

## **Quality of Life among University Teachers: A Study of Faculty Members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Bihar**

**Dr. Tabassum Praween<sup>1</sup>**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18992069>

**Review: 06/12/2025**

**Acceptance: 07/12/2025**

**Publication: 30/12/2025**

### **Abstract**

*The quality of life of university teachers has gained increasing attention in contemporary educational research, as the professional effectiveness, productivity, and academic engagement of faculty members are closely associated with their overall well-being. The present study aimed to examine the level of quality of life among university teachers and to analyse the differences across gender and locality among faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga, Bihar. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design to explore various dimensions of teachers' quality of life. A total of 600 university teachers were selected through convenience sampling, comprising 300 male and 300 female faculty members from different departments and affiliated colleges of the university. The sample also included an equal representation of 300 urban and 300 rural teachers to facilitate locality-based comparison. Data were collected using the WHOQOL-BREF Scale developed by the World Health Organization, which measures four major domains of quality of life: physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and environmental health. The reliability of the instrument was established using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient of 0.91, indicating high internal consistency and suitability of the scale for the present investigation. The collected data were analysed using descriptive statistics and independent samples t-tests. The findings revealed that the overall quality of life of university teachers was at a moderate level. Among the various dimensions, environmental health and social relationships demonstrated relatively higher levels, whereas psychological health was comparatively lower. The results further indicated significant differences in quality of life across gender and locality, suggesting that both personal and contextual factors influence the well-being of faculty members. The study highlights the importance of developing supportive institutional policies, strengthening psychological support systems, and improving working conditions to enhance the overall quality of life of university teachers. Improving teachers' well-being may ultimately contribute to better teaching effectiveness, higher academic productivity, and the sustainable development of higher education institutions.*

**Keywords:** *Quality of Life, University Teachers, L N Mithila University.*

### **Introduction**

Quality of life has emerged as a significant concept in contemporary social science and educational research, particularly in relation to professionals working in demanding academic environments. In the context of higher education, university teachers play a crucial role in shaping intellectual development, fostering research culture, and contributing to the overall progress of society. However, the effectiveness and productivity of teachers are often influenced by their overall quality of life, which encompasses physical well-being, psychological health, job satisfaction, social relationships, and work-life balance. The concept of quality of life generally refers to an individual's perception of their position in life within the cultural and value systems in which they live, in relation

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, M N D College, Chandauli, Ujiyarpur, Samastipur, Bihar, India.

to their goals, expectations, standards, and concerns (World Health Organisation [WHO], 1995). Therefore, understanding the quality of life of university teachers is essential for maintaining an effective and sustainable higher education system. University teachers frequently encounter various professional demands such as heavy teaching workloads, research expectations, administrative responsibilities, and pressures related to publication and academic performance. These professional challenges may influence their psychological well-being, job satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. Studies have indicated that occupational stress, institutional environment, professional recognition, and opportunities for professional growth significantly affect the quality of life of academic professionals (Sirgy et al., 2001; Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2015). When teachers experience a higher level of life satisfaction and well-being, they tend to demonstrate greater commitment, creativity, and effectiveness in teaching and research activities.

In recent years, the quality of life of teachers has gained increasing attention due to the changing nature of higher education systems, rapid technological advancements, and growing expectations from academic institutions. Teachers are now expected not only to deliver quality instruction but also to actively engage in research, community outreach, and academic administration. Such multifaceted roles may sometimes create role conflicts and work-related stress, thereby affecting their quality of life (Faragher, Cass, & Cooper, 2005). Consequently, examining the factors influencing the quality of life among university teachers has become an important area of research in educational psychology and higher education studies.

In the Indian context, university teachers operate within a unique socio-cultural and institutional environment. Public universities often face challenges such as limited infrastructure, heavy student enrolment, administrative constraints, and policy reforms in higher education. In states like Bihar, where universities play a vital role in expanding access to higher education, the professional well-being and life satisfaction of faculty members become particularly important for sustaining academic quality. Lalit Narayan Mithila University (LNMU), located in Darbhanga, is one of the major universities in the Mithila region, serving a large number of students and academic programs. The faculty members of this university contribute significantly to teaching, research, and academic administration; however, their quality of life may be influenced by institutional resources, work environment, professional expectations, and socio-economic conditions. Although numerous studies have explored job satisfaction, occupational stress, and psychological well-being among teachers, relatively fewer studies have specifically focused on the comprehensive concept of quality of life among university faculty members, particularly in regional universities of India. Investigating this aspect is important because teachers with a higher quality of life are more likely to exhibit greater professional commitment, enhanced teaching effectiveness, and improved interpersonal relationships within academic institutions.

