International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

Work–Life Balance Among Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions: Examining The Influence of Workload, Institutional Support, And Job Stress

Kavita Madhavrao Pawar[1] Dr. Manmeet Singh[2]
[1]Research Scholar , Oriental University, Indore
[2]Professor & Head of the Department Faculty of Management & Commerce Oriental University, Indore

Abstract - Work–life balance has become a significant concern in higher education institutions as faculty members are required to manage teaching, research, student mentoring, administrative responsibilities, and personal commitments simultaneously. This study examines the influence of workload, institutional support, and job stress on work–life balance among faculty members in Indian higher education institutions. Drawing on the Job Demands–Resources model, perceived organisational support theory, and work–family balance perspectives, the study proposes a quantitative framework to investigate the relationships between these variables. A cross-sectional research design using a structured questionnaire is proposed, with an illustrative sample of 300 faculty members. The analysis framework includes demographic profiling, descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression to assess the individual and combined associations of the explanatory variables with work–life balance. The illustrative results indicate a negative association of workload and job stress with work–life balance, while institutional support demonstrates a positive association. The hypothetical regression model suggests that job stress has the strongest absolute standardised association among the three predictors, followed by workload and institutional support. These numerical results are illustrative and must be validated using actual respondent data before being interpreted as empirical findings. The study provides a practical framework for understanding faculty work–life balance and highlights the potential importance of equitable workload allocation, supportive institutional policies, effective academic leadership, and systematic stress management. The proposed framework may assist higher education administrators in developing evidence-informed strategies to promote faculty well-being and sustainable academic performance.

Keywords: Work–life balance, faculty members, higher education institutions, workload, institutional support, job stress, faculty well-being

I. Introduction

1. Background Of The Study

Work–life balance (WLB) has become an important concern in human resource management because employees are expected to meet professional responsibilities while maintaining personal relationships, family obligations, leisure, and individual well-being. In higher education institutions (HEIs), faculty members perform multiple roles that extend beyond classroom teaching. Their responsibilities may include curriculum development, student mentoring, assessment, research, publication, grant applications, accreditation documentation, administrative duties, committee participation, and institutional development.

Although these activities contribute to academic quality and institutional performance, the simultaneous pursuit of teaching, research, and administrative objectives can create substantial time and role pressures. Faculty members may also be expected to remain available to students outside formal working hours, participate in institutional events, meet

research targets, and complete academic documentation within fixed deadlines. When these demands interfere with personal and family responsibilities, work–life balance may deteriorate.

The Indian higher education sector presents a particularly relevant setting for examining this issue. Institutions operate under differing governance structures, staffing arrangements, research expectations, promotion systems, and administrative requirements. Faculty members in public universities, private universities, autonomous colleges, and affiliated colleges may consequently experience different combinations of workload and institutional support.

Indian research has documented the relevance of work–life balance and quality of work life among higher education faculty. Punia and Kamboj (2013) examined work–life balance among teachers in higher education institutions and reported differences associated with academic designation, appointment type, academic stream, and institutional type. Arunachalam et al. (2024), using responses from 547 faculty members in India, examined quality of work life and reported differences across gender and academic specialisations. <Cite refs={["turn576685search0","turn576685search8"]}/>

Recent research has also examined occupational stress, faculty well-being, and the conditions that help academic staff manage professional demands. Sharma and Sengupta (2025), for example, investigated teaching demands and resources in private higher education institutions in India, identifying role ambiguity, workload stress, and emotional strain as important challenges in faculty work. <Cite refs={["turn504252search12"]}/>

The present study focuses on three explanatory factors: workload, institutional support, and job stress. Workload represents the demands associated with teaching, research, assessment, and administration. Institutional support represents the extent to which faculty members perceive their institutions as providing resources, flexibility, guidance, and consideration for employee well-being. Job stress represents the strain associated with occupational demands and the difficulty of managing competing responsibilities.

Work–life balance is treated as the outcome variable. The central argument is that excessive workload and job stress may be associated with poorer work–life balance, whereas effective institutional support may be associated with better balance.

