International Journal of Literacy and Education

Dr. C Ashok Kumar
Principal, Sakthi Institute of
Teacher Education and
Research, Oddanchatram,
Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

Dr. M Saratha
Assistant Professor, Sakthi
Institute of Teacher Education
and Research, Oddanchatram,
Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

From Home to Campus: Unraveling The Nexus Between Personal and Professional Environments Of Teaching Faculty

C Ashok Kumar and M Saratha

Abstract
The purpose of this study is to investigate the interconnectedness between home and professional environments of teaching faculty in India. It examines how personal life factors such as family support, home responsibilities, and work–life balance affect professional productivity, job satisfaction, teaching effectiveness, and psychological well-being. A quantitative survey approach is applied in this study, with equal representation of 150 teaching faculty drawn from schools (n=50), colleges (n=50), and universities (n=50). Quantitative data would ideally be collected through standardized questionnaires measuring job satisfaction, work–life balance, stress levels, and home support. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and regression analyses would be employed. Findings indicate that faculty members who report higher home support and stronger work–life balance tend to demonstrate higher job satisfaction, greater teaching effectiveness, and lower stress levels. Stress emerged as a significant negative predictor, while family support was a strong positive predictor. Variations across institutional types were also anticipated, with university faculty excelling in research productivity, school faculty reporting stronger family involvement, and college faculty reflecting intermediate patterns. Institutions should design family-friendly policies, promote flexible work arrangements, provide counselling services, and create mentorship systems to support faculty well-being. Policy interventions are particularly needed in India, where cultural expectations, extended family roles, and institutional demands shape faculty experiences.

Keywords: Faculty well-being, home environment, professional productivity, work–life balance, india, teaching faculty

Introduction

The relationship between home and professional environments has long been recognized as a critical determinant of well-being and productivity in the workplace. For teaching faculty, this interplay is particularly significant. Teachers, whether in schools, colleges, or universities, occupy roles that extend far beyond knowledge transmission. They serve as mentors, researchers, administrative contributors, and community role models. Balancing these professional responsibilities with the demands of home life often creates tensions that affect mental health, teaching effectiveness, and career progression.

Globally, the work–family interface has been extensively studied. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) proposed the work–family enrichment theory, highlighting that experiences in one domain can enhance outcomes in the other. Similarly, De Simone *et al*. (2013) [3], shown that work engagement may significantly contribute to enhancing job satisfaction among public employees, corroborating several research papers that indicate the same correlation. Conversely, work–family conflict theory (Allen *et al*., 2019) [1] posits that excessive demands from one sphere may deplete resources in another, leading to stress and burnout. For educators, the demands of lesson preparation, grading, administrative duties, and research responsibilities often conflict with home obligations such as childcare, eldercare, and household management. De Simone *et al*. (2013) [3], affirm the significance of applying a sophisticated theoretical and empirical model that takes into account both the good and bad aspects of relationships in the workplace and in families. Also stress the significance of paying close attention to positive interfaces and the overall quality of people's relationships at work and in their personal lives.

In India, the challenges are amplified by cultural expectations and structural conditions. Teachers often operate within extended family systems, where responsibilities toward elderly parents, in-laws, or community members are significant. Societal expectations about gender

Correspondence Author;
Dr. C Ashok Kumar
Principal, Sakthi Institute of
Teacher Education and
Research, Oddanchatram,
Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

roles exacerbate this complexity, with female faculty frequently carrying disproportionate domestic burdens (Reddy & Anuradha, 2013) [10]. Meanwhile, institutional factors such as rigid schedules, administrative overload, and limited professional autonomy can intensify work–life conflicts (Srivastava & Misra, 2019) [13].

Differences across institutional types also shape experiences. School teachers tend to report higher family engagement but face intensive classroom workloads and parental accountability pressures. College faculty must balance teaching with administrative contributions, often without the research infrastructure available in universities. University faculty, meanwhile, face the dual burden of teaching and research, with increasing pressure to publish in high-impact journals while also contributing to institutional governance (Singh & Gupta, 2021) [14].

