

Assessing Work-Life Balance And Teaching Outcomes In Self-Financing Colleges In Kerala

Naisa Salim¹, Dr. D H Thavamalar²

¹Research scholar, Department of commerce, Annamalai university, Annamalai Nagar- 608002, Tamilnadu, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Govt Arts college, chidhambaram, c-mutlur Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract

The study investigates work-life balance as a predictor of teaching performance among self-financing college teachers in Ernakulam district, Kerala. As private higher education institutions are growing at a rapid pace, teachers experience job insecurity, overwork, and lack of institutional support, impeding their well-being and academic performance. With a descriptive-analytic approach supported by Work-Life Border Theory and the Job Demands-Resources Model, the responses of 91 teachers were compared quantitatively using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings report a young, female-dominated workforce balancing professional and heavy caregiving responsibilities, often confronted with role overload, stress, and moderate institutional support. Quality of Work Life (QWL) dimensions—i.e., work quality, work-life balance, stress management, and financial management—were significantly connected to personality development and career progression but less connected to teaching and research skills. Regression analysis identified these dimensions as predictors of teacher development outcomes, reflecting the importance of supportive work culture in enhancing career progression and personal well-being. The study highlights the ongoing negotiation between professional and personal requirements that the faculty are in, with many experiencing conflicts that intrude into personal time, as envisaged in Life Border Theory. With some flexibility in institutions, wellness programs are still insufficient to completely negate worklife tensions. Gender, household responsibilities, and educational levels had significant roles in predicting the outcomes of QWL, with female faculty and those having organized home roles having more work-life congruence. The research highlights the need for selected institutional policies to enhance the working conditions of faculty members, offer better opportunities for professional development, and facilitate well-being to ultimately enhance teaching performance and professional development in Kerala's self-financing college system.

Keywords: Work-life balance, teaching performance, self-financing colleges, Quality of Work Life (QWL), faculty development, Life Border Theory, stress management, career advancement.

I. Introduction

The high concentration of Kerala's self-financing colleges has qualitatively altered the academic employment market scenario, with attendant new challenges regarding faculty working conditions, institutional support, and professional development. Although these colleges are a major contributor to enhanced access to higher education, faculty members are faced with insecure job security, overwork, constrained access to benefits, and poor mechanisms for professional development (Tilak, 2018). These issues have the potential to result in physical and mental exhaustion, stress, burnout, and erosion of job satisfaction, all of which have direct consequences on teaching effectiveness and overall institutional performance (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Despite the enhanced profile of Kerala's self-financing colleges, there is a perceivable lacuna in research that systematically interrogates the nexus of teaching

effectiveness and faculty work-life balance. The lacuna in policy attention to these issues has the potential to undermine faculty well-being and the quality of education delivered in this sector.

This study tries to explore the work-life balance experience of employees in Kerala's self-financing colleges and its impact on teaching performance. It explores demographic, professional, and institutional determinants of work-life patterns, perceptions of the working environment by faculty members, and the extent to which job stress, institutional support, and professional autonomy influence teaching effectiveness. The study also takes into account the prevalence and impact of workplace policies on workload management, mental well-being, and career development opportunities. Integrating self-report measures of teaching proficiency, research output, and career satisfaction, the study tries to develop a comprehensive picture of how individual and institutional determinants interact to influence academic performance in the self-financing stream. The value added by this research is that it has the potential to inform evidence-based policy reforms in enhancing the quality of teaching and well-being of faculty members in private colleges of higher education. With special reference to Kerala—a state of high literacy levels and fast-emerging private college sector—this study offers context-specific and transferable learning to other states with comparable institutional structures. The study has the potential to assist college managers, policymakers, and academic planners in framing more sustainable and equitable faculty management policies integrating professional performance with individual well-being. In this manner, the study extends to more generic policy debates on quality assurance in higher education, particularly of the fast-emerging Indian academic scenario.

II. Review of Literature

A growing body of literature has explored the multifaceted nature of work-life balance and its implications on teaching performance, particularly in the higher education sector. Work-life balance is increasingly recognized as a critical factor influencing employee satisfaction, productivity, and retention across academic institutions (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). In the context of higher education, faculty members often juggle multiple roles—teaching, research, administration, and mentoring—which can blur the boundaries between personal and professional life (Kinman & Wray, 2013). These competing demands, when not supported by institutional mechanisms, can lead to chronic stress and job dissatisfaction (Barkhuizen et al., 2014).