2. Statement Of The Problem

Faculty members are expected to maintain teaching quality, support student learning, contribute to research, participate in institutional administration, and meet performance expectations. When these responsibilities are not accompanied by sufficient time, staffing, autonomy, and supervisory support, employees may experience difficulties separating work from personal life.

However, workload, institutional support, and job stress should not be treated as interchangeable concepts. A faculty member may have a demanding workload but maintain a reasonable balance if responsibilities are predictable and institutional support is strong. Conversely, even a moderate workload may create substantial difficulties when deadlines are unpredictable, administrative expectations are unclear, or supervisors provide limited flexibility.

The research problem is therefore to examine the separate and combined associations of workload, institutional support, and job stress with work–life balance among faculty members in Indian higher education institutions.

3. Research Objectives

- To assess faculty members' perceived workload and work–life balance.

- To examine the relationship between workload and work–life balance.
- To investigate the relationship between institutional support and work–life balance.
- To analyse the relationship between job stress and work–life balance.
- To determine the combined explanatory contribution of workload, institutional support, and job stress to work–life balance.
- To recommend practical measures for improving faculty well-being and work–life balance in higher education institutions.

4. Research Questions

- RQ1: What is the perceived level of work–life balance among faculty members?
- RQ2: Is workload negatively associated with faculty members' work–life balance?
- RQ3: Is institutional support positively associated with work–life balance?
- RQ4: Is job stress negatively associated with work–life balance?
- RQ5: To what extent do workload, institutional support, and job stress jointly explain variation in work–life balance?

5. Significance Of The Study

The study has significance for academic administrators, human resource managers, university leadership, faculty development centres, and policymakers. By distinguishing job demands from organisational resources, it provides a framework for examining how workload allocation, supportive policies, and stress-management practices may relate to faculty members' ability to balance professional and personal responsibilities.

The study also offers a quantitative reporting structure that can be applied to a real faculty survey. Its contribution should ultimately be evaluated against the findings generated from actual respondents rather than the illustrative statistics presented below.

II. Review Of Literature

1. Concept Of Work–Life Balance

Work–life balance refers to an individual's perceived ability to manage work-related responsibilities alongside personal, family, and other non-work activities. It does not necessarily imply equal time allocation between work and personal life. Instead, balance may involve achieving an acceptable level of satisfaction, involvement, and control across different life domains.

Greenhaus et al. (2003) conceptualised work–family balance through the extent to which individuals are engaged in and satisfied with work and family roles. Although the work–family concept is narrower than the broader work–life construct, it provides a useful theoretical foundation for studying competing role demands.

In higher education, work–life balance may depend on teaching schedules, assessment deadlines, research commitments, institutional meetings, supervisory expectations, family responsibilities, commuting time, and access to flexibility. Faculty members' perceptions may also vary according to academic rank, employment security, discipline, career stage, and caregiving responsibilities.

Punia and Kamboj (2013) examined work–life balance among higher education teachers in India and reported differences associated with professional and institutional characteristics. Their work supports the need to examine work–life balance in relation to the conditions under which academic employees work rather than assuming that all faculty members experience the same challenges.

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

2. Workload And Work–Life Balance

Workload refers to the amount, intensity, complexity, and time requirements of assigned professional responsibilities. In higher education, workload may include classroom teaching, preparation, assessment, student supervision, research, publication, administrative work, accreditation tasks, and institutional service.

Workload is not necessarily harmful in every circumstance. Manageable and meaningful work can provide professional satisfaction and opportunities for development. However, excessive workload, insufficient time, overlapping deadlines, and frequent interruptions may restrict employees' ability to fulfil personal responsibilities.

The job demands–resources model proposed by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) explains that job demands require sustained physical or psychological effort and may contribute to strain when resources are insufficient. In an academic environment, heavy teaching schedules, research expectations, and administrative requirements may become particularly difficult when institutions do not provide adequate support.

Sharma and Sengupta (2025) examined faculty experiences in private higher education institutions in India and identified workload stress and role ambiguity as relevant teaching demands. Their study provides contextual support for investigating workload as an explanatory factor in faculty well-being.

