



Enhancement of Quality of Life for Faculty Members: Applied Study at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Khalid Matar S Alsahli^{1*}

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 23 September 2023
Received in Revised Form: 18 October 2023
Accepted: 13 November 2023
DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2023.108.010

Keywords

Quality of Life, Faculty Members,
Gender Disparities, Job Productivity,
Work-Life Balance, Mental Health Support.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This research seeks to examine the quality of life among faculty members and uncover any variations related to gender, years of experience, and educational background. **Method.** The research was carried out utilising a qualitative methodology, with data being gathered from participants through surveys and interviews. A sample of 300 faculty members took part in the study, and a descriptive research methodology was used. **Findings:** The results showed a strong overall quality of life among faculty members, including aspects such as physical health, family well-being, mental health, and work satisfaction. Nevertheless, there were notable variations in the quality of the public health dimension between genders, with males having an advantage. Several conclusions can be made based on the findings.

Implications for Research and Practice: First, it is essential to develop strategies to improve the faculty members' quality of life and address disparities among female faculty. These strategies can be implemented for healthcare services, awareness programmes, and regular assessment of members to detect problems early. Furthermore, educational institutions can create programmes tailored to specific genders, allowing them to participate openly and have equal opportunities. It is important to maintain work-life balance to enhance gender satisfaction through offering flexible work schedules, parental leaves, and childcare programmes. Additionally, mental health counselling programmes could be implemented to support the well-being of faculty members. Lastly, professional development opportunities should be offered to help faculty enhance their skills through workshops and seminars etc. **Originality:** The study emphasises the significance of the quality of life of faculty members and the policies that can assist in reaching the target. It addresses the challenges encountered by faculty members in the education sector and offers recommendations for institutions to enhance their status.

© 2023 Ani Publishing Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

¹ Department of Psychology, College Arts, Taif University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Department of Educational Sciences, College of Education in Al-kharj, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj 11942, Saudi Arabia. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4508-0695>,

Introduction

Enhancing quality of life for the faculty members who are teaching higher education and helping them in performing their research is crucial matter for academic research. Quality of life is not only linked with job satisfaction rather it covers various aspects which include work life balance, quality health, family time, workload etc. Faculty members hold great significance for educational institutions as their satisfaction directly impact the quality of education. Past research has shown that a positive work environment and support from peers can impact one's quality of life. Likewise, professional growth, job stability, and independence can improve one's well-being. Nevertheless, the rising academic responsibilities and external influences on professors may have repercussions on their mental health and job satisfaction. This study aims to identify current strategies used by organisations to enhance the quality of life for faculty members and offer suggestions for the future.

The quality of life is crucial for both faculty and students as it directly impacts the quality of education provided. Educational institutions must ensure a conducive environment for staff to work efficiently. Several factors impact the quality of life of faculty members, such as workload, work-related stress, student feedback, and social interactions etc. Evaluating faculty members' quality of life is crucial for educational institutions. A positive work environment can improve job satisfaction, retention rates, educational quality, and staff productivity (Kermansaravi et al., 2014). To comprehend the various dimensions contributing to enhancing quality of life, it is essential to study them for designing strategies and adjusting policies accordingly. Past research has shed light on the impact on faculty members' quality of life, emphasising the significance of work stress, job satisfaction, and maintaining work-life balance. However, there is still a gap that needs to be explored to understand the comprehensive differences based on variables such as gender, age, and experience. This will provide a holistic approach to grasp the importance of quality of life for faculty members and pinpoint areas that require improvement to enhance strategies and achieve desired outcomes (Kermansaravi et al., 2014).

Studying the quality of life in educational institutions among faculty members is crucial because it has a direct impact on their well-being, which in turn affects their performance. It is crucial to gain insight into the quality of life of faculty members and how it varies based on specific factors. This study has explored various dimensions such as family life, mental and public health, professional growth, and the effects of workload on stress levels, job satisfaction, and work-life balance. There is a shortage of in-depth studies that explore various aspects such as public health, mental health, quality of life, and their impact on the overall well-being of faculty members (Alves et al., 2019). Similarly, variables such as experience, gender, and age were not investigated, and their impact on quality of life was not addressed. Understanding variations is crucial for achieving results and exploring policies that promote a better quality of life. This study seeks to elucidate how the quality of life of faculty members is addressed in educational institutions, the measures taken to improve it, and the impact on members' gender and age. By exploring these aspects, the research will seek to gain a deeper understanding of faculty members' overall well-being and job satisfaction, which can have a positive impact on both the faculty and the students they interact with, ultimately influencing academic performance.

This study had three main goals:

1. To investigate the quality of life among faculty members by focusing on different dimensions like mental health, family life, career development etc.
2. To analyze the role of educational institutions in enhancing the quality of life of its faculty members.
3. To identify the significant difference in these dimensions for faculty members based on the factors like gender, age, experience etc.

This research is important due to its theoretical and practical implications, as the topic is crucial for scholarly investigation. Studying the impact of technological advancements and environmental changes is crucial for understanding the needs and challenges faced by members of institutions, as highlighted by various researchers. The study's results extend beyond faculty members' quality of life to also impact students, as faculty members' academic performance is closely linked to academic outcomes. Identifying issues in the field allows stakeholders to develop strategies to maintain work-life balance, ultimately enhancing overall quality of life. The study's results will be a valuable resource for upcoming researchers conducting research in various geographical areas and societies.

This study focuses on identifying factors contributing to the enhancement of faculty members' quality of life. It will explore various aspects such as work-life balance, mental health, job satisfaction, and career development. Basically, the research will offer a comprehensive insight into the factors that impact the well-being of faculty members. This study will concentrate on faculty members from various disciplines while maintaining a specific focus on a particular institution or group of institutions. This research will focus on both the experienced faculty members currently employed at the institution and newer faculty who have previously worked in educational settings to ensure a thorough understanding and validity of the results. We will be using interviews and surveys for data collection. In addition, a quantitative method will be utilised to determine significance. The study will be carried out within a specific time frame and will not include data from previous years. The study will be carried out with a strong emphasis on ethical standards, ensuring that participants are treated with dignity and respect. It will be ensured that their participation is voluntary and free from any external influence.