Therefore, the present study aims to examine the quality of life among university teachers with special reference to faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Bihar. By exploring different dimensions of quality of life, the study seeks to provide insights into the well-being of academic professionals and contribute to the development of supportive institutional policies that promote a healthy and productive academic environment.

## **Review of Related Literature**

**Arunachalam, Subbarayalu, and Ramalingam (2024)** conducted a study on the quality of work life among faculty members in higher education institutions in India. The study adopted an exploratory research design and

collected data from 547 faculty members using a self-structured questionnaire. The findings indicated that a majority of faculty members were moderately satisfied with their quality of work life, although significant differences were observed based on gender and academic specialisation. The study emphasised that institutional policies, professional development opportunities, and supportive work environments play a crucial role in improving the overall well-being and satisfaction of university teachers.

**D'Souza (2021)** examined the quality of life of teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic with special reference to mental health and professional stress. The study revealed that teachers who experienced better emotional well-being and institutional support reported a higher quality of life. Conversely, teachers facing high levels of stress and workload demonstrated lower levels of life satisfaction and professional well-being. The study highlighted the importance of mental health support systems for teachers.

**Cathrine (2021)** investigated the relationship between emotional well-being and quality of life among teachers. The study found that teachers with higher emotional stability and psychological well-being reported better quality of life and job satisfaction. The research emphasised that emotional health and supportive work environments are essential for improving teachers' overall quality of life and professional effectiveness.

**Singh and Maini (2019)** examined the factors associated with the quality of work life among faculty members of technical institutions in Punjab, India. The researchers used a survey method and collected data from teachers working in engineering colleges. The results revealed that factors such as organizational support, job security, workload, and opportunities for career advancement significantly influenced the quality of work life of faculty members. The study concluded that improving working conditions and providing professional autonomy could enhance teachers' quality of life and job satisfaction.

**Subbarayalu and Al-Kuwaiti (2018)** carried out a cross-sectional study on the quality of work life among teaching staff in higher education institutions. The research examined different dimensions such as workload, work environment, compensation, and job satisfaction. The results indicated that supportive leadership, balanced workload, and adequate institutional facilities contributed positively to the quality of life of academic staff. The study concluded that improving faculty work conditions can enhance both professional productivity and psychological well-being.

**Senthilkumar and Umasankar (2015)** conducted a study on the factors affecting the quality of work life of faculty members in higher educational institutions in India. The study employed a survey method and analysed various organisational and personal factors affecting teachers' well-being. The findings indicated that work environment, participation in decision making, and recognition of professional achievements significantly influenced teachers' quality of life. The researchers emphasised that improving institutional climate could enhance faculty performance and satisfaction.

**Rao, Arora, and Vashisht (2013)** conducted a study on the quality of work life among university teachers at Jammu University. Using a descriptive survey design, the researchers examined different dimensions such as job satisfaction, work environment, and institutional support. The findings suggested that teachers' quality of life was influenced by factors like administrative support, recognition of academic work, and adequate infrastructure. The

study recommended that universities should develop supportive policies to enhance teachers' professional and personal well-being.

**Bharathi and Umaselvi (2011)** investigated the perception of quality of work life among college teachers in India. The study focused on various dimensions including job security, salary satisfaction, working conditions, and opportunities for professional development. The results revealed that many teachers experienced moderate levels of satisfaction with their professional life, but challenges such as heavy workload and limited resources negatively affected their overall quality of life. The study highlighted the need for improved institutional policies to support teachers' well-being.