Workload should therefore be assessed through more than the number of classroom hours. A meaningful assessment should include preparation, grading, research, administrative duties, and work performed outside formal institutional hours.

On this basis, the present study proposes that increasing workload is associated with poorer work–life balance.

3. Institutional Support And Work–Life Balance

Institutional support refers to employees' perceptions that their organisation provides resources, guidance, flexibility, fair treatment, and consideration for their well-being. In higher education, this support may include reasonable workload allocation, supportive leadership, administrative assistance, access to research resources, flexibility in scheduling, leave arrangements, and transparent performance expectations.

Institutional support can be understood through perceived organisational support theory. Eisenberger et al. (1986) argued that employees develop general beliefs about the extent to which an organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Although this theory was not developed specifically for universities, it provides a relevant explanation for why faculty members may respond positively to supportive organisational practices.

Institutional support may help faculty members manage competing responsibilities by reducing avoidable administrative burdens, providing predictable schedules, and ensuring that performance expectations are achievable. Supportive supervisors may also make it easier for faculty members to discuss workload concerns before they become severe.

Indian research on the quality of work life among higher education faculty has emphasised the importance of institutional conditions for faculty satisfaction and well-being. Arunachalam et al. (2024) reported that faculty perceptions differed across relevant demographic and academic groups, indicating that institutional policies may need to account for varied employee experiences.

Institutional support is not simply the existence of formal policies. Its effectiveness depends on whether employees can access those policies in practice. A university may have a leave policy or flexible-working arrangement, but its benefits may be limited if employees fear negative performance evaluations for using it.

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

Accordingly, the study hypothesises a positive relationship between perceived institutional support and work–life balance.

4. Job Stress And Work–Life Balance

Job stress refers to the psychological or emotional strain associated with occupational demands that individuals perceive as difficult to manage. In higher education, potential sources include excessive responsibilities, time pressure, unclear expectations, conflicting instructions, limited resources, student-related concerns, job insecurity, and pressure to produce research outputs.

Stress may interfere with work–life balance when occupational concerns continue beyond formal working hours or reduce the time and energy available for personal activities. Faculty members experiencing persistent stress may find it difficult to disengage from work, recover after demanding days, or participate in family and social activities.

Solanki and Mandaviya (2021) examined job stress, work–life balance, health, and job satisfaction among university teachers in India. Their study, conducted with 86 respondents in Gujarat, reported gender-related differences in certain aspects of stress and work–life experience. The study supports the relevance of examining stress in relation to faculty members' work and personal lives.

Rao et al. (2025) also investigated occupational stress among faculty members in higher education institutions in Andhra Pradesh, addressing factors such as workload and role ambiguity. This regional research highlights the importance of understanding stress within the institutional and professional conditions experienced by academic staff.

Job stress should be distinguished from workload. Workload is a job demand, whereas stress is a psychological response or experience that may arise from workload and other circumstances. Faculty members facing similar workloads may experience different levels of stress because of differences in autonomy, resources, experience, coping strategies, and support.

The study therefore proposes a negative relationship between job stress and work–life balance.

5. Indian Research On Faculty Well-Being And Work–Life Balance

Indian studies provide an expanding evidence base on the conditions affecting faculty well-being.

Punia and Kamboj (2013) examined quality of work–life balance among teachers in higher education institutions. Their findings suggest that institutional and professional characteristics are relevant when assessing faculty experiences.

Solanki and Mandaviya (2021) studied job stress and work–life balance among university teachers in Gujarat. Their research provides a direct Indian context for the relationship between occupational strain and faculty work–life outcomes.

Kashyap et al. (2022) examined decent-work dimensions and work engagement among faculty members in Indian higher education institutions, using data from 293 faculty members. Their findings indicated that access to health care and complementary values were significant predictors of work engagement. Although engagement is not identical to work–life balance, the study highlights the relevance of employment conditions and institutional resources to faculty experiences.

Arunachalam et al. (2024) investigated quality of work life among 547 faculty members in Indian higher education institutions. Their study reported that 73% of respondents

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

expressed satisfaction with their quality of work life, while perceptions of several dimensions differed across gender and academic specialisations.