Literature Review

Definition of Key Terms

1. **Quality of Life:** Quality of life is described as including spiritual, social, and physical well-being (Hobfoll, 2001). Originating in Western Europe in the mid-20th century, the focus was on addressing material interests, evolving needs, and overall development according to Gayathiri et al., (2013). The concept of "quality of life" was initially introduced by A. C. Pigou and became prominent following World War II when the World Health Organisation broadened its scope to encompass various aspects of well-being (Gayathiri et al, 2013). Quality of life encompasses the holistic satisfaction and well-being individuals experience across different facets of their lives, such as physical health, mental wellness, social connections, and personal fulfilment. This covers personal perceptions and measurable factors related to an individual's life situation and their overall contentment and well-being.

Idiomatically, quality of life is defined as "characteristics of the good life that were dictated by normative ideas based on religious, philosophical, or other systems" (Ngan & Khoi, 2020).

"An individual's appraisal of his or her own life situation within a specific time span" Procedurally, the researcher defines quality of life as "conditions related to work that, in turn, contribute to affecting the levels of motivation, performance, and job satisfaction among faculty members. It is measured by the degree obtained by the study sample on the quality-of-life scale, which is represented in the following dimensions: quality of public health, quality of family life, quality of mental health, quality of social life, and quality of work life."

2. **Faculty Members:** In this study, faculty members are individuals who hold positions within higher education institutions, such as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers. They oversee teaching, research, and providing leadership in the field, which is essential for the growth and learning of students. This faculty member not only publishes their own articles but also assists their students in doing the same.
3. **Enhancement:** Improvement involves implementing strategies and policies to enhance and elevate the quality of life through various means such as career growth, professional advancement, and boosting job contentment. It represents a positive transformation in a person to boost their efficiency.

Theoretical Framework

In the study, the theoretical framework will explore the factors that impact the quality of life of faculty members, examining them from a theoretical perspective. Viewpoint. Studying the well-being of individuals and their job satisfaction is crucial for understanding their quality of life (Ngan & Khoi, 2020). One model that aligns with our study is the Job Demand Model, which examines the job demands and resources and their effects on employees' well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). This theory is relevant to our study as it centres on faculty workload and how the amount of work affects the health and well-being of individuals. Another theory that is relevant to our study is "The Conservation of Resources (COR) theory," which posits that safeguarding valuable resources enhances employees' well-being. Furthermore, another theory that is relevant to our study is the Work Life Balance Theory. It is essential to maintain a balance between work life and personal life to effectively manage work responsibilities and have time for oneself. These frameworks assist in comprehending the impact of these factors on promoting a healthy lifestyle for faculty members and their mental well-being (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Hobfoll, 2001).

Factors Influencing Quality of Life of Faculty Member in Educational Institutions

Within any academic institution, numerous factors influence the well-being of its faculty either directly or indirectly. One factor to consider is the workload, which has a direct effect on the faculty's quality of life. As per a study by Pace et al. (2021), a heavy workload can affect the work-life balance of professors, making it challenging for them to sustain a healthy lifestyle beyond work. It can be difficult for individuals to find time to dedicate to their families. Just like with an increased workload, faculty members may

experience stress from developing research papers within a specific timeframe and putting effort into publishing them for their institutions (Jermisittiparsert et al., 2021). In addition, when faculty members feel overwhelmed, their motivation to perform their job decreases due to work stress, leading to frustration. As per Franco et al. (2021), heightened stress levels can lead to health problems for faculty members, affecting their well-being and work performance. Also, the work-life imbalance can have a detrimental effect on professionals' ability to engage in conferences or collaborate with top researchers to improve their expertise. These factors influence the quality of life of faculty members in any educational institution.

Practices for Enhancing Quality of Life Within Educational Institutions

Recognising the significance of faculty well-being, educational institutions implement specific strategies to enhance their quality of life and job satisfaction. As per a study by Pedro et al. (2020), the quality of life for faculty members is closely linked to the work arrangements offered by institutions. Providing flexible work options, such as allowing faculty to set their own schedules, can enhance their well-being and effectiveness. This includes features like flexible timing, online communication with students, and empowering faculty to manage their time based on their availability.

Just like educational institutions have the potential to enhance the well-being of their staff by organising programmes such as counselling, health initiatives, and stress management workshops. These efforts can help in achieving a better work-life balance and ultimately improve the overall quality of life (Koyuncu & Demirhan, 2021). As per a study by Purwanto et al. (2021), leadership practices are crucial for the well-being of faculty. Transparency in communication, involving faculty in decision-making, and recognising their efforts can motivate them and make them feel valued.

Impact of Enhanced Quality of Life of Faculty on Educational Institutions

Educational institutions' dedication to improving quality of life benefits both staff members and the institutions themselves. As per a study by Lazić et al. (2021), faculty members who are content with their jobs are more likely to stay with the institution, leading to a decrease in turnover rates. This results in fewer resignations and lower costs associated with hiring for those positions. Furthermore, the expertise possessed by the professors will stay within the institution, benefiting the students who are already familiar and comfortable working with the staff. This familiarity helps students avoid the challenge of adjusting to new faculty members. When institutions appreciate the efforts of their faculty members and offer them chances to thrive in their area of expertise, it leads to successful outcomes in the academic realm (Özdogru & Akyürek, 2022).

Challenges in Practical Implication of Policies for Increasing Quality of Life of Faculty Member

There are numerous advantages to promoting the well-being of faculty members in educational institutions, benefiting both the institution and the individuals. However, there are also challenges in implementing these policies. As per a study by Ogunode and Aiyedun (2020), educational institutions encounter budgetary challenges when implementing policies due to resource constraints such as finances and technology.

These constraints can impact the effectiveness of policies aimed at improving staff welfare. Another challenge is the resistance from institutions to change, as they are hesitant to embrace new policies. Furthermore, each faculty member has their own preferences, making it challenging for institutions to accommodate each one separately. These challenges must be tackled to develop policies for enhancing the quality of life for faculty members.