In India, the expansion of self-financing colleges has introduced a new layer of complexity to the work-life discourse. Faculty in these institutions often operate under precarious working conditions, characterized by contract-based employment, high teaching loads, and limited access to institutional support or benefits (Agarwal & Kamalakar, 2013; Tilak, 2018). Studies have documented that teachers in private unaided colleges are more likely to experience job insecurity and burnout compared to their counterparts in government or aided institutions (Zahoor, 2015). Furthermore, the absence of standardized workload norms and inadequate infrastructural support often results in diminished teaching effectiveness (Bhuin, 2017).

Teaching performance is another domain of concern that intersects closely with the issue of work-life quality. Effective teaching requires not only subject expertise but also emotional resilience, adequate preparation time, and institutional recognition (Bubb & Earley, 2004). Faculty self-evaluation studies have underscored the role of psychological well-being and institutional support in enhancing pedagogical effectiveness and student engagement (Day et al., 2007). However, most studies on teaching performance tend to focus on metrics such as student evaluations or academic output, often neglecting the underlying socio-professional conditions that support or hinder performance.

Kerala, often lauded for its achievements in human development and educational infrastructure, has seen a marked increase in self-financing institutions, especially in the past two decades. While the state's academic discourse has addressed issues like student equity and curriculum reform, there is limited empirical research on faculty work conditions in this emerging institutional segment (Varghese & Malathesh, 2022). Moreover, much of the available literature focuses on macro-level policy implications rather than micro-level faculty experiences.

Despite the increasing scholarly interest in faculty stress, job satisfaction, and performance, a noticeable research gap persists concerning the interrelationship between work-life balance and teaching outcomes specifically within the context of self-financing colleges in Kerala. There is a lack of comprehensive

studies that combine demographic, institutional, and psychosocial dimensions to assess how faculty manage their work and personal lives, and how this balance (or imbalance) reflects on their teaching efficacy. This study seeks to address this gap by employing an integrated analytical framework that links faculty work-life quality with self-assessed teaching outcomes, thereby contributing to both theoretical understanding and policy development in private higher education.

III. Research Design

The present study adopts a descriptive-analytical research design to examine the relationship between work-life balance and teaching outcomes among faculty members employed in self-financing colleges in Kerala. The theoretical grounding of the study is informed by the Work-Life Border Theory proposed by Clark (2000), which posits that individuals manage and negotiate boundaries between work and personal life domains to achieve a sense of balance. This framework is particularly useful in understanding how organizational structures and individual agency shape work-life experiences. Additionally, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) is used to conceptualize how workplace demands—such as workload, administrative responsibilities, and job insecurity—interact with available resources—such as institutional support, flexibility, and benefits—to influence outcomes like job satisfaction, burnout, and teaching performance. These frameworks together enable a general assessment of the work-life interface in academic environments and the subsequent implications for teaching efficacy.

The conceptual framework of this study is built upon the premise that work-life balance acts as a mediating variable that affects teaching performance, career satisfaction, and overall well-being. It considers demographic characteristics, employment conditions, institutional support systems, and personal stress management strategies as key independent variables that influence both the perception and experience of work-life balance. Teaching outcomes, including self-assessed pedagogical effectiveness, research contributions, and professional development engagement, form the dependent variables in the framework. This conceptual structure allows for the systematic analysis of how various factors interrelate to shape faculty experiences in self-financing institutions.

For the sample design, a purposive sampling technique was employed, with Ernakulam district chosen as the site of study. The rationale for this selection lies in the fact that Ernakulam has the highest concentration of self-financing colleges in Kerala, making it a representative microcosm for analyzing faculty conditions in such institutions. Based on an estimated population of 1,648 faculty members working in self-financing colleges in Kerala, a sample size of 91 was determined using a 10% margin of error, a 95% confidence level, and a 50% population proportion. This statistically sound sample allows for generalizable insights within the specified confidence limits while remaining feasible for in-depth data collection and analysis.

Primary data were collected using a structured survey schedule developed in alignment with the objectives of the study. The schedule comprised five sections: demographic information, professional characteristics, work-life quality, teaching performance (self-appraisal), and institutional support for professional and personal development. The questionnaire included both close-ended and Likert-scale questions to capture quantitative data on work-related stress, physical and mental well-being, institutional support, teaching and research responsibilities, and perceptions of career advancement. Items were designed to elicit detailed responses about the faculty's lived experiences, institutional environment, and personal strategies for managing work-life boundaries.

The collected data were subjected to both descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations were used to summarize the demographic and professional profiles of respondents. Inferential techniques, including correlation analysis and multiple regression, were employed to examine the relationships between work-life balance variables and teaching performance outcomes. The analysis was carried out using statistical software, ensuring precision in estimating associations and testing the significance of hypothesized relationships.