### **Significance and Rationale of the Study**

The quality of life of university teachers has increasingly attracted attention in the domain of higher education, as teachers represent the core strength of academic institutions. The efficiency of teaching-learning processes, advancement in research activities, and overall institutional progress largely depend on the professional well-being and life satisfaction of faculty members. When teachers experience a higher level of quality of life, they are more likely to display greater motivation, creativity, and commitment toward their academic duties (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2015). In contrast, a lower quality of life may result in stress, burnout, diminished job satisfaction, and a decline in teaching effectiveness. Hence, assessing the quality of life of university teachers becomes crucial for ensuring both personal well-being and institutional advancement (Sirgy et al., 2001). In contemporary times, the roles and responsibilities of university teachers have expanded significantly due to growing expectations in teaching, research, publication, and administrative responsibilities. The increasing emphasis on academic productivity, research performance, and institutional accountability has introduced new challenges in the professional lives of teachers. Such demands may affect their psychological health, interpersonal relationships, and overall life satisfaction. Research findings indicate that excessive workload, role ambiguity, and institutional pressures can negatively influence teachers' quality of life and their work-life balance (Faragher, Cass, & Cooper, 2005). Therefore, exploring teachers' perceptions regarding their quality of life is important to identify the factors that either enhance or hinder their professional and personal well-being.

The relevance of the present study becomes particularly evident in the context of higher education institutions situated in developing regions such as Bihar. Universities in these areas often function with limited infrastructure, large enrolments of students, and various administrative constraints, all of which may shape the professional experiences of teachers. According to the World Health Organization, quality of life is influenced not only by individual well-being but also by the environmental and socio-cultural conditions within which individuals live and work (WHO, 1995). In this regard, examining the quality of life of teachers working in regional universities holds considerable importance.

Another important justification for conducting the present study is the need to develop empirical evidence that may assist educational administrators and policymakers in enhancing working conditions in universities. By understanding the quality of life of teachers, institutions can formulate policies and support systems that promote teachers' satisfaction, well-being, and professional efficiency. An improved quality of life among teachers ultimately leads to better academic performance, improved teaching quality, and more positive learning outcomes for students (Diener et al., 2015). Therefore, the present investigation seeks to examine the quality of life among

faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Bihar, with the aim of understanding their level of well-being and the factors influencing it. The results of this study are expected to enrich the existing body of literature on teacher well-being and provide valuable insights for improving the academic and professional environment within higher education institutions.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the level of quality of life among faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Bihar.
2. To study the quality of life among male and female faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University.
3. To analyse the quality of life among faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University with respect to their locality.

### Research Design

The present investigation explored the quality of life among university teachers with particular reference to faculty members of Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga, Bihar. A descriptive survey research design was employed to assess the level and various dimensions of quality of life and to examine gender differences among university teachers. The study included a sample of 600 teachers, selected through convenience sampling, comprising 300 male and 300 female faculty members from different departments and colleges of the university. The sample also included 300 urban and 300 rural university teachers, enabling a comparative analysis based on their locality background. To assess quality of life, the WHOQOL-BREF Scale developed by the World Health Organisation (1995) was utilised. The scale measures key domains such as physical health, psychological well-being, social relationships, and environmental conditions. The reliability of the instrument was established using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a coefficient of .91, indicating high internal consistency and suitability of the scale for measuring quality of life among university teachers.

### Analysis and Interpretation of Data

**Table No. 01: Descriptive Analysis of the Quality of Life of the Faculty Members**

Variables	Dimension of the Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Quality of Life	Physical Health	600	9	23	13.97	2.46
	Psychological Health	600	8	21	13.24	2.59
	Social Relationships	600	6	19	14.03	2.41
	Environmental Health	600	11	32	14.47	1.97
	<b>Total QL</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>55.71</b>	<b>12.05</b>

**Analysis and Interpretation:** Table 01 presents the descriptive statistics of quality of life (QoL) among faculty members across four dimensions—physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and environmental health—along with the overall quality of life score. The analysis was carried out on a sample of 600 university teachers.

In the physical health dimension, the scores ranged from 9 to 23, with a mean score of 13.97 and a standard deviation of 2.46. These values indicate that the faculty members demonstrate a moderate level of physical well-

being in terms of energy, mobility, and ability to perform daily activities, and the relatively small standard deviation suggests limited variation among respondents. For the psychological health dimension, the scores varied from 8 to 21, with a mean score of 13.24 and a standard deviation of 2.59. The mean score indicates a moderate level of psychological well-being, including aspects such as emotional balance, positive feelings, and stress management, although the standard deviation reflects some variability in psychological health among the faculty members. With regard to social relationships, the scores ranged from 6 to 19, with a mean score of 14.03 and a standard deviation of 2.41. This suggests that the respondents generally maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships and social support, with moderate variation in responses. In the environmental health dimension, the scores ranged from 11 to 32, with a mean score of 14.47 and a standard deviation of 1.97. This dimension recorded the highest mean score among all dimensions, indicating that faculty members perceive their environmental conditions, workplace facilities, safety, and access to resources relatively positively. The lower standard deviation suggests greater consistency in responses.

