

Exploring the Role of Mindfulness and Engagement in Enhancing Quality of Work life among Academicians: Insights from Kolkata's Academic Sector

**Bipasha Chatterjee ,
(Corresponding author)**

Research Scholar, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta & Assistant
Professor, Department of Psychology, Sister Nivedita University, India
Email ID: chatterjee.bipasha20@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-0431-8089

Koushiki Biswas,

Postgraduate student of M.Sc Occupational and Organizational Psychology, Sussex Business
School, University of Sussex).
Email ID: biswaskoushiki1307@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-4394-0526

Dr. Ishita Chatterjee

Associate Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta, India
Email ID: ishm55@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9271-9973

Cite this paper as: Bipasha Chatterjee ,Koushiki Biswas,Dr. Ishita Chatterjee (2024) Exploring the Role of Mindfulness and Engagement in Enhancing Quality of Work life among Academicians: Insights from Kolkata's Academic Sector. *Frontiers in Health Informatics, Vol.13(8) 5025-5043*

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the relationships between employee engagement, mindfulness, and quality of work-life and examined the potential predictive nature of employee engagement and mindfulness on quality of work life among academicians of Kolkata, India. A correlational research design was employed, with data collected from academicians working in colleges and universities. Standardized measures were used to assess employee engagement, mindfulness, and quality of work-life. Correlation and regression analysis were conducted to test the hypothesized relationships. The results revealed a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and overall quality of work-life, as well as specific dimensions such as general well-being, job-career satisfaction, and working conditions. Notably, the emotional and cognitive aspects of engagement demonstrated strong associations with work-life quality. Mindfulness exhibited a significant relationship with overall quality of work life and with the general well-being dimension. Both employee engagement and mindfulness emerged as a significant predictor of quality of work-life. The findings have practical implications for academic institutions, highlighting the importance of fostering employee engagement to enhance work-life quality and overall well-being among academicians. Tailored interventions and organizational support systems that promote emotional and cognitive engagement could contribute to a healthier and more productive academic workforce. This study extends the understanding of the intricate relationships between employee engagement, mindfulness, and quality of work-life within the academic population, a context that has been relatively understudied. It also contributes to the existing literature by exploring the unique challenges and demands faced by academicians, which may influence these relationships.

Keywords: Employee engagement, mindfulness, quality of work-life, well-being, work-life balance.

Introduction

In contemporary organizational discourse, the twin imperatives of employee engagement and quality of work-life have garnered significant attention owing to their pivotal role in driving organizational success and fostering employee well-being. Mental health emerges as a cornerstone issue, deeply intertwined with both employee engagement and the quality of work life. The modern workplace, characterized by relentless competition, rapid technological advancements, and ever-increasing demands, has become a fertile ground for the proliferation of mental health challenges. Amidst the myriad challenges posed by the contemporary work landscape, there exists a burgeoning field of research that offers promising avenues for intervention and enhancement. Central to this discourse is the concept of mindfulness—being in a state of profound awareness and willingness to embrace what is happening in the current moment without passing judgments. The word "mindfulness" is derived from the Pali word "sati," which means awareness, attentiveness, and remembering in ancient scriptures. (Pali is the original language used to record the Buddha's teachings.) In 1921, *sati* was originally translated as "mindfulness" in a dictionary (Davids & Stede 1921/2001). A moment-by-moment awareness of one's thoughts, feelings, physical sensations, and environment is called mindfulness. An individual's capacity to consciously focus on their experiences in the current moment is referred to as mindfulness (Coffey & Hartman, 2008). Trait mindfulness (or sometimes called dispositional mindfulness) refers to the innate capacity of paying and maintaining attention to the present moment with an open and non-judgmental attitude (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Being open, accepting, interested, kind, nonjudgmental, and accepting are all associated with mindfulness. Buddhist teachings provide the foundation for mindfulness (Garrison, 2021). Mindfulness is consciously concentrating on the here and now, without thinking about the past or the future, entailing acceptance of present-moment awareness and happenings. It promotes paying attention to ideas and emotions as they come to pass without getting too caught up in them, enhancing emotional regulation, cultivating attention to the present moment what they are, despite how difficult or uncomfortable they may be. This is a readiness to accept reality without opposition, not a sign of surrender. Using the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS) and other measures for mindfulness, Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietemeyer, and Toney (2006) also found negative correlations between dispositional mindfulness and psychological distress and positive correlations between dispositional mindfulness and measures of positive adjustment.

The management literature has seen a rise in the popularity of research on work engagement, which is defined as "[...] a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption" (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Kahn (1990) introduced the notion of job engagement as a means of gauging the degree of a worker's psychological presence or absence from the workplace. Research conducted worldwide indicates that highly engaged employees can significantly contribute to a company's success, often leading to significantly higher profit margins. This has sparked a growing interest in employee engagement over the past decade (Bakker et al., 2012). While assessing employee satisfaction has long been a common practice, it's now understood that engagement directly correlates with a company's business performance (Peter et al., 2014). Companies with high levels of engagement demonstrate a turnover rate that is 40% lower than those with low engagement levels (Gallup, 2019). These findings underscore the significant impact of employee engagement on organizational success and performance.