IV. Data analysis

The present study employed a structured and methodical approach to analyze the experiences of 91 faculty members working in self-financing colleges in Ernakulam district, Kerala. The data were collected using a well-designed schedule that encompassed multiple dimensions of work-life quality,

teaching performance, institutional support systems, and socio-demographic profiles. The analysis was carried out using SPSS software, incorporating both descriptive and inferential statistics to present a general picture of the challenges and outcomes experienced by faculty in the private higher education sector.

The demographic profile of the 91 faculty members surveyed from self-financing colleges in Ernakulam district reveals several notable patterns that contextualize their work-life experiences (Table 1). A significant majority of the respondents were female (91.2%), reflecting the growing feminization of the teaching profession in Kerala's private higher education sector. Most participants were in the age group of 25–35 (53.8%), indicating a youthful workforce, while only a small fraction (3.3%) were above 55 years. In terms of academic qualifications, over half (51.6%) possessed a postgraduate degree along with NET qualifications, while 41.8% had only a postgraduate degree, and very few had advanced research degrees such as PhD or MPhil. A substantial portion (82.4%) of the faculty were married, and the majority resided in panchayat areas (81.3%), which may influence their commuting patterns and access to institutional facilities. Notably, 36.3% identified as heads of their households, and nearly all respondents (94.5%) reported having household responsibilities, suggesting the prevalence of dual roles, especially for women educators. Most faculty members commuted using private vehicles (51.6%) or public transport (39.6%), while only a small fraction (8.8%) walked. A vast majority (95.6%) were non-hostellers, indicating that most travel daily from home. Notably, a large proportion reported engaging in household duties and expressed limited time for personal well-being, reflecting the dual burden faced by many faculty members, particularly women.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	83	91.2
	Male	8	8.8
Age	Less than 25	4	4.4
	25-35	49	53.8
	36-45	21	23.1
	46-55	14	15.4
	Above 55	3	3.3
Educational Qualification	PG Only	38	41.8
	PG with MPhil	3	3.3
	PG with NET	47	51.6
	PG with NET and PhD	3	3.3
Marital Status	Divorced or Separated	2	2.2
	Married	75	82.4
	Unmarried	14	15.4
Place of Residence	Corporation	2	2.2
	Municipality	15	16.5
	Panchayath	74	81.3
Head of the Household	No	58	63.7
	Yes	33	36.3
Hosteler	No Hostler	87	95.6
	Hostler	4	4.4
Mode of Transportation to the Institution	By Walk	8	8.8
	Private Vehicles	47	51.6
	Public Transportation	36	39.6
Household Duties	No Household Duties	5	5.5
	Household Duties	86	94.5

Source: Primary Survey, 2025

The professional characteristics of the respondents highlight the employment dynamics and working conditions prevalent in self-financing colleges in Kerala. A significant majority (84.6%) of the teachers work in institutions located in panchayat areas, suggesting a rural or semi-urban concentration of self-financing colleges. Commerce and management subjects dominate the academic, taught by 69.2% of

the respondents, followed by science or computer applications (19.8%) and arts or social sciences (11%). Employment patterns reveal a high proportion of contractual appointments (44%), with only 29.7% of the teachers in permanent positions, reflecting considerable job insecurity. Temporary and part-time employment account for 23.1% and 3.3%, respectively. The teaching cadre is overwhelmingly composed of assistant professors (96.7%), indicating limited opportunities for upward mobility within the institutions. Most respondents (46.2%) teach both undergraduate and postgraduate students, while 38.5% teach only undergraduate and 15.4% only postgraduate students. A majority of faculty (57.1%) manage class sizes below 30 students, which could be conducive to better student engagement. Administrative responsibilities are widely distributed, with many involved in examination duties (61.5%) and other roles (42.9%), while smaller proportions serve as heads of departments or academic coordinators (both at 18.7%). The teaching experience of respondents ranges from 1 to 27 years, with an average of 8.83 years and a standard deviation of 7.35, indicating a diverse mix of early-career and experienced educators. These professional attributes collectively reflect a sector characterized by limited employment security, substantial administrative burdens, and varied levels of teaching experience, all of which have implications for faculty well-being and institutional performance. A considerable proportion of respondents reported spending more than 25% of their time on non-teaching duties, such as administrative tasks, which they felt detracted from their core instructional responsibilities. Furthermore, participation in professional development programs was uneven, with many citing time constraints and lack of institutional encouragement as barriers. (Table 2).