Methodology

The study utilises a qualitative approach, gathering data through interviews and discussions. The research is guided by a strategy and methodological framework known as the research approach. This is the approach used by researchers to gather, analyse, and make sense of data, as mentioned by [Opie and Brown \(2019\)](#). It primarily includes two types: inductive and deductive methods. To accomplish the study's goals, the inductive approach was utilised. This research method is in line with the objectives of this study. Two crucial components for carrying out a study are the population and sample, as they play a vital role in data collection. Population is the group of individuals who have specific characteristics that researchers are interested in and from which a sample is drawn for study ([Bhardwaj, 2019](#)). All faculty members from educational institutions within the chosen context will be part of the study population. A sample of 300 faculty members will be randomly chosen for this study. The sample will be selected to ensure diversity across various departments or fields, considering factors like experience, gender, and employment status. For this study, we employed purposive sampling, a type of non-probability sampling method. Purposive sampling involves selecting samples based on specific characteristics they possess ([Campbell et al., 2020](#)). In this study, we will intentionally select our sample based on the institution from which they are chosen. Using a purposive sample helps to improve the study's findings' applicability to a wider range of faculty members.

In qualitative research, data is gathered by gaining a profound understanding of the participants' perspectives. As per [Lobe et al. \(2020\)](#), various techniques exist for gathering qualitative data, such as interviews that can be structured, semi-structured, or unstructured. Prepared interviews involve questions that are predetermined and fully planned out, while semi-prepared interviews have partially written questions that may be influenced by previous responses and partially follow a specific format. Finally, unstructured interviews are conducted spontaneously without any pre-prepared questions. Another approach involves conducting focus group discussions where participants engage in sharing their experiences and perspectives, thereby fostering interaction among each other. Observation is a method used to collect data by watching participants' behaviour and sometimes even joining in their activities to gain a better understanding. In addition, data analysis technique involves examining documents such as reports, materials, and case studies ([Lobe et al., 2020](#)). The study will include conducting surveys or interviews with selected participants to collect information on how education institutions impact their quality of life.

After analysing [Table 1](#), it's clear that the "male" category in the gender variable received the highest percentage of responses from the study sample. There were 185 samples, making up 61.7% of the total sample size of 300. On the other hand, the "female"

category accounted for 115 samples, representing 38.3%. Furthermore, the category with "more than 10 years" in the years of experience variable received the highest percentage of responses from the study sample. The study included 168 samples, accounting for 56% of the total sample size of 300. Nevertheless, there were a total of 47 samples in the less than 5 years category, accounting for 15.7% of the total. Most responses came from the "assistant professor" category in our sample. It collected 169 samples, which accounted for 56.3% of the total sample size of 300. On the other hand, the "professor" category had 27 samples, making up 9% of the total. Finally, the "humanitarian" category in the scientific track variable received the highest percentage of responses from the study sample. It obtained 201 samples, which accounts for 67% of the total sample size of 300. On the other hand, the "healthy" category comprised 45 samples, making up 15% of the total.

Table 1

The Demographic Study Included an Analysis of Frequencies and Percentages Based on The Variables of The Study Sample, Which Consisted of 300 Individuals (N=300)

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	185	61.7%
	Female	115	38.3%
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	47	15.7%
	From 5-10 years	85	28.3%
	More than 10 years	168	56%
Rank	Assistant Professor	169	56.3%
	Associate Professor	104	34.7%
	Professor	27	9%
Scientific specialization	Humanitarian	201	67%
	Scientific	54	18%
	inquire healthy	45	15%

1. Study Tool

To accomplish the study's objectives, a data collection instrument was created using theoretical literature, pertinent past research, and feedback from expert educators. The tool primarily emphasised the well-being of faculty members, and it consisted of 36 items divided into four dimensions:

1. Public health quality, which included eight items.
2. Quality of family life, which included ten items.
3. Quality of mental health, which included eight items.
4. Quality of working life, which included ten items.

2. Validity of the Content of the Study Tool

The study tool's content validity was confirmed by sharing its initial form with eight specialised experts who have teaching experience. These professionals assessed the suitability of the items, clarity of phrases, formulation, and linguistic integrity. Proposed changes, backed by most experts, were reviewed to complete the study tool.

The researcher utilised a five-point Likert scale for each section of the study, which

included five levels: strongly agree (weighted as 5), agree (weighted as 4), neutral (weighted as 3), disagree (weighted as 2), and strongly disagree (weighted as 1). The weights were assigned based on the direction of the statements, whether positive or negative. To assess the responses of the study sample, the researcher used the equal categories method, a technique that has been utilised in previous studies and supported by numerous experts. The calculation was done using the equation below:

$$\text{Class interval} = (\text{upper limit of scale} - \text{lower limit of scale}) / \text{number of required levels} \\ = (5-1) / 3 = 4/3 = 1.33$$

The following criteria were used to interpret the mean scores:

1. Low score: 1.00–2.33
2. Medium score: 2.34–3.67
3. High score: 3.68–5.00

3. Construct Validity of the Study Tool

To establish the construct validity of the study tool, Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed between each item and its corresponding domain. This analysis was performed within the scope of examining the impact of moral values on enhancing the well-being of faculty members, as outlined in [Table 2](#).

Table 2

The Values of The Correlation Coefficients for The Level of Quality of Life Among Faculty Members with The Field as a Whole

Quality of Life for Faculty Members			
Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient with Domain	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient with Domain
1	**0.32	19	**0.32
2	**0.24	20	**0.33
3	**0.40	21	**0.30
4	0.31**	22	**0.29
5	**0.41	23	**0.24
6	**0.38	24	**0.40
7	**0.30	25	**0.38
8	**0.32	26	**0.32
9	**0.24	27	**0.33
10	**0.40	28	**0.30
11	0.31**	29	**0.29
12	**0.41	30	**0.24
13	**0.38	31	**0.40
14	**0.30	32	**0.38
15	**0.32	33	**0.32
16	**0.24	34	**0.41
17	**0.40	35	**0.38
18	0.31**	36	**0.30

** Statistically significant at the significance level (0.01).

Table 2 displays the Correlation Coefficients for the Level of Quality of Life among Faculty Members. The correlation coefficients in Table 2 illustrate the connection between the paragraphs and the different domains of quality of life among faculty members collectively. The coefficients varied between 0.24 and 0.41, showing statistically significant correlations. These values are deemed satisfactory and contribute to the execution of this study.

