Investigating Effect of Socio-Economic Variables on Quality of Life of Teachers in Higher Education

Kinneri Jain[1] and Balbir Kaur[2*]

ABSTRACT

This research paper seeks to investigate the influence of various socio-economic variables on quality of life of teachers of University of Delhi. The data was collected from 425 teachers of University of Delhi. To test the effect of variables on quality of life, independent sample t-test and one way ANOVA were employed. The analysis revealed that age, experience, income, no. of children and nature of employment effected the quality of life of respondents whereas, gender, education, category, background of respondent, having a working/non-working partner did not influence their quality of life. The results indicated that experience and stages of life influence its quality of life rather than one's education and gender, the experiences gained with age help an individual to lead a better life. Permanent teachers had better quality of life in comparison to non-permanent teachers which is a matter of concern to be addressed by authorities in higher education.

Keywords : *Quality of Life, University of Delhi, Socio-Economic Variables.*

1. Introduction

Any individual constantly strives to achieve a life which is considered as a good life. Good life is not made by acquiring worldly materials. Good life is considered as a life where human is in state of mind where he feels happy at all times. According to stoics, happiness is when the whole life of an individual is harmonious but as per Aristotle, happiness is an activity, "activity of the soul in accordance with virtue". Happiness is achieved when an individual is living with the spirit of one's true self.

Human behaviour is such that it continuously keeps moving towards some mental goal representation and is thus affected by positive and negative emotions. Positive emotions are triggered when humans achieve or are likely to achieve the mental goal representations and where there is a loss to the goal it implies negative emotions and it has an impact on response to a situation. (Vitters 2004).

A feeling of happiness is achieved when an individual is creatively and wholeheartedly being occupied with what he or she is doing. Happiness is one of the greatest pursuits of achieving work life balance but there is more to quality of life than just happiness. People who made progress towards a good life were not the ones who were contented and happy in life. Recent researches indicate that realisation of one's true potential is more for a good life than only happiness and satisfaction as were traditionally measured. Teachers are the foundation of any society, community or nation. Teachers today have multiple obligations and roles to perform. They are expected to contribute to both their departments and larger academic community because of changing government norms and regulations.

2. Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find out differences between various groups of demographic variables in relation to quality of life of teachers in higher education. Research has indicated that certain demographic characteristics can influence attitudes and how expectations are communicated (Rajecki, 1982). We need to examine how meaning driven actions can have an impact on the quality of life under the umbrella of social structures of family, friendship, work and leisure. Hence the following hypothesis was framed.

H_A: There is significant influence of various demographic variables namely age, education, experience, income,

1. *Associate Professor, Deptt. of Commerce, Shri Ram College of Commerce, University of Delhi*
2. *Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Commerce, Kirori Mal College, University of Delhi*
* *Corresponding Author* ✉ *preeti_balbir@yahoo.co.in*

Received: 13 May, 2024
Available online: 31 July, 2024

partner status, no. of children, background of respondent, gender, category and nature of job on QL.

3. Review of Literature

Happiness, well-being and quality of life may be defined as the quality of consciousness or a positive inner human experience. (Frisch, 2013). Historically quality of life research stems from the Scan dinovian 'level of living' approach (Erikson, 1974) and the American 'quality of life' approach (Campbell et al. 1976). The level of living approach focuses on objective living conditions. According to this approach quality of life is dependent on the fact as to what extent a person has command over resources which enable an individual to consciously direct his/ her living conditions. Whereas the American quality of life approach focuses on subject evaluations instead of resources. The quality of life according to this approach consists of living conditions as perceived by an individual and their subjective positive evaluations disregarding others evaluation of living conditions. Contemporary approaches acknowledge the existence of subjective-objective duality in quality of life research (Drobnic *et al.,* 2010). The ultimate benchmark for judging the quality of human life is variability in a variety of positive feeling states, particularly affect and social factors are to be engaged, facilitated and explained in life quality (Hughes, 2006). Quality of life encompasses the extent to which individuals see how much sense their life is making to the goals they have set (Heintzelman et al., 2020, Schnell, 2021). Quality of life is associated with life satisfaction, happiness, self-esteem, work enjoyment and lower levels of stress (Abu-Raiya *et al.,* 2020, Perzirkianidiset *et al.,* 2018). Faculty members get job satisfaction after performing their work. A correlation was found between the quality of work-life and work environment, working hours and safe working conditions (Kumar, 2016).