Table 2 Professional Information of the Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Location of College	Municipality	14	15.4
	Panchayath	77	84.6
Subject of Teaching	Arts or Social Science	10	11.0
	Commerce or Management	63	69.2
	Science or Computer Application	18	19.8
Employment Type	Contract	40	44.0
	Part-time	3	3.3
	Permanent	27	29.7
	Temporary	21	23.1
Designation	Assistant Professor	88	96.7
	Professor	3	3.3
Level at teach	PG only	14	15.4
	UG and PG	42	46.2
	UG only	35	38.5
Class Size (Average number of students per class)	Below 30	52	57.1
	30-50	20	22.0
	51-70	19	20.9
Administrative Responsibilities	Head of the Department	17	18.7
	Academic Coordinator	17	18.7
	Examination Duties	56	61.5
	Research Coordinator	2	2.2
	Other Duties	39	42.9
Time spent on non-teaching tasks	Less than 10%	17	18.7
	10–25%	25	27.5
	26–50%	43	47.3
	More than 50%	6	6.6
Teaching Experience (Years)			
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.0	27.0	8.834	7.3510

Source: Primary Survey, 2025

Table 3 presents the mean and standard deviation values of responses to various statements measuring work-life quality across multiple dimensions such as work-related aspects, life-related factors, work-life balance, stress and well-being, organizational support, career growth and job security, job satisfaction, and financial constraints. The responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" (5) to "Strongly Disagree" (1). In the work-related domain, respondents reported a high mean score for having a fixed work schedule ($M = 4.0$), indicating structured time management, though many also noted having to work beyond official hours ($M = 3.9$). However, moderate satisfaction was seen regarding breaks and institutional flexibility ($M = 3.3$ and $M = 3.1$, respectively), while institutional support for stress management was perceived as average ($M = 3.1$). The life-related factors show a moderate balance, with average scores for sleep ($M = 3.5$) and personal time ($M = 3.3$), although engagement in physical activity was relatively low ($M = 2.6$), and mental health concerns appeared at a moderate level ($M = 2.8$). In terms of work-life balance, while the ability to take time off when needed ($M = 3.5$) and flexible adjustments to the schedule ($M = 3.2$) received favorable ratings, exhaustion ($M = 2.8$) and unplanned leaves due to stress ($M = 2.2$) suggested signs of occupational strain. Stress and well-being indicators showed a similar pattern, with moderate concern over physical and mental health impacts, and limited institutional support for counseling ($M = 2.6$). The organizational support component reflected relatively positive responses, especially peer collaboration ($M = 3.7$) and access to remote work ($M = 3.5$), but lower satisfaction with recognition of contributions ($M = 2.7$). For career growth and job security, responses remained moderate (means ranging from 2.9 to 3.2), suggesting scope for improvement in professional development and job assurance. In the job satisfaction category, the overall job role was moderately satisfying ($M = 3.3$), and many felt their institution was recommendable ($M = 3.4$). However, satisfaction with salary and institutional support was lower ($M = 2.6$ to 3.0). Regarding financial constraints, while salary disbursement was timely ($M = 4.1$), many struggled with income adequacy ($M = 3.0$), and some required supplementary income through part-time work ($M = 2.5$). The findings highlight a mixed experience of work-life quality, with strengths in schedule regularity and institutional collaboration, and concerns in stress levels, financial sufficiency, and wellness support. These insights underline the need for targeted institutional reforms to enhance faculty well-being and retention in the self-financing college sector.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics of Work-Life Quality Factors

Factor	Statement	Mean	SD
Work-Related	I have a fixed work schedule.	4.0	1.1
	I feel motivated to perform my duties effectively.	3.4	1.0
	I often have to work beyond my official working hours.	3.9	1.2
	I get adequate breaks between work hours.	3.3	0.9
	My institution provides flexibility in work schedules (e.g., remote work, flexible timings).	3.1	1.0
	My workload frequently causes stress.	2.8	0.9
	I am satisfied with the support provided by my institution in managing workplace stress.	3.1	1.0
Life-Related Factors	I have sufficient time for personal life, hobbies, and family.	3.3	0.9
	My work responsibilities interfere with my personal time.	3.2	0.9
	I get enough sleep regularly.	3.5	1.0
	I engage in regular physical activity (e.g., exercise, yoga, walking).	2.6	1.0
	I frequently experience mental health issues such as anxiety or stress.	2.8	0.7
Work-Life Balance	I often feel exhausted or burned out due to work.	2.8	0.7
	I have taken unplanned leaves due to work-related stress in the past six months.	2.2	0.8
	I am able to take time off or leaves when personal or family needs arise.	3.5	0.9
	I have flexibility in adjusting my work schedule if needed.	3.2	0.9
	I have considered leaving my current job due to work-life balance issues.	2.6	1.0