4. Stability of the Study Tool

For evaluating the stability of the study tool, the internal consistency between the paragraphs was assessed using Cronbach's alpha method. This approach evaluates the reliability by examining the level of association between the items in the tool. Through the calculation of Cronbach's alpha, we can assess the level of consistency among the items in the study tool and their ability to measure the same construct. When the alpha value is higher, it suggests a stronger internal consistency, indicating that the items can be trusted as a reliable measurement tool. Where Cronbach's alpha=084, Table 3.

Table 3

Stability Coefficient Values

The Dimension	Sub Dimension	Number of Vertebrae	Cronbach's Alpha
Quality of life for faculty members	Public health quality	8	0.854
	Quality of family life	10	0.899
	Quality of mental health	8	0.832
	Quality of working life	10	0.863
Total		63	0.862

Results

An evaluation was conducted on the quality of life and its components for faculty members by determining the means and standard deviations for the main axis and its sub-axes. This analysis offers valuable insights into the average quality of life experienced by faculty members and the variations within each dimension.

Table 4

Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of Quality-of-Life Dimensions among Faculty Members.

Domain No.	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Degree of Applicability
2	Quality of family life	4.52	.44	1	High
3	Quality of mental health	4.41	.43	2	High
4	Quality of working life	4.35	.51	3	High
1	Public health quality	3.74	.69	4	High
Total		4.25	.40		High

According to Table 4, the quality of life and its various aspects (general health, family life, mental health, and functional life) were reported to be high among faculty members. The average quality of life was calculated to be 4.25, with a standard deviation of 0.40. The

average values for the individual dimensions varied between 3.74 and 4.52.

Regarding the sub-dimensions, Dimension No. 2, family life, received the highest mean score of 4.52, suggesting a high level of quality. Next, the mental health dimension (Dimension No. 3) had an average of 4.41 and a standard deviation of 0.43. The functional life dimension, ranked third, had a mean of 4.35 and a standard deviation of 0.51. Dimension No. 1, general health, had the lowest mean score of 3.74, suggesting a lower quality level, with a standard deviation of 0.69. To access detailed information on the means and standard deviations of the paragraphs within each sub-dimension, please consult [Table 10](#) to [Table 13](#).

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Items in the Dimension of Public Health Quality

Domain No.	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Degree of Applicability
2	Make sure to eat healthy foods.	4.16	.91	1	High
1	I take care of my health, no matter what problems I encounter.	4.12	.84	2	High
7	I make sure to stay away from habits that are harmful to health.	4.04	.86	3	High
3	It gave my body enough time to rest.	3.83	.90	4	High
8	Make sure to make exercise a daily routine.	3.62	1.04	5	Medium
4	I do regular medical examinations.	3.46	1.12	6	Medium
5	I avoid stress and exhaustion in my work.	3.44	1.06	7	Medium
6	I receive appropriate health services from the university.	3.29	1.14	8	Medium
	Total	3.74	.69		High

In [Table 5](#), it is evident that the public health quality level was quite high, with an average of 3.74% and a standard deviation of 0.69. The average values for the domains varied from 3.29 to 4.16.

Concerning the elements in the research, paragraph No. 2 (focused on consuming nutritious foods) had an average of 4.16 with a high level and a standard deviation of 0.91. Secondly, paragraph No. 1 had an average of 4.12 with a high degree and a standard deviation of 0.84, despite the challenges I face. It was the second highest ranking. Paragraph No. 5 had an average of 3.44 with a high degree and a standard deviation of 1.06, placing it in the second-to-last position. Lastly, paragraph No. 6 had an average score of 3.29 with a high degree and a standard deviation of 0.69, making it the lowest ranked paragraph in terms of health services provided by the university.

Quality of Family Life

In [Table 6](#), it is evident that the quality of family life was rated highly, with an average of 4.52 and a standard deviation of 0.44. The average values for the domains varied from 4.26 to 4.69.

Table 6*Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations for Items Related To Quality Of Family Life*

Domain No.	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Degree of Applicability
9	I take care of the moral upliftment of my family members	4.69	.48	1	High
10	I seek to develop future skills in my children.	4.65	.53	2	High
8	I seek scientific progress for my family members.	4.64	.51	3	High
5	I show pride and cherish my family members.	4.59	.61	4	High
3	I seek to strengthen the relationships between my family members.	4.55	.60	5	High
4	My relationships with my family are based on mutual appreciation and respect.	4.54	.64	6	High
2	I make sure to be active with my family members.	4.50	.67	7	High
1	I am keen to spread the culture of dialogue among my family members.	4.50	.53	8	High
7	I make sure that my family is not affected by my external worries and burdens.	4.28	.78	9	High
6	I manage the family budget well.	4.26	.65	10	High
	Total	4.52	.44		High

Concerning the study's components, Paragraph No. 9 (focused on the moral development of family members) had an average of 4.69, indicating a high score, with a standard deviation of 0.48. Coming in second, Paragraph No. 10 (focused on developing future skills in my children) had an average score of 4.65 with a high score and a standard deviation of 0.65. In the second to last position, Paragraph No. 7 had an average score of 4.28 with a high score and a standard deviation of 0.78, ensuring that external concerns do not impact my family. Finally, coming in last, Paragraph No. 6 (I ensure efficient management of the family budget) had an average of 4.26 with a high score and a standard deviation of 0.65.

Quality of Mental Health

Table 7 indicates that the mental health quality level was high, with an average of 4.41 and a standard deviation of 0.43. The average values for the domains varied from 4.12 to 4.67.