Significant burnout was found among teachers in higher education in Portugal effecting their quality of life and teaching. The burnout was found to be greater amongst contractual teachers as compared to permanent teachers (Teles *et al.,* 2020). Research conducted by UNESCO in Peru, Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador and Chile identified the impact of work stress on educators, mental health deterioration, distress, gastritis, varicose veins and spinal conditions were identified to be problems faced by academicians (Lakeman *et al.,* 2022). Work-family facilitation leads to better physical health, happiness, life satisfaction and perceived quality of life of an individual (Rice *et al.,* 1992; van Steenbergen *et al.,* 2009; Karatepe *et al.,* 2008). Favourable working conditions have strong relation to teacher well-being and retention (Marshall *et al.,* 2022). Work that provides freedom from monotony on one hand and provides a chance to use their skills and develop as a person or another hand leads to greater subjective well-being (Ross *et al.*, 1997).

4. Methodology

The research design comprised a non-experimental, quantitative data collection. The data for the present study was collected through both online and offline survey platforms. In offline method data was personally collected from teachers of various colleges and in online method the questionnaire was sent through personal contacts and e-mails to the teachers. The present work is based on primary data collected from 425 respondents, who are working as teachers of University of Delhi. Out of the total data collected sample of 421 respondents was found suitable for analysis (4 respondents were found to be unengaged respondents). Of the 421 respondents 29.2 percent were men and 70.8 percent were women.

4.1 Instrument

Quality of life – In order to assess QL of teachers in higher education, a five-item scale was adapted from Diener (1985). Participants indicated their response on a five-point Likert scale with anchors (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly Agree. The numerical weights were assigned to the anchors as 1,2,3,4,5 respectively for Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree respectively. A high score on QL scale would mean high QL and vice-versa. For a measure to be acceptable Cronbach's alpha should be above 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). The Cronbach alpha for the scale was fairly good at 0.849.

4.2 Data Analysis

ANOVA and t-tests were conducted to find out differences between various groups of demographic variables in relation to QL. T-test was conducted where the demographic variable had 2 categorical data and where there were 3 or more categories in a demographic variable ANOVA test was conducted. Kolmogorov Smirnov (KS) test is considered a very strict test of normality hence, we used Skewness and Kurtosis to assess normality. If the sample size is more than 300 and skewness values are within ±2 and Kurtosis values are within ±4 then the data is said to be deviating not much from normality and parametric tests could be conducted (Mishra *et al.*, 2019). It was found that the data met the thresholds of Skewness and Kurtosis.

5. Results

The results of the study are presented below with hypotheses in relation to all demographic variables independently.

5.1 Age and QL

H_{A1}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the various age groups.

Table 1 shows a one way between groups ANOVA was performed to compare the differences in quality of life between various groups based on age. Participants were divided into five groups based on their age. Equal variances were not assumed based upon the results of

Table 1 : *Difference in Quality of Life based on Age*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance		WELCH	
Age groups	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
23-30	90	3.4311	0.68755	-0.284	0.012	2.984	.019	4.890	.002
31-40	174	3.4483	0.79272	-0.622	0.517				
41-50	95	3.6505	0.60281	0.228	-0.025				
51-60	49	3.8163	0.55202	-0.566	1.456				
61-65	13	3.8	0.87939	-0.758	-0.03				
Post-hoc test (Games Howell)						**p-value (Sig.)**		**Significant**	
51-60 years vs 23-30 years						.004			
51-60 years vs 31-40 years						.003			

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Levene's test (p = 0.019). There was a statistically significant difference in quality of life scores among the age groups based on Welch test results (F = 4.890, p = 0.002). So, we accept the hypothesis. To evaluate the nature of differences, Games Howell post hoc test was conducted. It indicated that one group within the age group of 51-60 years (M=3.82) was significantly different from the age group 23-30 years (M=3.43) and 31-40 years (M=3.45). Teachers within the age group of 51-60 years had better QL as compared to other two groups. There was no difference found between other groups.