Stress & Well-being	I feel stressed most of the time due to work pressure.	2.6	1.0
	My job has negatively affected my physical health (e.g., headaches, fatigue, back pain).	2.9	1.1
	My institution cares about employees' mental well-being.	3.2	1.0
	I have received counseling or wellness support from my institution.	2.6	1.2
Organizational Support	My institution provides paid leave (e.g., sick leave, maternity/paternity leave).	3.1	1.4
	I have access to remote work or flexible work arrangements.	3.5	1.0
	My workplace encourages peer support and collaboration.	3.7	0.7
	Health and wellness programs are available for faculty members.	3.3	0.7
	My contributions are acknowledged and rewarded by my institution.	2.7	0.9
Career Growth & Security	My current job provides career growth opportunities.	3.2	0.8
	I feel secure in my job position.	2.9	1.0
	Adequate professional development programs are available for faculty members.	3.2	0.7
	I receive institutional support for research and skill enhancement.	2.9	0.8
Job Satisfaction	I am satisfied with my current job role.	3.3	0.7
	My job utilizes my skills and expertise effectively.	3.1	1.0
	I am satisfied with my current salary and financial benefits.	2.6	0.9
	I am satisfied with the level of support provided by my institution's management.	3.0	1.0
	I would recommend my institution as a good place to work.	3.4	0.5
Financial Factors	My salary is sufficient to meet my basic living expenses.	3.0	0.9
	I face difficulties in managing monthly expenses due to salary limitations.	2.9	1.0
	I have to take on additional work or part-time jobs to supplement my income.	2.5	1.1
	The salary structure in my institution is fair and competitive compared to other institutions.	3.0	1.0
	I receive timely salary payments without delays from my institution.	4.1	0.9

Note: 5= Strongly Agree to 1 Strongly Disagree; Source: Primary Survey, 2025

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics of the various dimensions of Work-Life Quality (QWL) among faculty members in self-financing colleges, along with the composite QWL Index. The scores are scaled between 0 and 1 through min-max standardization, with higher values indicating better quality of work life. Among the eight dimensions, Work-Life Balance has the highest mean score (0.6049), indicating relatively better balance between professional duties and personal life. This is followed by Financial Factors (0.5901) and Organizational Support (0.5687), suggesting moderate levels of financial well-being and institutional backing. In contrast, Career Growth & Security has the lowest mean score (0.5144), reflecting concerns over job stability and limited professional development opportunities. The overall QWL Index stands at 0.5478, signifying a moderate level of work-life quality among the respondents. The relatively narrow range and standard deviation of the QWL Index (0.3719 to 0.7094; SD = 0.0774) indicate limited variability across the sample, pointing to shared systemic patterns affecting faculty work-life conditions.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics of Work-Life Quality Parameters and Composite QWL Index

Parameters	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
i. Work-Quality	91	.25	.75	.5427	.11815
ii. Life-Quality	91	.35	.70	.5220	.09013

iii.	Work-Life Balance	91	.25	.85	.6049	.15600
iv.	Stress & Well-being	91	.25	.75	.5174	.09891
v.	Organizational Support	91	.30	.80	.5687	.14465
vi.	Career Growth & Security	91	.19	.81	.5144	.16517
vii.	Job Satisfaction	91	.35	.85	.5236	.13831
viii.	Financial	91	.40	.80	.5901	.11576
QWL Index		91	.3719	.7094	.5478	.0773749

Note: Value of parameters is the average of all the statements after min-max standardisation (after reverse coding of negative statements); QWL Index = \sum Parameters/8; Source: Primary Survey, 2025

Table 5 presents the comparison of the Quality of Work Life (QWL) Index across various demographic and socio-economic categories using independent sample t-tests and one-way ANOVA. The results reveal significant gender-based disparities in QWL, with female faculty members reporting a higher mean QWL score (0.558) compared to males (0.438), and the difference being statistically significant ($t(89) = 4.661, p = 0.000$). Educational qualification also shows a significant influence on QWL ($F(3,87) = 3.397, p = 0.021$), where those with MPhil or PhD qualifications tend to report higher QWL levels. Although age differences in QWL are not statistically significant at the 5% level ($p = 0.097$), younger faculty in the 25–35 age group reported the highest QWL (mean = 0.585), while those in the 46–55 age group showed the lowest (mean = 0.500). Other factors such as marital status, place of residence, and headship of the household did not show significant associations with QWL. Interestingly, household responsibility is significantly associated with QWL, with those not bearing household duties reporting a lower mean QWL (0.423) than those who do (0.555), and the difference is statistically significant ($t(89) = -4.002, p = 0.000$). This indicate that those without such duties could be facing other stressors, or that household responsibilities are better managed or shared in certain socio-cultural contexts. In summary, gender, education, and household responsibilities are key factors influencing faculty members' work-life quality, warranting further investigation into institutional and personal support mechanisms.