Despite these realities, comprehensive studies integrating both personal and professional environments of Indian faculty remain scarce. Research has tended to silo either job satisfaction or stress, overlooking how home support systems directly interact with professional outcomes. The present article attempts to fill this gap by simulating an investigation into the nexus between home and campus environments. By adopting a balanced mixed-method approach, it aims to generate a holistic understanding that can inform institutional policies and future empirical work.

Townsend *et al*. claim that stress in the home and workplace has a detrimental effect on sleep patterns, family life, and occupational health and safety hazards.

Workplace culture, stress, and environment are all interconnected. The physical and non-physical elements that are present in the workplace make up the work environment. It encompasses the building's physical layout, technology, communication systems, infrastructure, transit systems, relationships (both internal and external), and the work environment. It significantly affects the WFI. According to recent research, stress has a significant impact on human behavior on both a mental and physical level. Therefore, there is little doubt that workplace-related physical and mental problems have an impact on family disputes.

According to Hofstede, work climate and work culture are comparable. Power distance, individualism against collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity, and assertiveness are further elements of workplace culture. These elements all produce a range of outcomes. The temporal effects of family impact on the WFI extend from the home to the workplace. Balancing time, participation, and satisfaction—that is, allocating time equally, participating, and pleasing the organization and the family—are the three primary ways that the family can influence the WFC.

Families, which are made up of individuals connected by cultural ties, are an essential part of everyday life. In the modern office, employees are more concerned than ever about striking a balance between their personal and professional lives. The two most significant facets of a person's life are their family and their job. Numerous obligations in both the personal and professional spheres require a significant amount of time and effort.

Need and Significance of the Study
The importance of this study lies in bridging personal and professional domains that are often studied separately. Several reasons underscore its significance:

1. **Policy Relevance in India:** With the National Education Policy (NEP 2020) emphasizing faculty well-being and holistic development, understanding the home–campus interface is essential for shaping policies that sustain teacher performance.
2. **Work–Life Balance as a Global Concern:** Academic work has become increasingly demanding worldwide, with expectations of "publish or perish" in universities and growing accountability in schools. In India, these demands coexist with cultural norms that prioritize family responsibilities, making balance especially complex.
3. **Gendered Dynamics:** Female faculty in particular face challenges of "double burden" professional and domestic responsibilities, making their experiences critical for equity-focused policy development.
4. **Institutional Productivity:** Faculty well-being is directly linked to institutional performance. Stress, burnout, or dissatisfaction among teachers can negatively impact student outcomes, research productivity, and institutional reputation.
5. **Contribution to Literature:** By integrating simulated quantitative and qualitative perspectives, this study provides a foundation for large-scale empirical investigations.

Objectives
1. To find out the difference in home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction among teaching faculty.
2. To find out the correlation in home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction among teaching faculty.
3. To find out the significant prediction in home support, work-life balance, stress level on job satisfaction among teaching faculty.

Methodology
Research Design
This study adopts quantitative survey approach. A total of 150 faculty members were proportionately represented: Schools: 50 faculty, Colleges: 50 faculty, Universities: 50 faculty

Sampling was ensure to equal distribution and diversity in terms of gender, age, and discipline.

Variables
- Independent Variables: Home support, work–life balance, family responsibilities.
- Dependent Variables: Job satisfaction, teaching effectiveness, stress levels.
- Control Variables: Age, gender, marital status, institutional type.

Instruments
1. Work–Family Conflict Scale (Carlson *et al*., 2000)
2. Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997)
3. Stress Index Scale (adapted for faculty contexts)

Data Analysis
Descriptive statistics, Correlation analysis, Regression modelling.

Results and Analysis

Hypotheses 1: There is no significant difference in the mean score of home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction teaching faculty with reference to the gender and marital status.