Work engagement is defined as “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s ‘preferred self’ in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 700). Employees with a high level of job engagement, for example, are psychologically present; *fully there*; and employ and present themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally throughout their role performance. Disengaged workers, on the other hand, act defensively and withdraw when performing their roles. Furthermore, engaged workers pay attention, connect, integrate, and accomplish tasks with emphasis. They are more sociable, eager to build relationships with coworkers, and inclined to give their all when performing their jobs (Kahn, 1992).

Quality of Work-Life (QWL) refers to the management of work and personal life in a manner that effectively meets the needs of both spheres. QWL focuses on providing opportunities for employees to participate in decision-making, enhancing job satisfaction, and enriching job roles, among other aspects. Among the first to use the term "Quality of Work Life" in research on how the workplace affects employees' performance was Mayo in 1960. The goal of quality of work life management is to foster an environment where employees are partners in sharing a common goal and other subjective indicators in a free, autonomous, and participatory manner. Research over the last decade has consistently emphasized the pivotal role of employee engagement and quality of work life (QWL) in organizational success, with engaged employees significantly impacting profitability and productivity.

According to Bhende *et al.* (2020) there is a general understanding that when employees have a higher quality work-life balance, they will be happier at work, which will positively affect their work-life balance. Daniel (2019) discovered that employee work performance, which in turn impacts organizational performance, is favourably and strongly correlated with a quality work life. It implies, therefore, that sustainability and attrition can be effectively controlled in an organization with strong Quality Work Life policies and systems. Employee involvement in decision-making will strengthen their sense of belonging and support the coherence's meaningfulness element. In their study, Kermansaravi *et al.* (2014) highlight the crucial link between job satisfaction and the quality of work life among faculty members, underscoring the potential for enhancing job satisfaction by manipulating various components of work life quality. They establish a significant positive correlation between these two constructs, indicating that an improved quality of work life is associated with heightened job satisfaction in faculty members.

Lyddy *et al.* (2021) have found that mindfulness reduces surface acting, look into the idea that mindful employees may be more prone to self-control depletion when they engage in surface acting, which could lead to unfavorable performance outcomes. Aránega *et al.* (2020) discussed the process of putting into practice a programme using an intrapreneurship approach, like mindfulness, which enhances emotional intelligence. The goal is for employees to use mindfulness to develop role self-awareness and enhance the workplace. Johnson *et al.* (2019) noticed mindfulness training raises awareness of the work and psychological environment as well as individual situations, it can help employees perform better at work and be more productive, behave well, and be happier in their jobs. Positive experiences with mindfulness training can help workers identify workplace-related problems, communicate with managers and coworkers, and increase productivity to better manage and control stress, strain, and conflict. The way that workers feel about their jobs and workplace can be impacted by meditation. Specifically, mindfulness training was crucial in lowering employees' stress, anxiety, burnout, and discomfort while raising their awareness, drive, positive emotions,

resilience, and general well-being. Additionally, the integration of mindfulness practices in the workplace has emerged as a promising strategy for enhancing employee well-being and organizational performance, with mindfulness shown to improve cognitive flexibility, emotional regulation, and overall health while reducing stress and anxiety. Together, these findings highlight the imperative for organizations to prioritize initiatives that promote employee engagement, support QWL dimensions, and integrate mindfulness practices to foster environments conducive to sustained success and innovation

Objectives of the research:

- To determine whether there is a relationship between employee engagement and quality of work-life among academicians.
- To determine whether there is a relationship between dispositional mindfulness and quality of work-life among academicians.
- To determine whether employee engagement predicts quality of work-life in among academicians.
- To determine whether dispositional mindfulness predicts quality of work-life among academicians.

Method

This research aims to explore relationships among Dispositional Mindfulness, Employee Engagement, Quality of Work-Life and their dimensions.

Hypothesis

→ H01: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and quality of work-life among academicians.

A. H01.1: There is no significant relationship between physical engagement and quality of work-life among academicians.

B. H01.2: There is no significant relationship between emotional engagement and quality of work-life among academicians.

C. H01.3: There is no significant relationship between cognitive engagement and quality of work-life among academicians.

D. H01.4: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and general well-being among academicians.

E. H01.5: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and home-work interface among academicians.

F. H01.6: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and job-career satisfaction among academicians.

G. H01.7: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and control at work among academicians.

H. H01.8: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and working conditions among academicians.

I. H01.9: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and stress at work among academicians.

→ H02: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and quality of work-life among academicians.

A. H02.1: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and general well-being among academicians.

B. H02.2: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and home-work interface among academicians.

C. H02.3: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and job-career satisfaction among academicians.

D. H02.4: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and control at work among academicians.

E. H02.5: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and working conditions among academicians.

F. H02.6: There is no significant relationship between dispositional mindfulness and stress at work among academicians.

→ H03: Employee engagement does not predict quality of work-life among academicians.