The overall quality of life (Total QoL) scores ranged from 34 to 95, with a mean score of 55.71 and a standard deviation of 12.05. The mean value indicates that the faculty members experience a moderate level of overall quality of life, while the comparatively higher standard deviation shows noticeable variation in the overall QoL among respondents.

Overall, the descriptive analysis reveals that faculty members exhibit a moderate level of quality of life across all four dimensions, with environmental health showing the highest mean score (M = 14.47), followed by social relationships (M = 14.03) and physical health (M = 13.97), whereas psychological health (M = 13.24) recorded the lowest mean score among the dimensions. These findings suggest that while faculty members perceive their environmental and social conditions positively, greater attention to psychological well-being may help enhance their overall quality of life.

**Table No. 02:**

**Mean Differences of Quality of Life and its Different Dimensions among Male and Female Teachers**

S. No.	Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	p
1.	Physical Health	Male	300	14.21	4.12	598	<b>4.61</b>	<b>0.0001</b>
		Female	300	12.69	3.96			
2.	Psychological Health	Male	300	13.26	3.95	598	<b>4.02</b>	<b>0.0001</b>
		Female	300	12.10	3.06			
3.	Social Relationships	Male	300	14.68	4.02	598	<b>4.05</b>	<b>0.0001</b>
		Female	300	13.19	4.95			
4.	Environmental Health	Male	300	13.33	4.26	598	<b>4.57</b>	<b>0.0001</b>
		Female	300	14.85	3.88			
5.	Total Quality of Life	Male	300	55.48	11.67	598	<b>2.64</b>	<b>0.0084</b>
		Female	300	52.83	12.85			

**Analysis and Interpretation:** Table 02 presents the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to examine the mean differences in quality of life and its four dimensions between male and female teachers. The sample consisted of 600 university teachers, including 300 male and 300 female faculty members. The table

shows the mean scores, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom, and significance levels for each dimension of quality of life. In the physical health dimension, male teachers obtained a mean score of 14.21 (SD = 4.12), whereas female teachers recorded a mean score of 12.69 (SD = 3.96). The calculated t-value ( $t = 4.61$ ,  $df = 598$ ) was found to be statistically significant at the 0.0001 level, indicating a significant difference between male and female teachers in terms of physical health. This suggests that male teachers reported comparatively better physical health than female teachers. Regarding psychological health, male teachers obtained a mean score of 13.26 (SD = 3.95), while female teachers scored 12.10 (SD = 3.06). The obtained t-value ( $t = 4.02$ ,  $df = 598$ ) was also significant at the 0.0001 level, indicating a statistically significant difference between male and female teachers in psychological health. The findings imply that male teachers reported relatively higher psychological well-being than female teachers. With respect to the social relationships dimension, male teachers obtained a mean score of 14.68 (SD = 4.02), whereas female teachers recorded a mean score of 13.19 (SD = 4.95). The obtained t-value ( $t = 4.05$ ,  $df = 598$ ) was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. The results suggest that male teachers reported better social relationships and interpersonal support compared to female teachers. In the environmental health dimension, male teachers obtained a mean score of 13.33 (SD = 4.26), while female teachers reported a higher mean score of 14.85 (SD = 3.88). The obtained t-value ( $t = 4.57$ ,  $df = 598$ ) was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. The findings reveal that female teachers perceived their environmental conditions more positively than male teachers.

With regard to the overall quality of life, male teachers obtained a mean score of 55.48 (SD = 11.67), whereas female teachers recorded a mean score of 52.83 (SD = 12.85). The obtained t-value ( $t = 2.64$ ,  $df = 598$ ) was statistically significant at the 0.0084 level, indicating a significant difference in the overall quality of life between male and female teachers. The results suggest that male teachers reported a slightly higher overall quality of life than female teachers. Overall, the findings indicate that significant gender differences exist in the quality of life of university teachers. Male teachers reported higher levels of physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and overall quality of life, whereas female teachers reported better environmental health. These results highlight the influence of gender on different dimensions of quality of life among faculty members.