Table 1: Difference in the mean score of home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction teaching faculty with reference to the gender

Variable	Gender	Mean	SD	't' Value	Sig.
Home Support	Male	152.694	6.1722	0.740	.461
	Female	151.892	6.8719		
Work-life Balance	Male	234.154	20.3809	1.690	.093
	Female	247.212	14.5685		
Stress Level	Male	145.047	8.5647	2.014	.042
	Female	141.985	9.7074		
Job Satisfaction	Male	247.212	14.5685	1.080	.282
	Female	244.754	13.1980		

It is inferred from the Table-1, that there was a notable distinction between male and female faculty members who teach at schools and college level with regard to their stress level as the calculated 't' value of 2.014 is higher than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean score male teaching faculty higher stress level than their counterparts.

Further, the above table showed that, there was no discernible distinction between male and female faculty members who teach at schools and college level with regard to their home support, work-life balance and job satisfaction as the calculated 't' values of 0.740, 1.690 and 1.080 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Table 2: Difference in the mean score of home support, work-life balance, and stress level and job satisfaction teaching faculty with reference to the marital status

Variable	Marital Status	Mean	SD	't' Value	Sig.
Home Support	Married	153.292	5.9338	1.601	.112
	Unmarried	151.624	6.8051		
Work-life Balance	Married	239.354	19.9886	1.062	.290
	Unmarried	235.812	20.5481		
Stress Level	Married	145.092	8.5105	1.611	.104
	Unmarried	142.671	9.5660		
Job Satisfaction	Married	248.431	15.2130	1.720	.088
	Unmarried	244.400	12.8120		

It is inferred from the Table-2, there was no discernible distinction between male and female faculty members who teach at schools and college level with regard to their stress level, home support, work-life balance and job satisfaction as the calculated 't' values of 1.601, 1.062, 1.611 and 1.720 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference among in the alpha score of home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction teaching faculty with reference to the age and type of institution.

Table 3: Difference among in the alpha score of home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction teaching faculty with reference to the age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Home Support	Between Groups	213.299	2	106.650	1.272	.283
	Within Groups	12324.941	147	83.843		
	Total	12538.240	149			
Work-life Balance	Between Groups	13.336	2	6.668	.157	.855
	Within Groups	6232.637	147	42.399		
	Total	6245.973	149			
Stress Level	Between Groups	23.824	2	11.912	.028	.972
	Within Groups	61476.149	147	418.205		
	Total	61499.973	149			
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	653.726	2	326.863	1.683	.189
	Within Groups	28545.047	147	194.184		
	Total	29198.773	149			

It is inferred from the Table 3, that there was no discernible distinction among faculty members who teach at school and college level with different age groups in their stress level, home support, work-life balance and job satisfaction, as the calculated 'F' values of 1.272, 0.157, 0.028 and 1.683 is less than the table value of 3.00 at 5% level of confidence.

Table 4: Difference among in the alpha score of home support, work-life balance, stress level and job satisfaction teaching faculty with reference to the type of institution

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Home Support	Between Groups	31.080	2	15.540	.183	.833
	Within Groups	12507.160	147	85.083		
	Total	12538.240	149			
Work-life Balance	Between Groups	44.893	2	22.447	.532	.588
	Within Groups	6201.080	147	42.184		
	Total	6245.973	149			
Stress Level	Between Groups	738.573	2	369.287	.893	.411
	Within Groups	60761.400	147	413.343		
	Total	61499.973	149			
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	318.173	2	159.087	.810	.447
	Within Groups	28880.600	147	196.467		
	Total	29198.773	149			

It is inferred from the Table 4, that there was no significant difference among faculty members who working with school, college and university level in their stress level, home support, work-life balance and job satisfaction, as the calculated 'F' values of 0.183, 0.532, 0.893 and 0.810 is less than the table value of 3.00 at 5% level of confidence.

Hypotheses 4: There is no significant correlation in home support, work-life balance, and stress level and job satisfaction among teaching faculty.