Table 7*Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations for Items Related to Quality of Mental Health*

Domain No.	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Degree of Applicability
8	I have a high degree of satisfaction with what God has destined for me	4.67	.47	1	High
6	I make sure that my life has meaning	4.58	.51	2	High
4	I approach life with optimism.	4.50	.55	3	High
7	I make sure to stay away from the causes of mental disorders	4.42	.63	4	High
2	I can adapt to new environments.	4.39	.61	5	High
3	I am keen on psychological balance in my life.	4.37	.61	6	High
5	I seek renewal in my life and away from routine.	4.21	.77	7	High
1	I have the ability to control my emotions.	4.12	.88	8	High
	Total	4.41	.43		High

With a mean score of 4.67, a high score, and a standard deviation of 0.47, Paragraph No. 8 (I have a high degree of happiness with what God has meant for me) ranked first among the study's items. With a high score of 4.58, a standard deviation of 0.51 and an arithmetic mean of 4.58, Paragraph No. 6 (I ensure that my life has value) came in second. With a mean score of 4.21, a high score, and a standard deviation of 0.77, Paragraph No. 5 (I seek renewal in my life and break away from routine) was ranked penultimate. Finally, Paragraph No. 1 (I can regulate my emotions) came in last with a high score of 4.12, an arithmetic mean of 0.88, and a standard deviation of 0.88.

Quality of Working Life Table

In [Table 8](#), it is evident that the general quality of working life was rated highly, with an average of 6.35 and a standard deviation of 0.51. The average values for the domains varied from 3.81 to 4.65.

"I am eager to develop a distinguished rapport with my colleagues" ranked first among the items in the study, boasting an arithmetic mean of 4.65, a significant degree of achievement, and a standard deviation of 0.51. Paragraph No. 5, which stated "I fulfil my responsibilities within the university in accordance with my functional capabilities," secured the second position. It achieved a high score of 4.64 on the arithmetic mean and a standard deviation of 0.59. Paragraph No. 3 (I have support from university administrators) occupied the penultimate position with a high score, an arithmetic mean of 3.94, and a standard deviation of 0.59. Finally, positioned last was Paragraph No. 10 (A sufficient financial income

is derived from academic work), which had a high degree of significance, an arithmetic mean of 3.81, and a standard deviation of 0.94.

Table 8

Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations for Paragraphs Related to Quality of Working Life

Domain No.	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Degree of Applicability
8	I am keen to build a distinguished relationship with co-workers.	4.65	.60	1	High
5	I perform my duties within the university in accordance with my job powers.	4.64	.59	2	High
1	I make sure to increase knowledge and knowledge.	4.61	.50	3	High
6	I deal with co-workers in a participatory manner.	4.55	.57	4	High
9	I seek to develop the university work environment	4.44	.75	5	High
2	I get a fair evaluation from my direct boss.	4.42	.80	6	High
7	I am keen on obtaining academic promotions at the university.	4.41	.72	7	High
4	The university fulfills my academic ambitions.	4.01	1.00	8	High
3	I have the support of the university leaders.	3.94	.99	9	High
10	Academic work provides me with sufficient financial income.	3.81	.94	10	High
	Total	4.35	.51		High

The results regarding the third question, which analyse the significant differences in the quality of life and its dimensions among faculty members based on various variables, will be presented separately from this response.

First, let's consider the Gender Variable. A study was carried out to investigate potential variations in the quality of life among faculty members based on gender, focusing on aspects like general health, family life, mental health, and functional life.

Table 9 shows significant variations in the quality of the public health dimension among faculty members depending on their gender. The significance level was below 0.05. After analysing the arithmetic means, it's clear that the male category had a higher mean of 3.91 compared to the female category's mean of 3.47.

On the other hand, there are no statistically significant variations in the quality of family life, mental health, and work life dimensions among faculty members based on gender. The significance level for these dimensions exceeded 0.05.

In addition, there are significant variations in the quality-of-life dimension among faculty members based on gender. The significance level was below 0.05. After analysing the arithmetic averages, it is evident that the male category had a higher mean of 4.30 compared to the female category, which had a mean of 4.18.

Table 9

Independent Samples T-test for Differences in Arithmetic Means of Quality of Life among Faculty Members Based on Gender Variable

Dimension	Categories	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	t Value	The Level of Significance
Public health quality	Male	3.91	.61	299	5.642	0.000**
	Female	3.47	.74			
Quality of family life	Male	4.51	.48	299	0.513	0.609
	Female	4.54	.36			
Quality of mental health	Male	4.43	.43	299	1.197	0.232
	Female	4.37	.43			
Quality of working life	Male	4.34	.54	299	0.210	0.834
	Female	4.35	.47			
Total	Male	4.30	.42	299	2.437	0.015*

* Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05

** Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to compare the arithmetic means of quality-of-life aspects (general health, family life, mental health, and functional life) among faculty members based on their years of experience.

Table 10

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to Determine Differences in Arithmetic Means of Quality of Life among Faculty Members Based on Years of Experience Variable

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean of Squares	p value	The Level of Significance
Public Health Quality	between groups	1.692	2	.846	1.742	.177
	within groups	144.260	297	.486		
Quality of Family Life	Total	145.953	299			
	between groups	1.505	2	.753	3.900	.021*
	within groups	57.312	297	.193		
Total	58.817	299				
Quality of Working Life Public Health Quality	between groups	.896	2	.448	2.349	.097
	within groups	56.663	297	.191		
	Total	57.559	299			
Quality of Family Life	between groups	4.039	2	2.020	7.955	.000**
	within groups	75.410	297	.254		
	Total	79.450	299			
Total	between groups	1.344	2	.672	4.127	.017*
	within groups	48.362	297	.163		
	Total	49.707	299			

* Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05

** Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01

Table 10 clearly shows significant differences in the quality of family life, quality of work life, and overall performance dimensions. The significance level was below 0.05.

Nevertheless, no statistically significant differences were identified for the quality of the public health dimension and mental health dimension. For a more in-depth analysis of these variations, a post-hoc examination was carried out.