5.2 Education and QL

H_{A2}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the various groups based on education.

Table 2 shows a one way between groups ANOVA was performed to compare the differences in quality of life between various groups based on education. Participants were divided into three groups based on their education. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p = 0.882). There was statistically no significant difference in quality of life scores among the groups (F = .202, p = 0.817). So, we reject the hypothesis.

5.3 Experience and QL

H_{A3}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the various groups based on experience.

Table 3 shows a one way between groups ANOVA was performed to compare differences in quality of life based on experience. Participants were divided into five groups based on their experience. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p = 1.023). There was a statistically significant difference in quality of life scores among the groups (F = 4.437, p = 0.002). So, we accept the hypothesis. To evaluate the nature of differences, Tukey's post hoc test was conducted to analyse the differences. It indicated that one group with 0-10 years of experience (M=3.41) was significantly different from the experienced group 21-30 years (M=3.76). Teachers with experience of 0-10 years had lower QL as compared to the other group. There was no difference found between other groups based on experience.

5.4 Income and QL

H_{A4}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the various groups based on income.

Table 4 shows One way ANOVA between groups was

Table 2 : *Difference in Work-Life Balance based on Education*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance		ANOVA	
Education	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
Post graduate	117	3.5094	0.71366	-0.751	1.716	.125	.882	.202	.817
M.phil	93	3.5462	0.7266	-0.252	0.2				
PhD	211	3.5621	0.72143	-0.521	0.286				

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05.
Source: *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Table 3 : *Difference in Work -Life Balance based on Experience*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance		ANOVA	
Experience (years)	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
0-10	207	3.4068	0.70101	-0.297	0.367	1.023	.395	4.437	.002
11-20	121	3.6248	0.75832	-0.693	0.91				
21-30	58	3.7586	0.57523	-0.308	0.833				
31-40	29	3.669	0.76583	-1.379	3.189				
Above 40	6	3.9667	0.74207	-1.495	2.555				
Post-hoc test (Tukey)						**p-value (Sig.)**			
0-10 years vs 21-30 years						.008			

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

performed to compare differences in quality of life based on income of the respondent. Participants were divided into five groups based on their monthly income. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p = .267). Results showed statistically differences in quality of life scores for the income categories (F= 5.612, p = 0.000). So, we accept the hypothesis. To evaluate the nature of differences, Tukey's post hoc test was conducted. It indicated that one group with less than 1 lakh of income (M=3.41) was significantly different from the income group of 1-2 lakhs (M=3.80) and 2-3 lakhs (M=3.75). Teachers with income of less than 1 lakh had lower QL as compared to other two groups. Group with 1-2 lakhs income (M=3.80) was different from the income group of Above 4 lakhs (M=3.51). Teachers with income between 1-2 lakhs had more QL as compared to the group with Above 4 lakhs of income. There was no difference found between other groups based on income.

5.5 Partner Status and QL

H_{A5}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the groups based on partner status.

Table 5 shows t-test was performed to compare the difference in quality of life based on partner status. Participants were divided into two groups based on working partners and non-working partners. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p=0.436). Respondents with working partners and non-working partners do not differ significantly t = .855, p = 0.393. So, we reject the hypothesis.