Jamunarani and Syed (2024) examined antecedents and outcomes of work–life balance among women faculty members in India, providing a gender-focused perspective on the management of professional and personal responsibilities.

Dewangan and Goswami (2025) examined organisational role stress, quality of work life, organisational citizenship behaviour, and psychological well-being among university faculty members. Their research reflects the importance of considering stress and work quality within a broader framework of faculty well-being.

These studies indicate that work–life balance should be examined in relation to both job demands and institutional resources. The present study contributes a focused model that places workload, institutional support, and job stress together as predictors of work–life balance.

6. Research Gap

Existing Indian research has examined faculty work–life balance, quality of work life, occupational stress, engagement, and organisational conditions. The literature therefore does not support a broad claim that the topic has never been studied.

The specific research opportunity addressed here is the integrated assessment of three distinct constructs—workload, institutional support, and job stress—in a single regression model predicting faculty members' work–life balance.

This integration permits the researcher to distinguish the statistical association of workload from that of stress while also considering the potential contribution of institutional support. It can help establish whether institutional support remains positively associated with work–life balance when workload and job stress are included in the same model.

The contribution is consequently one of contextual integration and comparative analysis rather than a claim of entirely new theory. Its empirical value will depend on the quality of the sampling strategy, the validity of the measures, and the findings obtained from actual respondents.

III. Theoretical Framework

1. Job Demands–Resources Model

The job demands–resources (JD–R) model provides the principal theoretical foundation for the study. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) distinguish between job demands, which require sustained effort, and job resources, which help employees achieve goals, manage demands, and maintain motivation.

For faculty members, workload and job stress represent demand-related constructs, while institutional support represents a potentially important organisational resource. Excessive demands may be associated with poorer work–life balance, whereas supportive institutional conditions may help employees manage their responsibilities.

The JD–R framework is appropriate because it recognises that employee outcomes are shaped not only by the volume of work but also by the resources available to manage it.

2. Work–Family And Role-Balance Perspective

Greenhaus et al. (2003) conceptualised work–family balance in terms of involvement and satisfaction across work and family roles. This perspective helps explain why the effects of workload may extend beyond the workplace: demands in one domain can restrict participation and satisfaction in another.

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

In the present study, the broader term work–life balance includes family and non-family personal responsibilities. The questionnaire should therefore include items that capture the perceived fit between professional obligations and life outside work.

3. Perceived Organisational Support

Perceived organisational support theory provides a rationale for examining institutional support. When faculty members believe that their institution values their contributions and considers their well-being, they may have greater access to the resources and flexibility needed to manage professional and personal responsibilities.

The study uses this perspective to explain why institutional support may be positively associated with work–life balance. It does not assume that support automatically eliminates workload or stress.

4. Conceptual Framework

The proposed framework is:

1. Workload → Work–life balance (negative relationship)

2. Institutional support → Work–life balance (positive relationship)

3. Job stress → Work–life balance (negative relationship)

The three explanatory variables are entered simultaneously into the regression model. This enables the analysis to estimate each variable's unique statistical association with work–life balance while controlling for the other two predictors.

IV. Research Hypotheses

- **H1:** Workload has a negative and statistically significant association with work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- **H2:** Institutional support has a positive and statistically significant association with work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- **H3:** Job stress has a negative and statistically significant association with work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- **H4:** Workload, institutional support, and job stress jointly explain a statistically significant proportion of variation in faculty members' work–life balance.
- **H5:** Workload, institutional support, and job stress differ in their relative statistical contributions to work–life balance.
- H5 is exploratory and comparative. It should not be interpreted as claiming that one predictor is significantly stronger than another without a suitable statistical comparison of the coefficients.

V. Research Methodology

1. Research Design

The study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory research design. Data are proposed to be collected through a structured questionnaire from faculty members employed in higher education institutions in India.

The design is suitable for assessing associations among workload, institutional support, job stress, and work–life balance at one point in time. However, cross-sectional data cannot establish causality or determine whether workload precedes stress and subsequent work–life difficulties.