Table 11

Post-hoc Test for Differences between Means

Dimension	Categories		Less Than 5 Years	From 5 To Less Than 10 Years	10 Years and Over
		average	4.47	4.43	4.58
Quality of Family Life	Less than 5 years	4.47		0.884	0.286
	From 5 to less than 10 years	4.43			0.032*
	10 years and over	4.58			
Dimension	Categories		Less than 5 years	From 5 to less than 10 years	10 years and over
		average	4.17	4.25	4.45
Quality of Working Life	Less than 5 years	4.17		0.673	0.004**
	From 5 to less than 10 years	4.25			0.013*
	10 years and over	4.45			
Dimension	Categories		Less than 5 years	From 5 to less than 10 years	10 years and over
		average	4.23	4.16	4.31
Total	Less than 5 years	4.23		0.603	0.498
	From 5 to less than 10 years	4.16			0.019*
	10 years and over	4.31			

* Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05

** Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01

Table 11 clearly shows statistically significant differences between the categories "From 5 to less than 10 years" and "10 years and more" in the quality of family life dimension based on the years of experience variable. According to the average values, the "10 years and more" category had a mean of 4.58, which was higher than the mean of 4.43 for the "From 5 to Less than 10 years" category.

Table 11 also indicates statistically significant differences between the "Less than 5 years" category and the "10 years and more" category in the quality of work life dimension based on years of experience. Referring to the arithmetic mean values, the differences favored the "10 years and more" category with a mean of 4.45, while the "Less than 5 years" category had a mean of 4.17. Moreover, there are statistically significant variations between the "From 5 to Less than 10 years" category and the "10 years and more" category in the subjective values dimension according to years of experience. The "10 years and more" category had a higher arithmetic mean of 4.45 compared to the "From 5 to Less than 10 years" category, which had an arithmetic mean of 4.25.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to compare the arithmetic means of quality-of-life aspects (general health, family life, mental health, and functional life) among faculty members based on their rank.

According to Table 12, there are statistically significant variations in the quality of the public health dimension, the quality of work life dimension, and the overall performance dimension among faculty members. The significance level was below 0.05. Nevertheless, no statistically significant differences were identified in the quality of family life dimension and mental health dimension. To delve deeper into these variations, a post-test was carried out and is shown in Table 24.

Table 12

One-Way ANOVA to Determine Differences in Quality of Life among Faculty Members Based on Rank Variable

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean of Squares	p Value	The Level of Significance
Public Health Quality	between groups	7.002	2	3.501	7.483	.001**
	within groups	138.950	297	.468		
	Total	145.953	299			
Quality of Family Life	between groups	.095	2	.047	.239	.787
	within groups	58.722	297	.198		
	Total	58.817	299			
Quality of Mental Health	between groups	.410	2	.205	1.065	.346
	within groups	57.149	297	.192		
	Total	57.559	299			
Quality of Working Life	between groups	1.572	2	.786	2.998	.048*
	within groups	77.878	297	.262		
	Total	79.450	299			
Total	between groups	1.118	2	.559	3.417	.034*

* Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05

** Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01

Table 13

A Satisfactory Test for Differences Between Means

Dimension	Categories	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Public Health Quality	average	3.64	3.80	4.17
	Assistant Professor	3.64	0.164	0.001**
	Associate Professor	3.80		0.050*
	Professor	4.17		
Dimension	Categories	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Quality of Working Life	average	4.28	4.42	4.45
	Assistant Professor	4.28	0.095	0.045*
	Associate Professor	4.42		0.965
	Professor	4.45		
Dimension	Categories	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Total	average	4.21	4.28	4.42
	Assistant Professor	4.21	0.394	0.047*
	Associate Professor	4.28		0.283
	Professor	4.42		

* Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05

** Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01

Table 13 clearly shows statistically significant differences between the "Assistant Professor" and "Professor" categories in the dimension of public health quality, based on the rank variable. In terms of the arithmetic mean values, the "Professor" category had a higher mean of 4.17 compared to the "Assistant Professor" category, which had a mean of 3.64. There are notable statistical variances between the "Associate Professor" and "Professor" categories in terms of public health quality, as per the rank variable. The differences favoured the "Professor" category with a mean of 4.17, while the "Associate Professor" category had a mean of 3.80.

In addition, based on Table 13, there are statistically significant variances in the quality of career dimension between the "Assistant Professor" and "Professor" categories, as per the rank variable. In terms of the arithmetic mean values, the "Professor" category had a higher mean of 4.45 compared to the "Assistant Professor" category, which had a mean of 4.28.

Furthermore, there is a significant difference between the "Assistant Professor" and "Professor" categories in the quality-of-life dimension based on the rank variable. In terms of the arithmetic mean values, the "Professor" category had a higher mean of 4.42 compared to the "Assistant Professor" category, which had a mean of 4.21.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to compare the arithmetic means of quality-of-life aspects (general health, family life, mental health, and functional life) among faculty members based on the scientific track variable.

Table 14

One-Way ANOVA to Determine Differences in Quality of Life Among Faculty Members Based on Scientific Track Variable.

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean of Squares	p Value	The Level of Significance
Public Health Quality	between groups	6.096	2	3.048	6.472	.002**
	within groups	139.857	297	.471		
	Total	145.953	299			
Quality of Family Life	between groups	1.990	2	.995	5.199	.006**
	within groups	56.827	297	.191		
	Total	58.817	299			
Quality of Mental Health	between groups	3.547	2	1.774	9.753	.000**
	within groups	54.011	297	.182		
	Total	57.559	299			
Quality of Working life	between groups	1.758	2	.879	3.360	.036*
	within groups	77.692	297	.262		
	Total	79.450	299			
Total	between groups	2.274	2	1.137	7.121	.001**
	within groups	47.432	297	.160		
	Total	49.707	299			

* Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05

** Statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01

Based on Table 14 findings, significant differences were observed between the "humanitarian"

and "healthy" categories regarding public health quality in relation to the scientific track variable. When looking at the arithmetic mean values, the "humanitarian" category had a higher mean of 3.84 compared to the "healthy" category, which had a mean of 3.45.