→ H04: Dispositional Mindfulness does not predict quality of work-life among academicians.

Operational definition of the variables:

➤ Employee Engagement:

The extent to which academicians actively participate in their job roles, exhibit enthusiasm, commitment, and investment in their work, and are mentally absorbed in tasks related to teaching, research, and other academic responsibilities. This includes physical engagement in job tasks, emotional connection to their work and workplace, and cognitive involvement in problem-solving, decision-making, and innovation.

➤ Quality of Work-Life:

The holistic assessment of "Quality of Work-Life" among academicians encompasses their perceived satisfaction, well-being, and balance in both professional roles and personal lives. It comprises several dimensions, including general well-being, reflecting their overall physical, mental, and emotional health; the home-work interface, assessing the integration of work and non-work responsibilities; job-career satisfaction, encompassing contentment with current roles and prospects for career advancement; control at work, measuring autonomy and influence over tasks and environment; working conditions, evaluating the quality of the academic workplace; and stress at work, reflecting the impact of job-related pressures on well-being and job satisfaction.

➤ Mindfulness:

The degree to which academicians maintain dispositional mindfulness i.e., moment-to-moment awareness of their thoughts, feelings, bodily sensations, and surrounding environment in a non-judgmental and accepting manner is what mindfulness is about. This includes the capacity to focus attention, regulate emotions, and cultivate present-moment awareness in daily activities, both within and outside the workplace.

A correlational research design has been used. Purposive sampling method has been used and the sample of 72 individuals has been selected based on the following inclusion and exclusion criteria. Participants were within the age range of 25 to 55 years currently working in a school or a university.

The tools used for assessing the variables were:

- *The Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS)* by Ryan, R.M., and K.W. Brown (2003).- It is a one-dimensional 15-item measure created to evaluate a fundamental aspect of mindfulness (acting with awareness): a receptive mental state in which attention simply observes what is happening in the present moment while being guided by a sensitive awareness of what is happening.

- *Job Engagement Scale (JES) by Rich et al. (2010)* - This 18-item scale is based on the seminal work of Kahn (1990), who described engagement as an employee's simultaneous and comprehensive application of their physical, emotional, and cognitive energies to their professional tasks. Kahn defines physical engagement as the amount of effort workers put in to fulfill their job duties, emotional engagement as the workers' feelings and emotional involvement in their work, and cognitive engagement as the workers' mindfulness and mental focus on their work.
- *Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale by Van Laar et al., 2007* – This is a psychometrically robust 23-item measure that assesses employees' perceived quality of life based on six psychosocial sub-factors (General Well-Being, Home-Work Interface, Job and Career Satisfaction, Control at Work, Working Conditions, Stress at Work).

Statistical computations were done using Mean, Standard Deviation, Shapiro Wilk Test (to determine the normality of the distribution), Spearman Correlation Coefficient, and Linear Regression Analysis.

Results

Table 1: Sample Characteristics:

Categories	N%
Age	
25 to 40 years	52.8%
40 to 55 years	47.2%
Sexual Identity	
Male	31.9%
Female	68.1%
Workplace	
School	52.8%
University	47.2%
Work Experience	
Less than 5 years	31.9%
5 to 15 years	22.2%
15 to 25 years	38.9%
More than 25 years	6.9%

Table 2: Shapiro Wilk Test for Normality

Variables	Shapiro Wilk Value	Significance Level
Employee Engagement	.946	.004
Physical Engagement	.847	.000
Emotional Engagement	.902	.000
Cognitive Engagement	.908	.000
Quality of Work-Life	.985	.577*
General Well-Being	.947	.004
Home-Work Interface	.960	.022
Job-Career Satisfaction	.984	.472*
Control at Work	.957	.014
Working Conditions	.951	.007
Stress at Work	.958	.017
Mindfulness	.934	.001

* Indicates that the variables are normally distributed at 0.05 level

As not all the variables are normally distributed, thus there is a significant difference between the obtained distribution and normal distribution. Hence, non-parametric statistics have been chosen for further analysis.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of variables under study:

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
Employee Engagement	77.0694	9.27715
Physical Engagement	25.9583	3.83254
Emotional Engagement	25.3750	4.26726
Cognitive Engagement	25.7361	3.43549
Quality of Work-Life	85.7778	10.75230
General Well-Being	21.2500	3.97439
Home-Work Interface	10.1806	2.36956
Job-Career Satisfaction	23.2778	2.98929
Control at Work	10.5278	2.12280
Working Conditions	11.1944	1.163275
Stress at Work	5.6806	1.86008
Mindfulness	64.6667	13.87368

Table 4:

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)
Employee Engagement and Quality of Work-Life	0.487**	0.000
Physical Engagement and Quality of Work-Life	0.200	0.093
Emotional Engagement and Quality of Work-Life	0.646**	0.000
Cognitive Engagement and Quality of Work-Life	0.509**	0.000
Employee Engagement and General Well-Being	0.431**	0.000
Employee Engagement and Home-Work Interface	0.101	0.397
Employee Engagement and Job-Career Satisfaction	0.662**	0.000
Employee Engagement and Control at Work	0.082	0.494
Employee Engagement and Working Conditions	0.417**	0.000
Employee Engagement and Stress at Work	0.006	0.960
Mindfulness and Quality of Work-Life	0.277*	0.018
Mindfulness and General Well-Being	0.249*	0.035
Mindfulness and Home-Work Interface	0.102	0.394
Mindfulness and Job-Career Satisfaction	0.212	0.074
Mindfulness and Control at Work	0.075	0.533
Mindfulness and Working Conditions	0.108	0.369
Mindfulness and Stress at Work	0.007	0.953

Relationship among the variables under study:

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

From Table 4, employee engagement has significant relationships with quality of work-life, and its subscales General Well-Being, Job-Career Satisfaction, Working Conditions. Similarly the subscales of Employee Engagement, Emotional Engagement and Cognitive Engagement have significant relationships with Quality of Work-Life whereas Employee Engagement does not have a significant relationship with Home-Work Interface, Control at work, Stress at Work as well as Physical Engagement does not have a significant relationship with Quality Work-Life. On the other hand Mindfulness does have a significant relationship with Quality of Work-Life and it's subscales except for General Well-Being. Therefore, we can say that hypotheses H01.1, H01.5, H01.7, H01.9, H02, H02.2, H02.3, H02.4, H02.5, and H02.6 have been accepted and hypotheses H01, H01.2, H01.3, H01.4, H01.6, H01.8, and H02.1 have been rejected.

Table 5: Linear Regression Analysis between Employee Engagement and Quality of Work Life and Mindfulness and Quality of Work-Life:

Criterion Measures	Regression Coefficient	R Square
Employee Engagement and Quality of Work-Life	0.499*	0.249
Mindfulness and Quality of Work-Life	0.350*	0.123

* Regression coefficients are significant at 0.05 level of significance.

As it can be seen from the table 5, 24.9% of change in quality of work-life can be attributed to employee engagement, thus H03 has been rejected. On the other hand, a relationship was found to be present between mindfulness and quality of work-life, therefore H04 has been rejected. So the 12.3% of change in quality of work life can be attributed to mindfulness.

Discussion

The key objective of this study was to investigate the relationship and effect of employee engagement and mindfulness on quality of work-life and its different aspects. Table 1 summarized the participants' demographic information, demonstrating a spread across two sexual identities in which 31.9% identified as male and 68.1% identified as female. The age range was 25 to 55 years, with the majority (52.8%) falling between 25 to 40 years and 47.2% falling between the age of 40 and 55 years. Participants all work in either school or university as teachers or professors. Their work experience varied in years from less than 5 years (31.9%), 5 to 15 years (22.2%), 15 to 25 years (38.9%) and more than 25 years (6.9%). Furthermore, Table 2 showed that the data collected for different variables had a non-normal distribution except for quality of work-life and its subscale job-career satisfaction.

Table 4 depicted the relationship between the variable under study using Spearman Correlation Coefficient, revealed multiple significant associations. Notably, there is a significant relationship of quality of work-life with emotional engagement and cognitive engagement. Moreover, employee engagement has significant relationships with general well-being, job-career satisfaction and working conditions. It also depicts that mindfulness has a relationship with general well-being, an aspect of quality of work-life. Given the strong link between employee engagement and quality of work-life, regression analysis was undertaken. Table 5 shows the regression results for employee engagement and quality of work life. The observed R-square value of 0.249 indicates that employee engagement can explain approximately 24.9% of the variance in quality of work-life.

The results indicate a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and quality of work-life, as well as with its subscales: general well-being, job-career satisfaction, and working conditions. These findings align with previous research highlighting the beneficial impact of engaged employees on various work-related outcomes (Bailey et al., 2017; Costa & Loureiro, 2019). Highly engaged workers tend to experience greater job satisfaction, positive well-being, and perceive their working conditions more favorably (Chandani et al., 2016). The emotional and cognitive dimensions of engagement, in particular, showed significant links with quality of work-life, underscoring the importance of employees

feeling emotionally invested and cognitively absorbed in their work (Gunasekara & Zheng, 2019).

Engaged employees experience flow, boosting their perception of well-being, job satisfaction, and working conditions. Conversely, a positive work-life balance with good well-being and reduced stress allows for stronger emotional investment and cognitive absorption in work, further fueling engagement. This reciprocal relationship is particularly evident in the emotional and cognitive dimensions of engagement, where feeling valued and having the mental space to focus amplify each other.

However, the results did not find significant relationships between employee engagement and other aspects of quality of work-life, such as home-work interface, control at work, and stress at work. Additionally, the physical engagement dimension failed to demonstrate a meaningful association with overall quality of work-life. These findings contradict some previous studies that suggested engagement could positively impact work-life balance and perceptions of control (Leitão et al., 2019; Puspitasari & Darwin, 2021). A potential explanation could be the unique demands and challenges faced by academicians, where the physical aspects of engagement may be less relevant to their work experiences. Alternatively, the measures used for these constructs or the specific academic context could have influenced the lack of significant relationships observed.