2. Target Population

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

The target population comprises full-time faculty members working in universities, autonomous colleges, and affiliated higher education institutions. Respondents may include assistant professors, associate professors, professors, and other eligible teaching faculty.

The actual study should define its geographic scope, participating institutions, eligibility criteria, and sampling frame. If the survey is conducted only in Maharashtra or another selected region, the findings should be described as relating to the sampled institutions rather than the entire Indian higher education sector.

3. Sample Size

For the worked example, the analysis assumes **300 valid responses**.

This sample size is illustrative. It is not evidence that 300 actual questionnaires have been collected. The final sample size should be justified through an a priori power analysis that considers the expected effect size, number of predictors, significance level, statistical power, sampling design, and anticipated non-response.

4. Sampling Technique

A stratified sampling strategy is recommended where a reliable sampling frame is available. Faculty members could be stratified by institution type, academic designation, and discipline, followed by random selection within each stratum.

Where institutional access is limited, purposive or convenience sampling may be necessary. In that case, the researcher should disclose the approach and avoid claiming that the results are representative of all Indian higher education faculty.

5. Data Collection Instrument

A structured questionnaire should contain two sections.

Section A: Demographic and employment information

1. Gender
2. Age group
3. Marital status, if relevant and voluntarily provided
4. Educational qualification
5. Academic designation
6. Type of institution
7. Years of teaching experience
8. Average weekly working hours

6. Section B: Construct Measurement

Each construct may be measured using five items adapted from relevant established scales and reviewed for suitability to the Indian higher education context.

A five-point Likert scale is proposed:

1=Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

The questionnaire should be pilot-tested to evaluate clarity, completion time, content validity, and potential ambiguity. Reverse-coded items, if used, must be recoded correctly before computing composite scores.

7. Operationalisation Of Variables

Construct	Measurement focus	Role in the model
Workload	Teaching hours, assessment, research demands, administrative work, deadline pressure	Independent variable
Institutional support	Supervisor support, workload flexibility, administrative assistance, leave flexibility, concern for faculty well-being	Independent variable
Job stress	Work-related strain, time pressure, role conflict, difficulty recovering from work	Independent variable
Work–life balance	Ability to manage work and personal responsibilities, time for non-work activities, satisfaction with balance	Dependent variable

The constructs should be measured distinctly. In particular, job stress items should not simply repeat workload items, and work–life balance items should not duplicate the institutional-support scale.

8. Proposed Statistical Analysis

The following statistical procedures are proposed:

1. Frequency and percentage analysis for demographic variables.

2. Mean and standard deviation for the study constructs.

3. Cronbach's alpha to assess internal consistency.

4. Pearson correlation analysis to examine bivariate associations.

5. Multiple linear regression to assess the unique and combined associations of the three predictors with work–life balance.

6. Diagnostic checks for multicollinearity, linearity, homoscedasticity, residual behaviour, and influential observations.

Cronbach's alpha does not establish construct validity by itself. For a publication-ready study, exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis should be considered, depending on whether the measurement structure is established and whether the sample supports the analysis.

9. Regression Model

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

The proposed regression equation is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
WLB =;& \beta_0+\beta_1 WL+\beta_2 IS\\
&+\beta_3 JS+\varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

Where:

- (WLB) = work–life balance
- (WL) = workload
- (IS) = institutional support
- (JS) = job stress
- (β_0) = intercept
- (β_1,β_2,β_3) = regression coefficients
- (ε) = error term
- The expected signs are ($\beta_1<0$), ($\beta_2>0$), and ($\beta_3<0$).

10. Ethical Considerations

Participation should be voluntary. Respondents should be informed about the purpose of the study, the confidentiality of their responses, and their right to withdraw where applicable. No unnecessary identifying information should be collected. Institutional permissions and ethics approval should be obtained where required.

Because job stress and institutional support may be sensitive subjects, data collection should minimise the possibility that individual responses can be identified by supervisors or institutional management.

VI. Data Analysis And Results

Important: Every numerical value in Sections 6.1–6.6 is illustrative. The tables demonstrate how an empirical paper could report results for a hypothetical sample of 300 faculty members. They are not actual survey findings and should not be represented as such.

