhanced Active Learning, and Online Resources. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00416-3

Lockee, B. B. (2020). Shifting Digital, Shifting Context: (Re)considering Teacher Professional Development for Online and Blended Learning in the COVID-19 Era. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *69*(1), 17–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09836-8

Luederitz, C., & Etzion, D. (2024). Generativity as a Heuristic for Impact-Driven Scholars Addressing Grand Challenges. *Strategic Organization*, *23*(1), 54–78.

https://doi.org/10.1177/147612702412391
37

Nienhusser, H. K., & Connery, C. (2021). Examining the Undocumented College Student Policy Implementation Environment Through a Contextual Interaction Theory Lens. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *43*(4), 615–646. https://doi.org/10.3102/016237372110092 40

Nousheen, A., & Tabassum, F. (2024). Assessing Students' Sustainability Consciousness in Relation to Their Perceived Teaching Styles: An Exploratory Study in Pakistani Context. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *25*(6), 1214–1231. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-12-2022-0406

Ojedokun, O. (2021). Self-Construal Types and Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment of Employees in a University. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *22*(4), 780–800. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-07-2020-0267

Olivier, É., Morin, A. J. S., Plante, I., Archambault, I., & Dupéré, V. (2024). Classroom Learning Climate Profiles: Combining Classroom Goal Structure and Social Climate to Support Student School Functioning and Behavioral Adaptation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *116*(2), 256–277. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000837

Qiao, S., Yeung, S. S., Zainuddin, Z., Ng, D. T. K., & Chu, S. K. W. (2022). Examining the Effects of Mixed and Non-digital Gamification on Students' Learning Performance, Cognitive Engagement and Course Satisfaction. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(1), 394–413. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13249

Renfors, S.-M. (2024). Education for the Circular Economy in Higher Education: An Overview of the Current State. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *25*(9), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-07-2023-0270

Rögele, S., Rilling, B., Apfel, D., & Fuchs, J. (2022). Sustainable Development Competencies and Student-Centered Teaching Strategies in Higher Education

Institutions: The Role of Professors as Gatekeepers. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *23*(6), 1366–1385. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-02-2021-0069

Roos, N., Sassen, R., & Guenther, E. (2022). Sustainability Governance Toward an Organizational Sustainability Culture at German Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 553–583. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-09-2021-0396

Rushton, E. A. C., & Reiß, M. (2020). Middle and High School Science Teacher Identity Considered Through the Lens of the Social Identity Approach: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Studies in Science Education*, *57*(2), 141–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2020.17 99621

Sang, G., Wang, K., Li, S., Xi, J., & Yang, D. (2023). Effort Expectancy Mediate the Relationship Between Instructors' Digital Competence and Their Work Engagement: Evidence From Universities in China. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *71*(1), 99–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10205-4

Santos, A. I. d., Chinkes, E., Carvalho, M. A. G. de, Solórzano, C. M. V, & Marroni, L. S. (2023). The Digital Competence of Academics in Higher Education: Is the Glass Half Empty or Half Full? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00376-0

Schalk, A. E., McAvinia, C., & Rooney, P. (2022). Exploring the Concept of the Digital Educator During COVID-19. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 131–143. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7316

Starkey, L., Yates, A., Róiste, M. d., Lundqvist, K., Ormond, A., Randal, J., & Sylvester, A. (2023). Each Discipline Is Different: Teacher Capabilities for Future-Focussed Digitally Infused Undergraduate Programmes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *71*(1), 117–136. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10196-2

Subhaktiyasa, P. G. (2024a). Evaluasi Validitas dan Reliabilitas Instrumen Penelitian Kuantitatif: Sebuah Studi Pustaka. *Journal of Education Research*, 5(4), 5599–5609. https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v5i4.1747

Subhaktiyasa, P. G. (2024b). Lecturers' perceptions of spiritual leadership: A quantitative descriptive study in higher education. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Development (IJED)*, 5(1), 62–170. https://doi.org/10.59672/ijed.v5i1.3682

Subhaktiyasa, P. G. (2024c). Menentukan Populasi dan Sampel : Pendekatan Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan*, 9(4), 2721–2731. https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v9i4.2657

Subhaktiyasa, P. G. (2024d). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Spiritual, Motivasi Kerja, Budaya Organisasi, dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Dosen Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Provinsi Bali. In *Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*.