Table 4 : *Difference in Work-Life Balance based on Respondent Income*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance		ANOVA	
Income (p.m)	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
less than 1 lakh	186	3.4118	0.70525	-0.749	1.24	1.305	.267	5.612	.000
1-2 lakhs	82	3.7976	0.72111	-0.44	0.366				
2-3 lakhs	43	3.7535	0.54482	-0.966	1.359				
3-4 lakhs	5	3.2	0.87178	-0.181	-2.501				
Above 4 lakhs	105	3.5105	0.73641	-0.208	-0.197				
Post-hoc test (Tukey)						**p-value (Sig.)**			
Less than 1 lakh vs 1-2 lakhs						.000			
Less than 1 lakh vs 2-3 lakhs						.035			
1-2 lakhs vs Above 4 lakhs						.046			

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Table 5 : *Difference in Work-Life Balance based on Partner Status*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance			t-test for Equality of Means	
Partner Status	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**		**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**t-Statistic**	**Sig.**
Working	318	3.561	0.71097	-0.541	0.743	**Equal variances assumed**	.608	.436	.855	.393
Non-working	103	3.4913	0.74454	-0.446	0.346	**Equal variances not assumed**			.835	.405

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

5.6 Number of Children and QL

H_{A6}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the groups based on number of children.

Table 6 shows a one way between groups ANOVA was performed to compare differences in quality of life based on number of children. Participants were divided into four groups based on their no. of children. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p = 0.851). There was statistically significant difference in quality of life scores among the groups (F = 6.794, p = 0.000). So, we accept the hypothesis. To evaluate the nature of differences, Tukey's post hoc test was conducted. It indicated that the group with two children (M=3.73) was significantly different from the group of no child (M=3.37) and one child (M=3.51). Teachers with two children had better QL as compared to other two groups. There was no difference found between other groups based on number of children.

5.7 Background of the Respondent and QL

H_{A7}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the groups based on background.

Table 7 shows t-test was performed to compare differences in quality of life based on the background of the respondent. Participants were divided into two groups based on urban and rural. Equal variances were not assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p=0.047). Urban respondents do not differ significantly from rural respondents (t = .821, p = .415). So, we reject the hypothesis.

5.8 Gender and QL

H_{A8}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the groups based on gender.

Table 8 shows t-test was performed to compare differences in quality of life based on gender. Participants were divided into two groups based on their gender. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p=0.322). Male respondents did not differ significantly from female respondents (t = -0.492, p = 0.623). So, we reject the hypothesis.

5.9 Category and QL

H_{A9}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the groups based on category

Table 6 : *Difference in Work -Life Balance based on Number of Children*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance		ANOVA	
No. of Children	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
none	124	3.3694	0.70263	-0.241	0.236	.264	.851	6.794	.000
0ne	137	3.5095	0.73042	-0.897	1.188				
two	154	3.7299	0.6793	-0.348	0.387				
more than 2	6	3.1667	0.79415	-2.087	3.708				
Post-hoc test (Tukey)						**p-value (Sig.)**			
Two children vs No child						.000			
Two children vs One child						.040			

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig.-Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Table 7 : *Difference in Work -Life Balance based on Background of the Respondent*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance			t-test for Equality of Means	
Background	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**		Levene's Statistic	**Sig.**	**t-Statistic**	**Sig.**
Urban	364	3.5571	0.6961	-0.531	0.759	**Equal variances assumed**	3.979	.047	.952	.342
Rural	57	3.4596	0.85353	-0.366	-0.083	**Equal variances not assumed**			.821	.415

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Table 8 : *Difference in Quality of Life based on Gender*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance			t-test for Equality of Means	
Gender	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**		**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**t-Statistic**	**Sig.**
Male	123	3.5171	0.7386	-0.317	0.174	**Equal variances assumed**	.985	.322	-.492	.623
Female	298	3.555	0.7118	-0.608	0.861	**Equal variances not assumed**			-.485	.628

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig. - Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Table 9 shows a one way between groups ANOVA was performed to compare differences in quality of life based on the category of the respondent. Participants were divided into five groups based on their category. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p = 0.947). There was statistically no significant difference in quality of life scores among the groups (F = 2.080, p = 0.083). So, we reject the hypothesis.

5.10 Nature of Job and QL

H_{A10}: There is significant difference in mean score of quality of life between the groups based on nature of job.