1. Demographic Profile

Demographic variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Men	165	55.0
	Women	132	44.0
	Prefer not to say / other	3	1.0
Age	Below 30 years	48	16.0
	30–39 years	102	34.0
	40–49 years	90	30.0
	50 years and above	60	20.0
Designation	Assistant Professor	165	55.0
	Associate Professor	81	27.0
	Professor	54	18.0
Institution type	Public institution	114	38.0

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

Demographic variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
	Private institution	186	62.0
Teaching experience	Below 5 years	72	24.0
	5–10 years	93	31.0
	11–15 years	69	23.0
	Above 15 years	66	22.0

Table 1. Illustrative demographic profile of respondents (N = 300)

Note: Illustrative values only.

Interpretation: In the hypothetical sample, 55% of respondents are men and 44% are women. Faculty members aged 30–39 years represent the largest age group (34%). Assistant professors constitute 55% of the sample, while respondents employed in private institutions account for 62%. The largest teaching-experience category is five to ten years (31%).

This profile demonstrates how the sample may be described. It does not establish the demographic composition of the wider Indian faculty population. Such a conclusion would require an appropriate sampling frame and evidence that the selection process represents the target population.

2. Descriptive Statistics

Table 2. Illustrative descriptive statistics of study constructs

Construct	Number of items	Mean	Standard deviation
Workload	5	3.82	0.72
Institutional support	5	3.21	0.81
Job stress	5	3.58	0.77
Work–life balance	5	3.14	0.79

Note: All values are hypothetical. Each construct is assumed to be measured on a five-point Likert scale.

Interpretation: In the illustrative results, workload has the highest mean score (3.82), followed by job stress (3.58). Institutional support has a mean of 3.21, while work–life balance has the lowest mean score (3.14).

The hypothetical pattern suggests that respondents may perceive considerable professional demands while reporting comparatively modest work–life balance. The institutional-support mean is above the scale midpoint but lower than the workload and stress means. These descriptive differences do not, by themselves, establish statistically significant differences between constructs or prove that workload is excessive. Such conclusions require actual data and appropriate inferential analysis.

3. Reliability Analysis

Table 3. Illustrative reliability analysis

Construct	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha	Assessment
Workload	5	0.84	Good internal consistency

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

Construct	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha	Assessment
Institutional support	5	0.87	Good internal consistency
Job stress	5	0.85	Good internal consistency
Work–life balance	5	0.88	Good internal consistency

Note: These are simulated coefficients, not results calculated from respondent-level data.

Interpretation: The illustrative alpha values range from 0.84 to 0.88. Values above 0.70 are often regarded as acceptable for research purposes, subject to the characteristics of the scale and its intended use. The table demonstrates a conventional reporting format; it does not establish the reliability of any actual questionnaire.

The final study should calculate reliability from the observed item responses and examine whether each construct is sufficiently unidimensional. A high alpha does not prove that the items measure the intended construct or that the four constructs are distinct.

4. Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation is proposed to examine the direction and strength of the bivariate relationships among workload, institutional support, job stress, and work–life balance.

Table 4. Illustrative Pearson correlation matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Workload	1.00			
2. Institutional support	-0.28	1.00		
3. Job stress	0.56	-0.41	1.00	
4. Work–life balance	-0.45	0.48	-0.57	1.00

Note: Correlation coefficients are illustrative. Significance levels have not been assigned because no real observations were analysed.

Interpretation: In the hypothetical matrix, workload is negatively correlated with work–life balance ((r=-0.45)). This would indicate that higher workload scores tend to accompany lower work–life balance scores.

Institutional support has a positive correlation with work–life balance ((r=0.48)), suggesting that respondents who perceive stronger institutional support also tend to report better balance. Job stress has the strongest absolute bivariate correlation with work–life balance ((r=-0.57)), indicating that greater reported stress tends to accompany poorer balance in the illustrative example.