This divergence from some previous findings warrants further exploration. One potential explanation lies in the unique demands of academic work. Unlike many professions, the physical aspects of engagement might be less relevant for academicians. Their primary focus might be on intellectual stimulation and problem-solving, achieved through activities like research, writing, and teaching. This could explain the lack of association with physical engagement. Another possibility lies in the specific measures used or the academic context itself. The chosen scales for work-life balance, control at work, and stress might not have fully captured the nuances experienced by academicians. For an academician, however, work-life integration might be more relevant, where research or writing bleeds into evenings or weekends due to the nature of their projects and the passion they bring to their work. Similarly, "control at work" might translate differently for an academic. While they might not have direct control over curriculum or administrative decisions, they might have significant autonomy in shaping their research agendas and teaching styles. The culture within academia itself could be a factor. A strong sense of community and shared purpose among academicians might mitigate some of the work-life conflict and stress typically experienced in other professions. Further research that delves deeper into these possibilities and utilizes measures more tailored to the academic context could shed light on these intriguing null findings.

Remarkably, the results indicate that mindfulness does have a significant but low correlation with quality of work-life and its subscales, general well-being. These findings slightly contradict existing literature that has consistently linked mindfulness with improved work-life balance, job satisfaction, and reduced stress levels (Althammer et al., 2021; McNall et al., 2021). One potential explanation could be the specific nature of mindfulness interventions or practices employed in the organizations, which may have been less effective in influencing broader aspects of work-life quality. Alternatively, the academic context and unique challenges faced by this population might require tailored mindfulness approaches to yield more comprehensive benefits.

To delve deeper into the surprising modest impact mindfulness had on most quality of work-life aspects, the mindfulness interventions can be explored themselves. The organizations participating in the study might not have offered a comprehensive enough range of mindfulness practices. Perhaps they focused solely on meditation techniques, neglecting aspects directly applicable to work-life challenges. For academicians, incorporating practices like mindful communication or managing workload could be particularly relevant to their well-being.

There's also the possibility of a delivery method mismatch. Maybe the way mindfulness was introduced (e.g., workshops vs. individual coaching) didn't resonate with academicians' learning preferences or busy schedules. Exploring alternative delivery methods tailored to their needs, like shorter, more frequent online sessions, could be beneficial.

The analysis revealed that employee engagement can be responsible for the 24.9% of the variance in quality of work-life among academicians. This finding aligns with the Job Demands-Resources model (Bailey et al., 2017), which posits that engaged employees possess greater personal resources to cope with job demands, leading to more positive work experiences. The predictive power of engagement on work-life quality is also supported by studies highlighting its role in fostering job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment (Rasool et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2020).

This finding can be further explained by considering the specific characteristics of engagement and how they influence the quality of work-life for academicians. Engagement fosters a sense of meaning and purpose in work, which acts as a buffer against stress and burnout often associated with high workloads and long hours in academia. The feeling of being competent and capable that comes with engagement empowers academicians to navigate challenges and manage their work effectively, reducing feelings of overwhelm and contributing to a better work-life balance. The state of flow associated with engagement allows for deeper absorption in tasks, leading to increased productivity and a sense of accomplishment. This efficiency can free up time for personal pursuits and contribute to healthier work-life integration. For academicians who are passionate about their research and teaching, the boundaries between work and personal life can blur. Engagement allows them to find meaning and fulfillment in their work, potentially reducing the negative aspects of work-life conflict often experienced in other professions.

Interestingly, the results also indicate that mindfulness significantly predict quality of work-life among academicians. As per the result table, mindfulness can be responsible for the 12.3% of the variance in quality of work-life among academicians. This aligns with some previous research suggesting that mindfulness can enhance work-life balance and well-being by promoting attentional focus, emotional regulation, and acceptance (Lyddy et al., 2021; Taylor & Millear, 2016). However, it is important to note that the effectiveness of mindfulness interventions may depend on factors such as program design, duration, and individual differences in receptivity and practice (Shahbaz & Parker, 2021). Additionally, the unique demands and stressors faced by academicians might require more targeted mindfulness approaches to significantly impact their overall work-life quality.

The findings can have a few possible explanations. Academicians may vary in their ability to effectively engage with and apply mindfulness techniques in their work and personal lives.

Factors such as personal beliefs, motivation, and prior experience with mindfulness could have influenced the extent to which participants truly embraced and practiced the mindfulness principles. The academic environment or cultural context in which the study was conducted may have played a role in shaping the effectiveness of mindfulness interventions on work-life quality. Certain cultural norms, beliefs, or attitudes towards mindfulness practices could have influenced their impact on work-related outcomes. Potential confounding variables, such as job characteristics, organizational support, or individual differences, could have masked or diminished the effects of mindfulness.