Table 10 shows t-test was performed to compare differences in quality of life based on the nature of job of the respondent. Participants were divided into two groups based on their job. Equal variances were assumed based upon the results of Levene's test (p=0.369). Permanent

Table 9 : *Difference in Work -Life Balance based on Category of the Respondent*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance		ANOVA	
Category	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**	**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
SC	50	3.556	0.65812	0.013	-0.076	.184	.947	2.080	.083
ST	21	3.5238	0.67075	-0.02	0.943				
OBC	68	3.3412	0.6807	-0.73	0.819				
PWD	9	3.8222	0.771	-0.967	2.283				
GEN	272	3.5934	0.72251	-0.55	0.595				

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig.-Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

Table 10 : *Difference in Work -Life Balance based on Nature of Job of Respondent*

						Test for Homogeneity of Variance			t-test for Equality of Means	
Nature of Job	**N**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**		**Levene's Statistic**	**Sig.**	**t-Statistic**	**Sig.**
Permanent	202	3.7337	0.66479	-0.36	0.272	**Equal variances assumed**	.810	.369	5.272	.000
Non-permanent	219	3.3789	0.71076	-0.559	0.59	**Equal variances not assumed**			5.285	.000

N - Number of Observations, S.D - Standard Deviation, Sig.-Significance p<.05.
Source : *Authors' analysis from the dataset.*

respondents differ significantly from non-permanent respondents (t = 5.272, p = 0.000). So, we accept the hypothesis. Non-permanent respondents (M=3.38) had lower work life balance as compared to permanent respondents (M=3.73).

6. Discussion

Mc Call, 1975 defined quality of life not as a summation of the individual happiness state of all members of the society but as the obtaining of the necessary conditions for happiness throughout society. Individual well-being is effected by ,one work and economic conditions which require personal control and second, marriage & family condition, which require social support. ANOVA and t-test were used to assess the effect of demographic variables on QL. In case of 2 groups t-test was employed and in case of more than 2 groups ANOVA was employed. The results are summarised below. QL was found to be different in age-groups (p = .002). QL was higher in age-groups of 51-60 years (M=3.82) as compared to age groups of 23-30 years (M=3.43) and 31-40 years (M=3.45. The reason for this could be in such an age a person has already discharged many significant duties of life like making career, raising a family and having a secured economic life for the family. Hence, his life is more peaceful as compared to other age groups who are still in their struggling times. There was no difference found in groups based on education (p = 0.817). So, it's not education having an effect on QL, likewise based on gender, there was no difference found in QL (p = 0.623). Being male or female was not found to be effecting QL whereas age and experience (p = 0.002) were factors effecting QL implying that experiences and stages of life influence its quality rather than one's education and beliefs, probably they assist handling various times of life and thereby indirectly contribute to quality of life. Higher income group respondents had a better quality of life as compared to lower income groups which is quite certain. Having working or non-working partners had no influence on quality of life similarly, having urban background or rural background did not affect quality of life. Category of a respondent did not influence their quality of life whereas being a permanent teacher increased their quality of life in comparison to being non-permanent. Permanent jobs extend tranquillity to people and happiness as a pursuit is bound to follow. Educational institutes should facilitate their staff in terms of giving them stability and better working conditions to improve their quality of life.

7. Limitations and Areas of Future Research

Only teachers of University of Delhi were analysed, teachers belonging to other private institutions, universities and sectors could also be analysed. So, larger sample could be considered with overcoming budgetary constraints. The Findings cannot be generalized to all occupational groups and cultures as sample was homogeneous, consisting of University of Delhi. The impact of community/ culture interventions could be incorporated to see its effect on variables.

8. Conclusion

Full growth and development of human resources should be primary purpose of every educational institution as well as it should be integral part of its very processes. Changes in aspects of administration can lead to positive outcomes and ensure better motivation and engagement of faculty members at university setting. The quality of life of teachers can also be improved by having uniform practices and common standards within a department. Problems like part-time teachers, large class size, class load, tight budgets have deleterious effect upon the teachers and eventually threaten the quality of university teaching. University regulatory bodies and government should manage work-family enrichment policies so that teachers have better job satisfaction. Enrichment between work and family is a useful tool for promoting improvements in quality of life of teachers (Jijena, 2012: Michel and Michel, 2012).