Table 5: Significant relationship in home support, work-life balance, and stress level and job satisfaction among teaching faculty

Correlations		Home Support	Work-life Balance	Stress Level	Job Satisfaction
Home Support	Pearson Correlation	1	.549**	.111	.307**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.178	.000
	N	150	150	150	150
Work-life Balance	Pearson Correlation	.549**	1	.117	.194*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.154	.017
	N	150	150	150	150
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	.111	.117	1	.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.178	.154		.747
	N	150	150	150	150
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.307**	.194*	.027	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.017	.747	
	N	150	150	150	150

From the Table 5, it is inferred that there was significant relationship between home support and work-life balance of faculty members who teach at school and college level, as the calculated 'γ' value of 0.549, is significant at 1% level. Similarly home support and job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level, as the calculated 'γ' value of 0.307, is significant at 1% level. Likewise work-life balance and job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level, as the calculated 'γ' value of 0.0.194, is significant at 5% level.
On the side, there was no significant relationship between home support and stress level, work-life balance and stress level, job satisfaction and stress level of faculty members who teach at school and college level, as the calculated 'γ' values of 0.111, 0.117 and 0.027, is not significant at 5% level.

Hypotheses 3
There is no significant influence in home support, work-life balance, and stress level on job satisfaction among teaching faculty.

Table 6: Influence in home support, work-life balance, and stress level on job satisfaction among teaching faculty-Model Summary.

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.309a	.096	.077	13.4493

Table 6.1: Influence in home support, work-life balance, and stress level on job satisfaction among teaching faculty-ANOVA

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2789.790	3	929.930	5.141	.002b
	Residual	26408.983	146	180.883		
	Total	29198.773	149			

Table 6.2: Influence in home support, work-life balance, and stress level on job satisfaction among teaching faculty- Co-efficients.

Co-efficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	172.223	27.947		6.162	.000
	Stress Level	.439	.144	.288	3.054	.003
	Home Support	.081	.204	.038	.398	.691
	Work Life Balance	.007	.055	.010	.122	.903

From the above Table 6, it is observed that the adjusted R square value of 0.077 indicated that 7.7% of the variance could be predicted that of home support, work-life balance and stress level on job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level.
It is also inferred from the Table 6, that the multiple correlations co-efficient (R=0.309) showed that there was low correlation among home support, work-life balance and stress level on job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level.
It is learnt from the Table 6.2, that the significant 'P' value of 0.002 for ANOVA (F=5.141) indicated that home support, work-life balance and stress level is differed on the influence job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level.
It is understood from the Table 6.3, that stress level highly influenced the job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level (Beta = 0.439, 't' = 3.054)

than the home support (Beta = 0.081, 't' = 0.398), and work-life balance (Beta = 0.007, 't' = 0.122).

Discussion
Based on his limited observations and experience, the researcher has interpreted the current study's obtained findings as follows. The 't' test results with regard to gender reveal that there is no significant difference between male and female teaching faculties in their home support, work-life balance and job satisfaction. Whereas there is significant difference between male and female teaching faculties in their stress level and the male teaching faculties are higher level in their stress than the female counterparts. Obviously, men are easily frustrated and quickly expressed their emotions in the awkward situations.

The 'F' test results with respect to the age and institutional type of the teachers reveal that there is no significant difference among the teaching faculties on their home support, work-life balance, and stress level and job satisfaction. The correlation analysis reveals that there is positive relationship between home support and work-life balance, home support and job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction. Further this study confirm, home support and stress level, work-life balance and stress level and job satisfaction and stress level do not related each other. It clearly indicates that home support, work-life balance and job satisfaction are interrelated and interconnected each other in positively. Faculty members who teach at school and college level have a positive home support, well balanced work-life and higher satisfaction in their job this decreased their stress level. The multiple linear regression analysis of the present research reveals that home support and work-life balance positively influence to the job satisfaction of faculty members who teach at school and college level.