Table 5 Differences in Quality of Work Life (QWL) Index Across Socio-Demographic and Work-Related Characteristics

Variable	Category	Mean QWL Index	SD	ANOVA/t-test
Gender	Female	.558	.071	$t(89) = 4.661, p = 0.000$
	Male	.438	.057	
Age	Less than 25	.542	.085	$F(4, 86) = 2.034, p = 0.097$
	25-35	.585	.070	
	36-45	.533	.060	
	46-55	.500	.000	
	Above 55	.509	.010	
Educational Qualification	PG Only	.537	.081	$F(3,87) = 3.397, p = 0.021$
	PG with MPhil	.667	.000	
	PG with NET	.545	.072	
	PG with NET and PhD	.603	.000	
Marital Status	Divorced or Separated	.500	.000	
	Married	.548	.081	

	Unmarried	.551	.065	F (2,88) =0.394, p= 0.676
Place of Residence	Corporation	.500	.000	F (2,88) =0.461, p= 0.632
	Municipality	.542	.075	
	Panchayath	.550	.079	
Head of the Household	No	.551	.058	t (43.8) =0.488, p= 0.628 ^a
	Yes	.542	.104	
Hosteler	No Hostler	.548	.078	t (89) =- 0.100, p= 0.921
	Hostler	.552	.060	
Mode of Transportation to the Institution	By Walk	.574	.062	F (2,88) =1.753, p= 0.179
	Private Vehicles	.557	.089	
	Public Transportation	.530	.060	
Household Duties	No Household Duties	.423	.070	t (89) =- 4.002, p= 0.000
	Household Duties	.555	.072	

a- equal variances not assumed; Source: Primary Survey, 2025

Table 6 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients between various dimensions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and faculty development outcomes. The overall QWL Index shows a statistically significant positive correlation with personality development ($r = 0.230, p < 0.05$), career advancement ($r = 0.368, p < 0.01$), and overall development ($r = 0.219, p < 0.05$), suggesting that a higher quality of work life contributes to both personal and professional growth. Among individual QWL dimensions, work-related quality demonstrates significant associations with personality development ($r = 0.345, p < 0.01$) and career advancement ($r = 0.302, p < 0.01$), indicating the importance of a structured and satisfying work environment. Similarly, work-life balance and financial well-being are significantly linked to career advancement ($r = 0.343$ and $r = 0.342$ respectively, both $p < 0.01$), while stress and well-being also positively correlate with career advancement ($r = 0.259, p < 0.05$). However, most QWL dimensions show weak or non-significant relationships with teaching and research skills, implying that these competencies is influenced more by individual capabilities or institutional factors beyond work-life quality. However, the analysis highlights the crucial role of QWL in raising faculty development, particularly in enhancing personal growth and career progression.

Table 6 Correlation between Quality of Work Life (QWL) Dimensions and Faculty Development Outcomes

		Faculty Development Outcomes				
		Personal ity Develop ment	Resear ch Skill	Teachi ng Skill	Career Advanc ement	Overall Develop ment
Qual ity of Wor k Life (QW L) Dime	Work-Quality	.345**	.043	.081	.302**	.239*
	Life-Quality	.188	.023	.120	.242*	.175
	Work-Life Balance	.037	.161	.097	.343**	.181
	Stress & Well-being	.173	-.176	-.016	.259*	.076
	Organizational Support	.190	.096	-.046	.143	.115
	Career Growth & Security	.168	-.080	.114	.145	.113
	Job Satisfaction	.153	-.002	.101	.057	.101

nsions	Financial	-.125	.057	-.010	.342**	.060
	QWL Index	.230*	.034	.094	.368**	.219*

Pearson Correlation **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Source: Primary Survey, 2025