9. References

1. Abu-Raiya, H., Sasson, T., & Russo‐Netzer, P. (2020). Presence of meaning, search for meaning, religiousness, satisfaction with life and depressive symptoms among a diverse Israeli sample. *International Journal of Psychology, 56*(2), 276-285.
2. Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

3. Diener, E. (1984). 'Subjective well-being'. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 542 575.
4. Drobnič, S., Beham, B., & Präg, P. (2010). Good Job, Good Life? Working Conditions and Quality of Life in Europe. *Social Indicators Research*, *99*(2), 205–225.
5. Erikson, R. (1974). Welfare as a planning goal. *Acta Sociologica, 17*, 273-288.
6. Frisch, M.B. (2013). Evidence-Based Well-Being/Positive Psychology Assessment and Intervention with Quality of Life Therapy and Coaching and the Quality of Life Inventory (QOLI). *Social Indicators Research, 114*(2), 193-227.
7. Heintzelman, S. J., Mohideen, F., Oishi, S., & King, L. A. (2020). Lay beliefs about meaning in life: Examinations across targets, time, and countries. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *88*, 104003.
8. Hughes, M. (2006). Affect, meaning and quality of life. *Social Forces*, *85*(2), 611-629.
9. Jijena M., R. (2012). Work-Family Enrichment and its Organizational Positive effect: an Application on a Faculty Context. *Panorama Socioeconómico*, *45*, 68–79.
10. Karatepe, O. M., & Bekteshi, L. (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation among frontline hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27*, 517–528.
11. Kumar, S. (2016). Quality of Work Life: Comparative Study of University Teachers. *Srusti Management Review*, *9*(2), 52-60.
12. Lakeman R, Coutts R, Hutchinson M, Masse D, Nasrawi D, Fielden J, et al. (2022). Stress, distress, disorder and coping: the impact of anonymous student evaluation of teaching on the health of higher education teachers. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,47*, 1489-1500.
13. Marshall DT, Pressley T, Neugebauer NM, Shannon DM. (2022). Why teachers are leaving and what we can do about it. *Phi Delta Kappan, 104,* 6-11.
14. Michel, R. D. J., & Michel, C. E. J. (2012). Faculty Satisfaction and Work-Family Enrichment: The Moderating Effect of Human Resource Flexibility. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*(1), 5168–5172.
15. Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C., & Keshri, A. (2019). Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of cardiac anaesthesia*, *22*(1), 67–72.
16. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
17. Pezirkianidis, C., Karakasidou, E., Lakioti, A., Stalikas, A., & Galanakis, M. (2018). Psychometric properties of the Depression, Anxiety, Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21) in a Greek sample. *Psychology, 9*, 2933-2950.
18. Rajecki, D. W. (1982). *Attitudes: Themes and advances*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, Inc.
19. Rice, R. W., Frone, M. R., & McFarlin, D. B. 1992. Work-nonwork conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 155–168.
20. Ross, C. E., & Van Willigen, M. (1997). Education and the Subjective Quality of Life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* , 38(3), 275–297.
21. Schnell, T. (2021). The psychology of meaning in life. New York: Routledge.
22. Teles, R., Valle, A., & Rodriguez, S. (2020). Burnout among teachers in higher education: An empirical study of higher education institutions in Portugal. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, *6*(5), 7-15.
23. Van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2009). Combining work and family: How family supportive work environments and work supportive home environments can reduce work-family conflict and enhance facilitation. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families & work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. New York, NY: University Press of America.
24. Vittersø, J. (2004). Subjective well-being versus self-actualization: Using the flow-simplex to promote a conceptual clarification of subjective quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, *65*(3), 299-331.

❖ ❖ ❖