Conclusion, Limitations, Implications

Conclusion

The present study investigated the relationships between employee engagement, mindfulness, and quality of work-life among academicians in India. The findings revealed a

significant positive association between employee engagement and overall quality of work-life, as well as specific dimensions like general well-being, job-career satisfaction, and working conditions. Notably, the emotional and cognitive aspects of engagement demonstrated strong links with work-life quality, underscoring their importance. However, no significant relationships were observed between employee engagement and aspects of quality of work life such as home-work interface, control at work, and stress levels, potentially due to the unique nature of academic work.

Mindfulness exhibited a significant relationship with quality of work-life and its dimension general well-being. This aligned with previous literature suggesting mindfulness enhances work-life balance and job satisfaction. Furthermore, employee engagement emerged as a significant predictor of quality of work-life, accounting for 24.9% of the variance. This finding aligns with theoretical models positing that engaged employees possess greater resources to cope with job demands, leading to more positive work experiences. Mindfulness also emerged as a significant predictor of quality of work-life, accounting for 12.3% of the variance.

Overall, the study contributes to the understanding of factors influencing the work-life quality of academicians and highlights the potential benefits of fostering employee engagement and mindfulness within academic institutions.

Limitations

While the present study offers valuable insights, certain limitations should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional nature of the data precludes inferences about causality. Longitudinal studies tracking changes in employee engagement, mindfulness, and work-life quality over time would provide a more robust understanding of the relationships.

Additionally, the study relied on self-report measures, which may be susceptible to response biases. Future research could incorporate objective measures or multi-source data to triangulate findings.

Another potential limitation lies in the generalizability of the results. The study focused exclusively on academicians in Indian metropolitan city, and cultural or contextual factors might influence the observed relationships. Replicating the study across diverse academic settings and regions would enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Future Suggestions

Based on the findings and limitations, several avenues for future research can be proposed:

- Exploring the role of mindfulness interventions tailored specifically for academicians, addressing their unique work-life challenges and demands. Examining the impact of such interventions on various dimensions of work-life quality could yield valuable insights.
- Investigating potential moderators or mediators in the relationships between employee engagement, mindfulness, and work-life quality. Factors such as organizational support, job characteristics, or individual differences might influence the strength and nature of these associations.
- Conducting longitudinal studies to establish causal relationships and examine the long-term effects of employee engagement and mindfulness on work-life quality. Such studies could also explore potential reciprocal relationships between these variables over time.
- Expanding the research to include a more diverse sample of academicians across different regions, institutional types, and cultural contexts. This would enhance the generalizability of the findings and capture potential variations in the observed relationships.

- Qualitative investigations could provide deeper insights into the lived experiences of academicians, shedding light on the nuances of work-life quality, engagement, and mindfulness within this population.

Implications

The findings of this study have several theoretical and practical implications that contribute to our understanding of the workplace, mental health, and organizational development.

Theoretical Implications

- The study contributes to the existing literature by extending the understanding of the relationships between employee engagement, mindfulness, and quality of work-life to the academic population.
- The results highlight the importance of considering the unique demands and challenges faced by academicians when studying these constructs, as some findings diverged from previous research in other contexts.
- The study supports the Job Demands-Resources model by demonstrating the predictive power of employee engagement on work-life quality, suggesting that engaged employees possess greater resources to cope with job demands.

Practical Implications for the Workplace

- Academic institutions can benefit from implementing initiatives and interventions aimed at fostering employee engagement, as it has been shown to positively impact various dimensions of work-life quality and overall well-being.
- By promoting emotional and cognitive engagement among academicians, institutions can enhance job satisfaction, productivity, and a sense of meaning and purpose in their work.
- Engaged employees are more likely to experience positive emotions, better coping mechanisms, and increased resilience, contributing to a healthier and more positive work environment.

Implications for Mental Health

- The significant relationship between employee engagement and general well-being among academicians highlights the potential mental health benefits of cultivating an engaged workforce.
- Engaged employees are better equipped to manage stress and maintain a healthy work-life balance, reducing the risk of burnout and other mental health issues often associated with academic professions.
- While mindfulness did not exhibit a significant impact on most work-life quality dimensions, its potential for enhancing general well-being should not be overlooked, and further exploration of tailored mindfulness programs for academicians is warranted.

Implications for Organizational Development

- By fostering employee engagement and promoting a positive work-life quality, academic institutions can contribute to the overall development and success of their organization.
- Engaged and satisfied employees are more likely to be productive, innovative, and committed to their institution, ultimately contributing to its growth and achievement of its goals.
- Recognizing the unique challenges and demands faced by academicians is crucial when developing strategies to enhance their work-life quality. Tailored

interventions and organizational support systems can help create a culture that values and supports the well-being of its academic staff.

- Investing in initiatives that promote employee engagement and work-life quality can lead to reduced turnover rates, improved recruitment and retention of top talent, and a positive reputation for the institution.