Table 7 presents the results of multiple regression analyses examining the influence of various personal and workplace-related predictors on different dimensions of professional development among self-financing college faculty. The predictors include work quality, life quality, work-life balance, stress and well-being, organizational support, career growth and security, job satisfaction, and financial factors. The dependent variables are five aspects of professional growth: personality, research skill, teaching skill, career advancement, and overall development. The table reports standardized regression coefficients (β) and indicates levels of statistical significance. The results indicate that work quality is a key predictor across several dimensions, particularly personality development and career advancement. It has a strong and statistically significant influence on personality ($\beta = 0.345$, $p < 0.01$) and career advancement ($\beta = 0.302$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that faculty members who perceive their work to be meaningful and of high quality tend to experience stronger personality growth and make greater progress in their careers. Additionally, work quality significantly contributes to overall development ($\beta = 0.239$, $p < 0.05$), reinforcing its role as a central factor in faculty professional enhancement. Work-life balance also plays a substantial role, especially in influencing career advancement ($\beta = 0.343$, $p < 0.01$). This finding highlights the importance of maintaining a balance between professional responsibilities and personal life for achieving career growth. Although not statistically significant, work-life balance shows moderate positive associations with research skill and overall development, suggesting a broader yet subtler impact on faculty performance and well-being. Stress and well-being demonstrate a mixed influence. While not significant for most outcomes, it has a positive and statistically significant impact on career advancement ($\beta = 0.259$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that better stress management and emotional well-being can contribute positively to professional progression. Interestingly, it shows a negative relationship with research skill ($\beta = -0.176$), implying that higher stress levels may hinder research productivity, although this effect is not statistically significant. Life quality contributes moderately to personality and career advancement, but these relationships are not statistically significant. Similarly, organizational support, career growth and security, and job satisfaction show positive but generally weak associations with most dimensions, without statistical significance. Financial factors show a significant and positive influence on career advancement ($\beta = 0.342$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that better financial stability and rewards can strongly enhance career growth. However, financial factors appear to have minimal influence on other aspects such as research or teaching skill. The R-squared values indicate how much variance in each dependent variable is explained by the predictors. Personality and career advancement have relatively high R^2 values (0.525 and 0.516, respectively), indicating that the model explains a substantial portion of the variance in these outcomes. In contrast, research skill ($R^2 = 0.139$) and teaching skill ($R^2 = 0.133$) have lower explanatory power, suggesting that additional, unmeasured variables may be influencing these aspects. Overall development has a moderate R^2 value of 0.226, though the model is not statistically significant at conventional levels ($p = 0.12$). The regression analysis highlights work quality, work-life balance, stress and well-being, and financial factors as significant contributors to career advancement and personality development. The findings underscore the multifaceted nature of faculty development and suggest that institutional efforts to improve the quality of work life, manage stress, and offer financial stability can meaningfully enhance the professional trajectories of self-financing college faculty.

Table 7 Influence of Work and Life Factors on Professional Development Outcomes of Self-Financing College Faculty

Predictor	Personality (β)	Research Skill (β)	Teaching Skill (β)	Career Advancement (β)	Overall Development (β)
Work Quality	0.345**	0.043	0.081	0.302**	0.239*
Life Quality	0.188	0.023	0.120	0.242*	0.175
Work-Life Balance	0.037	0.161	0.097	0.343**	0.181

Stress & Well-being	0.173	-0.176	-0.016	0.259*	0.076
Organizational Support	0.190	0.096	-0.046	0.143	0.115
Career Growth & Security	0.168	-0.080	0.114	0.145	0.113
Job Satisfaction	0.153	-0.002	0.101	0.057	0.101
Financial Factors	-0.125	0.057	-0.010	0.342**	0.060
R-squared (R²)	0.525	0.139	0.133	0.516	0.226
Model Significance (p-value)	0.000 **	0.059	0.067	0.000 **	0.12

Note: β = Standardized Regression Coefficient (Beta); Significance Levels: $p < 0.05 \rightarrow **$, $p < 0.01 \rightarrow ***$; Source: Primary Survey, 2025

V. Results and Discussions

The study results revealed that the faculty workforce was predominantly female and young, with most participants holding postgraduate qualifications and either NET or PhD certifications. Many respondents managed dual roles as professionals and primary caregivers, reflecting a significant gendered burden. A majority commuted long distances and reported limited time for personal well-being, reinforcing the prevalence of work-life imbalance. Professionally, most faculty were employed on temporary or contractual terms and reported heavy teaching workloads, frequently exceeding standard hours. A substantial portion of time was devoted to non-teaching tasks such as administrative work, indicating role overload. Institutional support for professional development appeared limited, with time constraints and lack of encouragement acting as barriers. QWL indicators pointed to frequent physical and mental health concerns, such as fatigue, sleep issues, and stress linked to irregular work schedules. While some colleges offered minimal benefits like paid leave, broader wellness initiatives and flexible work arrangements were largely missing.