Subhaktiyasa, P. G., Agung, A. A. G., Jampel, I. N., & Dantes, K. R. (2024). Spiritual Leadership and Lecturer Performance: Mediating Role of Work Motivation. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13(6), 3653~3662. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i6.29175

Subhaktiyasa, P. G., Arisusana, I. M., Wahyudi, H., & Sumaryani, N. P. (2024). Dynamics of hierarchical conflict in higher education : What does the literature tell us about performance and well-being ? *Jambura Journal of Educational Management*, 5(2), 537–547. https://doi.org/10.37411/jjem.v5i2.3265

Subhaktiyasa, P. G., Mustari, M., Lede, Y. U., Santika, T., Arifin, Nurjanah, Sunarsih, Hamadi, H. H., & Rusli, R. (2024). *Manajemen Pendidikan*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

Subhaktiyasa, P. G., & Sintari, S. N. N. (2024). Elevating Performance : Spiritual Leadership and Mitigation of Counterproductive Work Behavior in Higher Education. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 7(2), 467–476. https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v7i2.76966

Subhaktiyasaa, P. G., Candrawati, S. A. K., Sumaryani, N. P., Sunita, N. W., &

Syakur, A. (2025). *Penerapan Statistik Deskriptif: Perspektif Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*, 14(1), 96–104. https://doi.org/10.59672/emasains.v14i1.4450

Sum, M., & Oancea, A. (2022). The Use of Technology in Higher Education Teaching by Academics During the COVID-19 Emergency Remote Teaching Period: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00364-4

Truss, A., McBride, K., Porter, H. F. J., Anderson, V., Stilwell, G. D., Philippou, C., & Taggart, A. (2024). Learner Engagement With Instructor-generated Video. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(5), 2192–2211. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13450

Turner, K., O'Brien, S., Wallström, H., Samuelsson, K., & Uusimäki, S.-L. M. (2023). Lessons Learnt During COVID-19: Making Sense of Australian and Swedish University Lecturers' Experience. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00395-5

Viberg, O., Mutimukwe, C., Hrastinski, S., Pargman, T. C., & Lilliesköld, J. (2024). Exploring Teachers' (Future) Digital Assessment Practices in Higher Education: Instrument and Model Development. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(6), 2597–2616. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13462

Voet, M., & Wever, B. D. (2020). How Do Teachers Prioritize Instructional Goals? Using the Theory of Planned Behavior to Explain Goal Coverage. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 89, 103005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103005

Watermeyer, R., Crick, T., Knight, C., & Goodall, J. (2020). COVID-19 and Digital Disruption in UK Universities: Afflictions and Affordances of Emergency Online Migration. *Higher Education*, 81(3), 623–641. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00561-y

Weidlich, J., & Kalz, M. (2021). Exploring Predictors of Instructional Resilience

During Emergency Remote Teaching in Higher Education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00278-7

Williamson, B. (2020). Making Markets Through Digital Platforms: Pearson, Edu-Business, and the (E)valuation of Higher Education. *Critical Studies in Education*, *62*(1), 50–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2020.1737556

Yang, Y., Dong, Y., Jiang, L., Xu, C., Luo, F., Zhao, G., & Kurup, P. M. (2023). Requesting a Commitment in School Teachers to Teach in Unprecedented Ways: The Mediating Role of Teacher Agency. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(6), 1858–1877. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13322

Yu-peng, L., & Yu, Z. (2023). Extending Technology Acceptance Model to Higher-Education Students' Use of Digital Academic Reading Tools on Computers. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00403-8

Zhang, Li, & Hwang, Y. (2023). "Should I Change Myself or Not?": Examining (Re)constructed Language Teacher Identity During the COVID-19 Pandemic Through Text-Mining. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *127*, 104092. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104092

Zhang, Lifang, & Xie, Z. (2022). Research Agendas and Organizational Commitment Among Academics in Mainland China. *Higher Education*, *86*(2), 429–448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00941-6