**Table No. 03:**

**Mean Differences of Quality of Life and its Different Dimensions of Teachers based on their Locality**

S. No.	Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	p
1.	Physical Health	Urban	300	14.36	4.08	598	<b>3.82</b>	<b>0.0002</b>
		Rural	300	13.12	3.94			
2.	Psychological Health	Urban	300	13.48	3.76	598	<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.0006</b>
		Rural	300	12.36	3.29			
3.	Social Relationships	Urban	300	14.71	4.21	598	<b>3.91</b>	<b>0.0001</b>
		Rural	300	13.39	4.46			
4.	Environmental Health	Urban	300	15.12	3.67	598	<b>5.18</b>	<b>0.0001</b>
		Rural	300	13.82	3.74			
5.	Total Quality of Life	Urban	300	56.74	11.89	598	<b>2.97</b>	<b>0.0031</b>
		Rural	300	54.28	12.17			

**Analysis and Interpretation:** Table 03 presents the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to examine the mean differences in quality of life and its four dimensions between urban and rural teachers. The sample consisted of 600 teachers, including 300 urban and 300 rural faculty members. The table reports the mean scores, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom, and significance levels for each dimension of quality of life.

With regard to the physical health dimension, urban teachers obtained a mean score of 14.36 (SD = 4.08), whereas rural teachers recorded a mean score of 13.12 (SD = 3.94). The obtained t-value of 3.82 with df = 598 was found to be statistically significant at the 0.0002 level, indicating a significant difference between urban and rural teachers in terms of physical health. The results suggest that urban teachers reported better physical health compared to their rural counterparts. In the case of psychological health, urban teachers obtained a mean score of 13.48 (SD = 3.76), while rural teachers scored 12.36 (SD = 3.29). The t-value of 3.47 with df = 598 was also significant at the 0.0006 level, indicating a statistically significant difference between urban and rural teachers in psychological health. This finding suggests that urban teachers experience relatively better psychological well-being than rural teachers. Regarding the social relationships dimension, urban teachers obtained a mean score of 14.71 (SD = 4.21), whereas rural teachers recorded a mean score of 13.39 (SD = 4.46). The obtained t-value of 3.91 with df = 598 was significant at the 0.0001 level, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. The findings reveal that urban teachers reported slightly stronger social relationships than rural teachers. For the environmental health dimension, urban teachers obtained a mean score of 15.12 (SD = 3.67), while rural teachers reported a mean score of 13.82 (SD = 3.74). The t-value of 5.18 with df = 598 was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level, indicating a significant difference between urban and rural teachers in environmental health. This suggests that urban teachers perceive their environmental conditions, such as access to resources, safety, and facilities, more positively compared to rural teachers.

With respect to the overall quality of life, urban teachers obtained a mean score of 56.74 (SD = 11.89), whereas rural teachers recorded a mean score of 54.28 (SD = 12.17). The obtained t-value of 2.97 with df = 598 was statistically significant at the 0.0031 level, indicating a significant difference in the overall quality of life between urban and rural teachers. The results indicate that urban teachers reported a slightly higher overall quality of life compared to rural teachers. Overall, the findings reveal that significant differences exist in the quality of life of teachers based on locality. Urban teachers reported higher levels of physical health, psychological health, social relationships, environmental health, and overall quality of life compared to rural teachers. These results highlight the influence of environmental and infrastructural factors associated with urban settings, which may contribute to better living conditions and overall well-being among urban teachers.

## **Results and Discussion**

The present study examined the quality of life of university teachers and analysed the differences across gender and locality using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The findings provide a comprehensive understanding of the overall level of quality of life among faculty members and the variations that exist among different groups of teachers. The descriptive analysis indicated that the overall quality of life of university teachers was at a moderate level. Among the various dimensions of quality of life, the environmental health dimension emerged as the most favourable, followed by social relationships and physical health, whereas psychological health was found to be comparatively lower. These results suggest that teachers generally perceive their