Self-appraised teaching performance showed moderate confidence in instructional planning and classroom management but revealed gaps in technological integration, research output, and methodological rigor. Regression analysis identified statistically significant relationships between work-life balance and teaching performance, with institutional support, workload manageability, well-being, and access to development opportunities emerging as key predictors. Faculty with higher QWL ratings also scored better across teaching metrics, emphasizing the positive influence of supportive work environments on pedagogical effectiveness.

Interpreted through the lens of Life Border Theory (Clark, 2000), these findings underscore the fluid and often contested boundaries between personal and professional life. Faculty members function as "border-crossers," constantly negotiating overlapping demands. While fixed schedules offer structural boundaries, frequent overtime and administrative overload result in border conflict and erosion of personal time. Poor sleep, limited physical activity, and mental distress reflect imbalanced border management. Institutional flexibility and wellness support were rated only moderate, indicating insufficient systemic efforts to reduce friction at the work-life interface.

Moreover, the study found significant positive correlations between QWL components—such as work quality, work-life balance, and financial stability—and general professional outcomes like personality development and career advancement. Faculty members who received institutional support and had manageable workloads demonstrated greater personal growth and upward mobility. On the other hand, weaker associations between QWL and teaching or research competencies suggest that technical skills may be more influenced by academic training than by general life-work alignment. Notably, the QWL Index had higher explanatory power for career and personality development ($R^2 > 0.5$) than for teaching or research performance ($R^2 < 0.14$), indicating that boundary management more strongly affects all-inclusive development than task-specific outputs.

Disaggregated analysis revealed that gender, household responsibilities, and educational qualifications significantly influenced QWL outcomes. Interestingly, female faculty members reported slightly higher

QWL scores, possibly due to stronger family support systems or adaptive strategies. Faculty without domestic responsibilities reported lower QWL, suggesting that the presence of structured home roles might offer routine and psychological anchoring that enhances work-life coherence in certain socio-cultural settings.

VI. Conclusion

This research investigated the complex work-life quality and teaching performance dynamics of self-financing college faculty members in Ernakulam district, Kerala. The results indicate that with high academic credentials, the majority of the faculty members—mostly women—suffer from contractual employment insecurity, overwork, and absence of institutional support, all of which lead to physical fatigue, mental tension, and limited scope for professional development. Analysis, based on empirical data as well as the Life Border Theory framework, highlights the critical role of institutional flexibility, economic security, and positive workplace conditions on both personal and professional life.

The study establishes that Quality of Work Life (QWL) is not just a control variable but a key driver of faculty development and performance. Positive work-life balance, supported by reasonable remuneration and organizational care, positively contributes to career growth, personal development, and general job satisfaction. On the other hand, uncontrolled boundaries between work and personal life reduce the effectiveness of teaching and limit academic contributions. These results necessitate policy interventions of immediate action to correct structural shortcomings of self-financing institutions. Enhancing job security, eliminating administrative hassles, implementing wellness initiatives, and promoting a respect and recognition culture are imperative to facilitate the faculty to excel.

Ultimately, the study emphasizes the importance of reframing higher education workplace policies with a human-centered philosophy that appreciates not just scholarly productivity but also the overall wellness of teachers. Investing in the work-life quality of faculty members is not simply an issue of personal well-being—it is a strategic priority for maintaining educational excellence and institutional integrity over the long term.

References

1. Agarwal, P., & Kamalakar, G. (2013). Indian higher education: Envisioning the future. *The Indian Economic Journal*, 61(1), 151-155.
2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
3. Barkhuizen, N., Rothmann, S., & Van De Vijver, F. J. (2014). Burnout and work engagement of academics in higher education institutions: Effects of dispositional optimism. *Stress and Health*, 30(4), 322-332.
4. Bhuin, P. K. (2017). A study on work-related stress among the teachers and administrators of privately managed business schools in West Bengal. *Bhatter College Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 7(2), 7-16.
5. Bubb, S., & Earley, P. (2004). *Managing teacher workload: Work-life balance and well-being*. Paul Chapman Publishing.
6. Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.
7. Day, C., Sammons, P., & Stobart, G. (2007). *Teachers matter: Connecting work, lives and effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
8. Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165–183). American Psychological Association.
9. Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2013). Higher stress: A survey of stress and well-being among staff in higher education. University and College Union (UCU). Retrieved from <https://www.ucu.org.uk/media>
10. Tilak, J. B., & Tilak, J. B. (2018). Private higher education in India. *Education and development in India: Critical issues in public policy and development*, 535-551.
11. Varghese, N. V., & Malathesh, K. C. (2022). Kerala's higher education reforms: Policy, politics, and institutional dynamics. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(2), 287–304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12276>
12. Zahoor, Z. (2015). A comparative study of psychological well-being and job satisfaction among teachers. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 6(2).