Workload is positively correlated with job stress ((r=0.56)), while institutional support is negatively correlated with job stress ((r=-0.41)). These patterns are theoretically plausible, but they do not demonstrate causation. The final study must calculate the coefficients and their confidence intervals or p-values from the actual data.

5. Multiple Regression Analysis

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

Multiple linear regression is proposed to examine the unique statistical association of workload, institutional support, and job stress with work–life balance.

Table 5. Illustrative regression model summary

Statistic	Illustrative value
R	0.681
R^2	0.464
Adjusted R^2	0.458
Standard error of estimate	0.580
F-statistic	85.3
Degrees of freedom	3, 296
Model significance	$p < 0.001$

Note: These values are illustrative and have not been estimated from actual observations.

Interpretation: In the hypothetical example, the model explains 46.4% of the variation in work–life balance ((R^2=0.464)), while the adjusted (R^2) is 0.458. The illustrative overall F-test indicates that the predictors jointly explain a statistically significant proportion of variation in the dependent variable.

If these results were reproduced using actual survey data, the model would indicate that workload, institutional support, and job stress jointly contribute to explaining differences in work–life balance. The remaining variation could be associated with other factors, including family responsibilities, autonomy, commuting time, leadership practices, job security, individual circumstances, and measurement error.

Table 6. Illustrative regression coefficients

Predictor	Standardised beta (β)	t-statistic	Significance	Illustrative direction
Workload	-0.24	-4.91	$p < 0.001$	Negative
Institutional support	0.22	4.76	$p < 0.001$	Positive
Job stress	-0.36	-7.21	$p < 0.001$	Negative

Note: The coefficients and test statistics are simulated. The final values must be calculated from actual data.

Interpretation of workload: The illustrative standardised coefficient for workload is negative ((\beta=-0.24)). If supported by actual data, this would indicate that higher workload is associated with lower work–life balance after controlling for institutional support and job stress. This would be consistent with the proposition that competing teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities may limit faculty members' capacity to manage non-work commitments.

Interpretation of institutional support: Institutional support has a positive illustrative coefficient ((\beta=0.22)). If confirmed empirically, this would suggest that faculty members who perceive stronger organisational support tend to report better work–life balance, even after accounting for workload and job stress. Supportive scheduling, administrative assistance, and fair workload allocation may be relevant areas for institutional intervention.

Interpretation of job stress: Job stress has the largest absolute illustrative standardised coefficient ((\beta=-0.36)). If the actual analysis produced a similar pattern, it would suggest

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

that job stress has the strongest unique statistical association with work–life balance among the three predictors in this model. This would not prove that stress causes poor balance or that reducing stress alone would resolve work–life difficulties.The regression coefficients must be interpreted with diagnostic checks. In particular, the relationship between workload and stress may produce multicollinearity, while self-reported measures collected in one questionnaire may create common-method concerns. The final analysis should report variance inflation factors, residual diagnostics, and confidence intervals for the regression coefficients.

6. Hypothesis-Wise Testing

Table 7. Illustrative hypothesis-testing summary

Hypothesis	Proposed relationship	Illustrative result	Decision in the example
H1	Workload → work–life balance	$\beta = -0.24$, $p < 0.001$	Supported in the illustrative model
H2	Institutional support → work–life balance	$\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.001$	Supported in the illustrative model
H3	Job stress → work–life balance	$\beta = -0.36$, $p < 0.001$	Supported in the illustrative model
H4	Three predictors jointly explain work–life balance	$F(3, 296) = 85.3$, $p < 0.001$	Supported in the illustrative model
H5	Relative strength of predictor associations	Job stress has the largest absolute illustrative beta	Descriptive comparison only; formal coefficient comparison required

Note: These decisions are based on hypothetical statistics and must not be presented as empirical findings.

Interpretation: In the illustrative model, all three predictors have the expected coefficient signs and are shown as statistically significant. If the same results were obtained from real survey data, H1–H3 would be supported. H4 would be supported if the overall regression test were statistically significant.

H5 requires additional caution. The absolute standardised beta for job stress is larger than those for workload and institutional support in the hypothetical results. However, this numerical difference does not by itself prove that the coefficients differ significantly from one another. A formal comparison or appropriate confidence-interval analysis is needed before making that claim.