environmental conditions, including workplace facilities, safety, and access to necessary resources, in a positive manner. Similarly, satisfactory social interactions and supportive relationships with colleagues, family members, and the academic community appear to contribute positively to their overall well-being. However, the comparatively lower psychological health levels indicate that teachers may experience certain degrees of emotional pressure, stress, or mental strain arising from professional responsibilities, academic workload, and institutional expectations. The findings also revealed significant gender differences in the quality of life and its various dimensions. Male teachers demonstrated relatively higher levels of physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and overall quality of life when compared to female teachers. These results may indicate that male teachers experience comparatively fewer challenges in maintaining a balance between professional obligations and personal responsibilities. On the other hand, female teachers reported better environmental health, suggesting that they perceive their working environment, safety conditions, and availability of resources more positively. These variations highlight the role of gender in influencing different aspects of teachers' quality of life and emphasize the importance of considering gender-related factors in institutional policies and support systems. Furthermore, the study examined the differences between urban and rural teachers. The findings suggested that teachers working in urban areas experienced a comparatively higher level of quality of life across most dimensions than those working in rural areas. This difference may be attributed to the availability of better infrastructure, improved healthcare facilities, transportation systems, and greater access to academic resources and professional development opportunities in urban settings. In contrast, teachers working in rural areas may encounter challenges such as limited facilities, inadequate institutional support, and fewer opportunities for professional growth, which may influence their overall quality of life.

Overall, the results of the study highlight that quality of life among university teachers is shaped by both personal and contextual factors, particularly gender and locality. Although teachers generally experience a moderate level of quality of life, the differences observed among groups indicate the need for targeted institutional initiatives. Efforts aimed at strengthening psychological well-being, improving working conditions in rural institutions, and providing greater support for female faculty members may significantly enhance the overall quality of life of teachers. Enhancing these aspects is essential for promoting teacher satisfaction, professional effectiveness, and institutional productivity within the higher education system.

### **Conclusion**

The present study sought to understand the quality of life of university teachers and to determine whether variations exist across gender and locality. The findings of the investigation provide valuable insights into the overall well-being of faculty members working in higher education institutions. The study highlights that the quality of life of teachers is a multidimensional construct influenced by physical, psychological, social, and environmental factors that collectively shape their professional and personal experiences. The analysis suggests that teachers' well-being is closely connected with the nature of their working environment, social support, and access to resources that enable them to perform their academic responsibilities effectively. The differences observed across gender and locality indicate that individual circumstances and contextual conditions play an important role in shaping the quality of life of teachers. These variations reflect the diverse experiences of teachers within higher education institutions and emphasize that well-being cannot be viewed as uniform across all groups. The study also underscores the importance of creating supportive institutional environments that promote the holistic development of teachers. Providing adequate facilities, fostering a positive academic climate, and

ensuring opportunities for professional growth can contribute significantly to improving teachers' overall well-being. Furthermore, addressing the challenges faced by teachers in different social and professional contexts can help strengthen their satisfaction and commitment toward their profession.

In conclusion, enhancing the quality of life of teachers is essential for the sustainability and effectiveness of higher education systems. When teachers experience better well-being, they are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of motivation, productivity, and engagement in teaching and research activities. Therefore, educational institutions and policymakers should focus on developing strategies that support teachers' well-being, as it ultimately contributes to the quality of education and the overall development of the academic community.

### **References**

- **Arunachalam, A., et al. (2024).** Quality of work life among the faculty members of higher education institutions in India. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 20(3), 582–597. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v20i3.27867> (Mendeley)
- **Bharathi, P. S., & Umaselvi, M. (2011).** Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers. *MPRA Paper No. 27868*. Munich Personal RePEc Archive.
- **Cathrine, W. (2021).** Impact of quality of life among teachers after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*.
- **D'Souza, M. J. (2021).** Teachers' mental health and quality of life during the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Educational Research*.
- **Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2015).** National accounts of subjective well-being. *American Psychologist*, 70(3), 234–242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038899>
- **Faragher, E. B., Cass, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2005).** The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(2), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2002.006734>
- **Rao, M. S., Arora, R., & Vashisht, R. (2013).** Quality of work life among university teachers: A study of Jammu University. *Journal of Services Research*.
- **Senthilkumar, N. & Umasankar, M. (2015).** A study on factors influencing quality of work life among faculty members in higher educational institutions. *International Journal of Applied Research*.
- **Singh, A., & Maini, J. J. (2019).** Factors associated with quality of work-life among faculty of technical institutes in Punjab. *Management and Labour Studies*, 44(3), 225–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X19833211> (SAGE Journals)
- **Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001).** A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241–302. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010986923468>
- **Subbarayalu, A. V., & Al-Kuwaiti, A. (2019).** Quality of work life (QoWL) of faculty members in Saudi higher education institutions: A comparison between undergraduate medical and engineering programs. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(4), 768–779. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2017-0311>
- **World Health Organization. (1995).** *The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the World Health Organization*. WHO. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(95\)00112-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(95)00112-K)