Table 14 shows statistically significant differences between the "humane" category and the "healthy" category in the quality of family life dimension based on the scientific track variable. In terms of the arithmetic mean values, the "humane" category had a higher mean of 4.56 compared to the "healthy" category, which had a mean of 4.33.

There are significant differences in the quality of mental health between the "humanitarian" and "healthy" categories based on the scientific track variable. In terms of the arithmetic mean values, the "humanitarian" category had a higher mean of 4.46 compared to the "healthy" category, which had a mean of 4.15.

Moreover, this study indicated statistically significant differences between the "scientific" and "healthy" categories in the quality of work life dimension, based on the scientific track variable. The arithmetic mean values show that the "scientific" category had a mean of 4.50, while the "healthy" category had a mean of 4.26.

Please note that the specific labels and categories may vary based on the actual data and context of the study.

Discussions

The study findings revealed a positive quality of life among faculty members, covering aspects such as physical health, family well-being, mental health, and work-life balance. The emphasis on the "Quality of Family Life" dimension demonstrates faculty members' understanding of the importance of maintaining balance in various areas of life, such as health, family relationships, and mental well-being.

It is vital for educational institutions to prioritise the well-being of faculty members by offering benefits such as health insurance and implementing strategies to help them maintain a healthy work-life balance. Recognition and awards play a crucial role in boosting motivation at work by making employees feel valued and appreciated for their efforts. One crucial aspect in attaining public health is the faculty members' own dedication to prioritising their well-being, enabling them to fulfil their duties effectively. One must prioritise consuming nutritious foods, steering clear of unhealthy options, staying physically active, and refraining from engaging in unethical behaviours. Educational institutions can improve by offering health management programmes and consistent health services. Another important aspect of the study involves examining the quality of life of family members. Family members of faculty play a crucial role in the well-being of educational institutions and students. Faculty members strive to ensure a high quality of life for their families, as any disruption can affect their mental health and subsequently impact academic performance. The faculty members prioritise building and nurturing strong relationships with their family members. They advocate for work flexibility and family-friendly policies within institutions to support these relationships without imposing strict regulations. This study highlighted the crucial role of mental health in the quality of life of faculty members, who believe that their academic performance can be influenced by mental health. Life satisfaction is directly related to having a more optimistic outlook. Academic institutions contribute to mental health management by organising awareness programmes and offering counselling services to

faculty members to enhance a healthy work environment. Furthermore, the internal benefits of the work completed also contribute to mental well-being, ultimately leading to an improved quality of life. The research also explored how the faculty members' well-being is influenced by the quality of their work life, leading to increased commitment and performance in their roles. To ensure quality education for students, faculty members focus on fostering relationships with colleagues to cultivate a positive work environment. This can be achieved by offering clear communication opportunities, fostering collaborative leadership to build relationships among colleagues, and creating chances for long-term career advancement. Similarly, providing flexibility and autonomy from institutions also contributes to enhancing the quality of life of faculty members. The study revealed variations in the quality of life among faculty members across different dimensions such as general health, mental health, and work life. The main factors analysed included gender, years of experience, rank, and track within the field.

There is a significant disparity in public health quality, with a preference for males. The difference in performance may be due to biological variances, societal expectations, and the extra duties shouldered by males in and out of the academic setting. Nevertheless, gender did not have a significant effect on the quality of family life, mental health, or professional life. These aspects could apply to individuals of all genders, as both men and women are invested in cultivating a fulfilling family and professional life.

Faculty members with over 10 years of experience showed significant variations in family life, work life, and overall performance. Experienced faculty members may achieve a better balance between work and personal life while gaining a deep understanding of managing both family and career effectively. Nevertheless, the physical and mental health quality did not exhibit any significant variation based on the members' experience, indicating that these factors are not related to their well-being.

The rank variable indicated a significant disparity in the quality of life and career in favour of the "professors" category. Professors are content with their work and professional development thanks to their past accomplishments and the resources available to them through their experience and knowledge. In addition, factors such as quality of life, mental health, and family life did not vary based on institutional ranks. The results indicate that these factors are not influenced by individuals' positions and even holding a higher rank does not contribute to achieving the objective.

Humanitarians have a better understanding of factors such as family health, public health, and mental health due to their close connection to these areas. This specialisation has shown significant differences in how these factors are perceived. Nevertheless, the significance of career advancement and growth leaned towards the scientific field due to its specialised focus and the inherently challenging nature of its subjects.

This study highlighted the significance of faculty members' well-being and the importance of their quality of life. The study found that faculty members generally had a high quality of life, regardless of factors such as gender, age, and experience. Future research could explore the same findings by including a more diverse population and utilising various methods for data collection.

Recommendations

Ensuring the welfare of faculty members is crucial in educational institutions for both

the faculty and the students who interact with them. Based on the study conducted following recommendations can be suggested

1. Educational institutions can implement healthcare initiatives for faculty members, including health awareness programmes tailored for female faculty. These programmes can provide valuable information on various health issues, promoting a healthy lifestyle. Schools can create programmes tailored to specific genders and provide support for them. These programmes focus on discussing specific health issues related to each gender to address the issue, and faculty members can participate without any hesitation. Solutions are offered to address the problems and ensure equal health opportunities for all genders without any bias. It is important for institutions to support their members by implementing policies that promote work-life balance. This includes offering flexible schedules and the option to work remotely, enabling individuals to fulfil their commitments while still being able to attend classes and fulfil their responsibilities. Furthermore, offering parental leaves and childcare support, particularly for female employees, is crucial and can boost job dedication by enabling them to work remotely or bring their children to work in a comfortable setting.
2. Educational institutions should prioritise the mental well-being of their faculty members who often face stress from work overload. Providing counselling services and raising awareness about mental health are crucial steps to address this issue and eliminate societal stigma. Regular mental health assessments should be scheduled to identify individuals in need of assistance. Professional well-being goes beyond job satisfaction and work flexibility. It involves offering opportunities for growth through workshops, seminars, and on-the-job training for advanced skills that can boost career development. It is important for every institution to conduct longitudinal studies to track changes in the quality of life of faculty members over time. Monitoring studies conducted by other institutions can provide insights into effective policies for promoting faculty well-being.