By addressing the limitations and expanding upon the findings through future research, a more comprehensive understanding of the complex interplay between employee engagement, mindfulness, and quality of work-life in the academic context can be achieved. This knowledge can inform the development of effective strategies and interventions to support the well-being, mental health, and overall success of academicians and their institutions, ultimately contributing to a thriving and sustainable academic ecosystem.

References

- Abdullahi, M., Raman, K., & Solarin, S. (2021). Effect of organizational culture on employee performance: A mediating role of employee engagement in Malaysia educational sector. *International Journal of Supply and Operations Management*, 8(3), 232-246.
- Ahmed, U., Umrani, W. A., Zaman, U., Rajput, S. M., & Aziz, T. (2020). Corporate entrepreneurship and business performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. *Sage Open*, 10(4), 2158244020962779.
- Ali, H. Y., Asrar-ul-Haq, M., Amin, S., Noor, S., Haris-ul-Mahasbi, M., & Aslam, M. K. (2020). Corporate social responsibility and employee performance: The mediating role of employee engagement in the manufacturing sector of Pakistan. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(6), 2908-2919.
- Althammer, S. E., Reis, D., van der Beek, S., Beck, L., & Michel, A. (2021). A mindfulness intervention promoting work-life balance: How segmentation preference affects changes in detachment, well-being, and work-life balance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94(2), 282-308.
- Aránega, A. Y., Núñez, M. T. D. V., & Sánchez, R. C. (2020). Mindfulness as an intrapreneurship tool for improving the working environment and self-awareness. *Journal of Business Research*, 115, 186-193.
- Axel Grund, Kerstin Senker, Motivational foundations of self-control and mindfulness and their role in study-leisure conflicts, *Learning and Individual Differences*. Volume 68, 2018, Pages 72-84, ISSN 1041-6080, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.10.007> .
- Baer, R. (2019). Assessment of mindfulness by self-report. *Current opinion in psychology*, 28, 42-48.
- Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods
- Baer, Ruth. (2007). Mindfulness, Assessment, and Transdiagnostic Processes. *Psychological Inquiry - PSYCHOL INQ*. 18. 238-242. 10.1080/10478400701598306.

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International journal of management reviews*, 19(1), 31-53.

Bakker, A.B., Tims, M., Derks, D., 2012. Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human relations*, 65 (10), Pp. 1359-1378.

Beloor, V., Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. R. (2017). Employee commitment and quality of work life—A literature review. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(2), 175-188.

Bhende, P., Mekoth, N., Ingalhalli, V., & Reddy, Y. V. (2020). Quality of work life and work–life balance. *Journal of Human Values*, 26(3), 256-265.

Borst, R. T., Kruyen, P. M., & Lako, C. J. (2019). Exploring the job demands–resources model of work engagement in government: Bringing in a psychological perspective. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(3), 372-397.

Brewer JA, Worhunsky PD, Gray JR, Tang YY, Weber J, Kober H. Meditation experience is associated with differences in default mode network activity and connectivity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011 Dec 13;108(50):20254-9. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1112029108. Epub 2011 Nov 23. PMID: 22114193; PMCID: PMC3250176.

Chandani, A., Mehta, M., Mall, A., & Khokhar, V. (2016). Employee engagement: A review paper on factors affecting employee engagement. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*.

Chen, P.Y., Cooper, C.L., 2014. Wellbeing: A complete reference guide, Volume III, Work and Wellbeing. Part 3 Happy Workers and Happy Organizations. Peter Hosie, Nada ElRakhawy, Bret L. Simmons. New York, NY, Pp. 113-139.

Coffey, K. A., & Hartman, M. (2008). Mechanisms of action in the inverse relationship between mindfulness and psychological distress. *Complementary Health Practice Review*, 13(2), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1533210108316307> .

Daniel, C. O. (2019). Analysis of quality work life on employees performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*, 8(2), 60-65.

Demerouti, E., Cropanzano, R., 2010. From thought to action: employee work engagement and job performance. In A. B. Bakker, M. P. Leiter (Eds.). *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*. New York: Psychology Press, 1447-163.

Gallup, 2019. Employee engagement. https://www.gallup.com/topic/employee_engagement.aspx

Garrison, R. (2021). A Buddhist context for mindfulness. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 77(4), 392-401.

Guest, D., 2014. Employee engagement: A skeptical analysis. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1(2), Pp. 141-156.

Gunasekara, A., & Zheng, C. S. M. (2019). Examining the effect of different facets of mindfulness on work engagement. *Employee Relations*, 41(1), 193-208.

Gunawan, H., & Amalia, R. (2015). Wages and employees performance: The quality of work life as moderator. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 5(1), 349-353.

Hassed, C. (2021). Mindfulness: Is it buddhist or universal?. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 49(1), 72.

Johnson, K. R., Park, S., & Chaudhuri, S. (2020). Mindfulness training in the workplace: Exploring its scope and outcomes. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 44(4/5), 341-354.

Kermansaravi, F., Navidian, A., Rigi, S. N., & Yaghoubinia, F. (2015). 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.