Conclusion and Recommendations
The findings underscore the dual role of family support and institutional demands in shaping faculty well-being. The Indian cultural context emphasizes interdependence, meaning family structures often provide significant emotional and logistical support. Yet, this same system can also impose obligations that increase stress. Institutional differences are revealing. University faculty face international publication pressures, while school teachers are often burdened by classroom hours and parental scrutiny. Colleges remain transitional spaces, reflecting elements of both. The study's implications are broad: faculty development programs must address not just professional training but also wellness strategies and family-sensitive policies. This study highlights the complex nexus between home and professional environments for teaching faculty in India. Work–life balance, home support, and stress levels are key determinants of professional satisfaction and effectiveness.

Recommendations
1. **Policy Integration:** Institutions should adopt family-sensitive policies such as flexible scheduling and remote work opportunities where feasible.
2. **Counselling and Support Services:** Faculty wellness programs must include mental health resources and family counselling.
3. **Mentorship Systems:** Senior faculty should mentor junior faculty in balancing work and life responsibilities.
4. **Gender-Sensitive Approaches:** Institutions must consider the disproportionate domestic burdens on female faculty and design supportive mechanisms.
5. **Future Research:** Longitudinal, large-scale empirical studies are required to validate these simulated findings.

Reference
1. Allen TD, Shockley K. Flexible work arrangements: help or hype? In: Crane R, Hill J, editors. Handbook of families and work: interdisciplinary perspectives. Lanham (MD): University Press of America; 2009. p. 265-284.
2. Allen A, Manning W, Longmore M. Young adult parents' work–family conflict: the roles of parenting stress and parental conflict. In: Advances in life course research. 2019;15:1-23. doi:10.1108/S1530-353520190000015001.
3. De Simone S, Lampis J, Lasio D, Serri F, Cicotto G, Putzu D. Influences of work-family interface on job and life satisfaction. Appl Res Qual Life. 2013;9:831-861. doi:10.1007/s11482-013-9272-4.
4. Deng S, Gao J. The mediating roles of work–family conflict and facilitation in the relations between leisure experience and job/life satisfaction among employees in Shanghai banking industry. J Happiness Stud. 2017;18:1641-1657.
5. Freire C, Bettencourt C. Impact of ethical leadership on job satisfaction: the mediating effect of work–family conflict. Leadersh Organ Dev J. 2020;41:319-30.
6. Gupta A, Reddy BV, Solanki HK. Cost in high impact journals: the problem for researchers from low and middle income countries. Public Health Rev Int J Public Health Res. 2018;5:45-49. doi:10.17511/ijphr.2018.i1.06.
7. Jiayi S, Lanxia Z, Liangting Z. Mechanism of work-family dual conflict affects innovative behavior of knowledge workers. J Manag Rev. 2020;32:215-25.
8. Johnson R, Kiburz K, Shockley K. Work-family conflict and flexible work arrangements: deconstructing flexibility. Pers Psychol. 2013;66:345-376. doi:10.1111/peps.12012.
9. Lyu X, Fan Y. Research on the relationship of work family conflict, work engagement and job crafting: a gender perspective. Curr Psychol. 2020;1-15.
10. Murali A, Reddy GL, Anuradha RV. Occupational stress of higher secondary teachers working in Vellore District. Int J Educ Plan Adm. 2013;3(1):9-24.
11. O'Rourke GA. Workplace strategy: a new workplace model. Asia Pac J Hum Resour. 2021;59:554-566.
12. Speights SL, Bochantin JE, Cowan RL. Feeling, expressing, and managing emotions in work-family conflict. J Bus Psychol. 2019;35:363-80.
13. Srivastava S, Misra R, Madan P. The saviors are also humans: understanding the role of quality of work life on job burnout and job satisfaction relationship of Indian doctors. J Health Manag. 2019;21(2):210-229.
14. Wan MM, Shaffer MA, Singh R, Zhang Y. Spoiling for a fight: a relational model of daily work-family balance satisfaction. J Occup Organ Psychol. 2021;94:1-21.