Study Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be considered when relying on the findings. One limitation is the potential bias of faculty members, who were selected from a specific institution, making it difficult to generalise the results to the broader population. There is a potential for self-reporting bias as members may share information that is socially acceptable rather than expressing their true feelings and how their well-being is affected by workload. Additionally, the study focused on a limited number of variables such as gender, experience, status, and tenure in relation to quality of life. However, there are numerous other variables that could be explored, such as financial status, marital status, and environmental conditions etc. Furthermore, the significant factors that can impact the study were not explored, such as personal health, family support, and institutional culture, all of which affect quality of life in various ways. Our study solely concentrated on self-explaining measures without discussing any external factors that could affect the quality of life. This could raise concerns about the validity and reliability of our findings since we did not consider the impact of external factors for more precise results. The identified constraints offer guidance for future research to enhance comprehension of the topic by tackling these issues.

Future Directions

To improve the quality of life for faculty members from various geographical areas, it is

suggested to gather data from a variety of locations and institutions. This will help in obtaining findings that can be applied more broadly, leading to a better understanding of the behaviour, satisfaction levels, and well-being of faculty members. Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection is advised to gain a comprehensive understanding of the data and improve its validity. Comparing the benefits and challenges experienced by faculty members and other professionals can provide insights into their respective lifestyles. It is important to consider programmes that support work-life balance and mental health, as well as examining cultural and social perspectives to understand their effects on the quality of life and well-being of faculty members.

Study Implications

The results of the study hold significant importance for educational institutions and faculty members in improving their quality of life. The study suggested recommendations for enhancing strategies to support the well-being of individuals and ensuring a healthy work-life balance within a nurturing work setting that enables optimal performance. Educational institutions should consider investing in programmes that promote the well-being of faculty members. This can include offering flexible work timings, health management initiatives, and stress management programmes. Providing professional development opportunities is also crucial for faculty members to enhance their expertise and manage stress effectively. Faculty members should have the opportunity to contribute to decision-making in educational institutions because of their proximity to students and their understanding of the necessary requirements. By incorporating these policies into institutions, faculty members can enjoy improved well-being and quality of life.

Acknowledgement

The authors extend their appreciation to Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University for funding this research work through the project number (PSAU/2023/2/24992).

References

- Alves, P. C., Oliveira, A. d. F., & Paro, H. B. M. d. S. (2019). Quality of life and burnout among faculty members: How much does the field of knowledge matter? *PLoS One*, 14(3), e0214217. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214217>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands–resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bhardwaj, P. (2019). Types of Sampling in Research. *Journal of Primary Care Specialties*, 5(3), 157-163. https://doi.org/10.4103/jpcs.jpcs_62_19
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive Sampling: Complex or Simple? Research Case Examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Franco, L. S., Picinin, C. T., Pilatti, L. A., & Franco, A. C. (2021). Work-life balance in Higher Education: a systematic review of the impact on the well-being of teachers. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação*, 29, 691-717. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-403620210002903021>
- Gayathiri, R., Ramakrishnan, L., Babatunde, S. A., Banerjee, A., & Islam, M. Z. (2013). Quality of work life–Linkage with job satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of*

- Business and Management Invention, 2(1), 1-8. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/GayathiriRamachari/publication/374914414>
- 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. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259280583>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The Influence of Culture, Community, and the Nested-self in the Stress Process: Advancing Conservation of Resources Theory. *Applied Psychology, 50*(3), 337-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>
- Jemsittiparsert, K., Petchchedchoo, P., Kumsuprom, S., & Panmanee, P. (2021). The impact of the workload on the job satisfaction: Does the job stress matter? *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 20*(5), 1-13. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/the-impact-of-the-workload-on-the-job-satisfaction-does-the-job-stress-matter-11987.html>
- Kermansaravi, F., Navidian, A., & Yaghoubinia, F. (2014). The relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction of faculty members in Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. *Global Journal of Health Science, 7*(2), 228-234. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v7n2p228>
- Koyuncu, D., & Demirhan, G. (2021). Quality of work life, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior of teaching staff in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Governance and Policy, 2*(2), 98-109. <https://dergi.park.org.tr/en/pub/hegp/issue/67725/952143>
- Lazić, Z., Đorđević, A., & Gazizulina, A. (2021). Improvement of Quality of Higher Education Institutions as a Basis for Improvement of Quality of Life. *Sustainability, 13*(8), 4149. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084149>
- Lobe, B., Morgan, D., & Hoffman, K. A. (2020). Qualitative Data Collection in an Era of Social Distancing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 19*, 16094069-20937875. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920937875>
- Ngan, N. T., & Khoi, B. H. (2020). Behavioral Intention to Accept and Use Banking Service. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 7*(11), 393-400. [10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no11.393](https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no11.393)
- Ogunode, N. J., & Aiyedun, T. G. (2020). Administration of Science Programme in Nigerian Higher Institutions: Issues, Challenges and Way Forward. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 6*, 94-99. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2020.6.121>
- Opie, C., & Brown, D. (2019). *Getting Started in Your Educational Research: Design, Data Production and Analysis*. SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526480507>
- Özdogru, M., & Akyürek, M. İ. (2022). The Effect of Quality of Faculty Life on Student Loyalty. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 9*(4), 2003-2018. <https://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/1765>
- Pace, F., D'Urso, G., Zappulla, C., & Pace, U. (2021). The relation between workload and personal well-being among university professors. *Current Psychology, 40*(7), 3417-3424. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00294-x>
- Pedro, E. d. M., Leitão, J., & Alves, H. (2020). Bridging Intellectual Capital, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life in Higher Education Institutions. *Sustainability, 12*(2), 479. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020479>
- Purwanto, A., Purba, J. T., Sijabat, R., & Bernarto, I. (2021). The Role of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Innovative Work Behaviour, Quality Work Life, Digital Transformation and Leader Member Exchange on Universities Performance. *Linguistica Antverpiensia. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3987666*