Khoury, B., Manova, V., Adel, L., Dumas, G., Lifshitz, M., Vergara, R. C, & Rej, S.(2023). Tri-process model of interpersonal mindfulness: theoretical framework and study protocol. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1130959.

Kusuma, A. (2021). The Role of Employee Engagement Mediates the Influence of Quality of Work Life on Employee Performance.

Lai, F. Y., Tang, H. C., Lu, S. C., Lee, Y. C., & Lin, C. C. (2020). Transformational leadership and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 2158244019899085.

Leitão, J., Pereira, D., & Gonçalves, . (2019). Quality of work life and organizational performance: Workers' feelings of contributing, or not, to the organization's productivity. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(20), 3803.

Liu, S., Xin, H., & Liu, J. (2020). The influence of individual and team mindfulness on work engagement. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 485693.

Lyddy, C. J., Good, D. J., Bolino, M. C., Thompson, P. S., & Stephens, J. P. (2021). The costs of mindfulness at work: The moderating role of mindfulness in surface acting, self-control depletion, and performance outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(12), 1921.

McNall, L. A., Tombari, J. M., & Brown, M. M. (2021). Exploring how mindfulness links to work outcomes: Positive affectivity and work-life enrichment. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 16(1), 167-182.

Monje-Amor, A., Vázquez, J. P. A., & Faiña, J. A. (2020). Transformational leadership and work engagement: Exploring the mediating role of structural empowerment. *European Management Journal*, 38(1), 169-178.

Pânișoară, I.O., Pânișoară, G., Sandu, C.M., & Chirca, R. (2019). STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MINDFULNESS AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE LEVELS IN THE ROMANIAN YOUNG POPULATION. *Revista de Pedagogie - Journal of Pedagogy*.

Perangin-Angin, M. R., Lumbanraja, P., & Absah, Y. (2020). The effect of quality of work life and work engagement to employee performance with job satisfaction as an intervening variable in PT. Mopoly Raya Medan.

Pradhan, R. K., Dash, S., & Jena, L. K. (2019). Do HR practices influence job satisfaction? Examining the mediating role of employee engagement in Indian public sector undertakings. *Global Business Review*, 20(1), 119-132.

Puspitasari, A. S. A., & Darwin, M. (2021). Effect of work-life balance and welfare level on millennial employee performance through work engagement. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 3(1), 334-344.

Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2021). How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(5), 2294.

Rich, B.L., Lepine, A.J., Crawford, E.R., 2010. Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53 (3), Pp. 617-135.

Rodrigues da Costa, L., & Maria Correia Loureiro, S. (2019). The importance of employees' engagement on the organizational success. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 25(3), 328-336.

Sahni, J. (2019). Role Of Quality Of Work Life In Determining Employee Engagement And Organizational Commitment In Telecom Industry. *International Journal for Quality Research*.

Sawal, M.S. (2023). Mindfulness and Life Satisfaction in Workplace Among Employees. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*.

Schaufenbuel, K. (2014). Bringing mindfulness to the workplace. *UNC Kenan-Flagler Business School*, 1, 13.

Schuman-Olivier, Z., Trombka, M., Lovas, D. A., Brewer, J. A., Vago, D. R., Gawande, R., & Fulwiler, C. (2020). Mindfulness and behavior change. *Harvard review of psychiatry*, 28(6), 371-394.

Shahbaz, W., & Parker, J. (2021). Workplace mindfulness: fundamental issues for research and practice. *Labour & Industry: a journal of the social and economic relations of work*, 31(2), 172-179.

Sharma, P. K., & Kumra, R. (2020). Relationship between workplace spirituality, organizational justice and mental health: mediation role of employee engagement. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 17(5), 627-650.

Siegel, R. D., Germer, C. K., & Olendzki, A. (2009). Mindfulness: What is it? Where did it come from?. In *Clinical handbook of mindfulness* (pp. 17-35). New York, NY: Springer New York.

Soni, B.S., 2013. Employee engagement - A key to organizational success in 21st century. *Voice of Research*, 1(4), Pp. 51-55.

Taylor, N. Z., & Millear, P. M. R. (2016). The contribution of mindfulness to predicting burnout in the workplace. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 89, 123-128. To explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment*, 13, 27-45.

Wang, C., Xu, J., Zhang, T. C., & Li, Q. M. (2020). Effects of professional identity on turnover intention in China's hotel employees: The mediating role of employee engagement and job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 10-22.

Wardani, L. M. I., & Anwar, M. S. (2019). The role of quality of work life as mediator: Psychological capital and work engagement. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(6), 447-463.

Wimmer, L., Bellingrath, S., & Von Stockhausen, L. (2020). Mindfulness training for improving attention regulation in university students: is it effective? And do yoga and homework matter?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 506100.

Zhang, D., Lee, E. K., Mak, E. C., Ho, C. Y., & Wong, S. Y. (2021). Mindfulness-based interventions: an overall review. *British medical bulletin*, 138(1), 41-57.