VII. Discussion

The proposed study examines whether workload, institutional support, and job stress are associated with faculty members' work–life balance in higher education institutions. The illustrative findings show how the results could be interpreted if a real survey produced a similar pattern.

1. Workload And Work–Life Balance

The illustrative negative coefficient for workload ((\beta=-0.24)) is consistent with the proposition that greater professional demands may be associated with poorer work–life

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

balance. Faculty responsibilities often extend beyond formal classroom hours to include lesson preparation, assessment, research, student support, and institutional administration.

This pattern is consistent with the job demands–resources framework, which suggests that sustained demands can contribute to strain when resources are insufficient (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). It also aligns with Indian research that identifies workload-related pressure as a relevant concern in higher education faculty experiences.

If confirmed empirically, the result would support a more comprehensive approach to workload allocation. Institutions should assess the full range of faculty duties rather than relying exclusively on classroom teaching hours. Fair distribution of administrative responsibilities, predictable deadlines, and adequate support staff may help reduce avoidable time pressure.

2. Institutional Support And Work–Life Balance

The illustrative positive coefficient for institutional support ((\beta=0.22)) suggests that supportive institutional conditions may be associated with better work–life balance.

If actual results confirm this relationship, institutions should consider whether their policies provide practical assistance to faculty members. Such measures may include transparent workload allocation, supportive supervision, reasonable flexibility, adequate administrative assistance, and accessible leave arrangements.

The interpretation is consistent with perceived organisational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), which emphasises employees' perceptions that the organisation values their contribution and well-being. A policy is unlikely to produce its intended benefit if employees cannot access it or believe that using it will damage their career prospects.

3. JOB STRESS AND WORK–LIFE BALANCE

Job stress has the largest absolute illustrative standardised coefficient ((\beta=-0.36)). If replicated with real data, this would indicate a comparatively strong unique association between stress and work–life balance in the specified regression model.

This pattern would be consistent with the view that psychological strain can interfere with the ability to disengage from work and participate in personal activities. Indian studies examining stress among university teachers and occupational stress among faculty members provide relevant contextual grounding for investigating this relationship.

However, job stress should not be treated solely as an individual coping problem. Institutional conditions—including workload, role ambiguity, competing deadlines, resource constraints, and supervisory practices—may contribute to the strain employees experience. Sustainable interventions should therefore address both individual well-being and organisational causes of stress.

4. Integrated Interpretation

The proposed model distinguishes three related but conceptually different factors. Workload represents professional demands, institutional support represents organisational resources, and job stress represents experienced occupational strain.

A similar pattern in actual data would suggest that faculty work–life balance should not be addressed through a single intervention. Reducing unnecessary workload, strengthening institutional support, and addressing the sources of job stress may be complementary strategies.

The model does not test whether job stress mediates the relationship between workload and work–life balance. Such a mechanism is theoretically plausible, but it would require a

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

separately specified mediation analysis and appropriate evidence. It should not be claimed as an established finding from the present direct-effects model.

VIII. Managerial And Policy Implications

1. Comprehensive Workload Allocation

Institutions should assess teaching, assessment, research, mentoring, administrative duties, and committee responsibilities together. A transparent workload framework can help identify uneven distributions and reduce the concentration of non-teaching responsibilities among a small group of faculty members.

2. Reduction Of Avoidable Administrative Burden

Routine reporting, repetitive documentation, and overlapping administrative requirements can consume time that might otherwise be devoted to teaching, research, or personal recovery. Institutions should review reporting procedures, remove unnecessary duplication, and provide appropriate administrative support.

3. Flexible And Predictable Scheduling

Where academic and operational requirements permit, institutions may consider predictable meeting schedules, reasonable flexibility, and advance notice of major deadlines. Flexibility should be implemented fairly and transparently so that it does not create additional burdens for colleagues.

4. Supportive Academic Leadership

Department heads, deans, and supervisors influence how workload and institutional policies are experienced. Leadership development should therefore include workload planning, communication, conflict resolution, fair task allocation, and early identification of excessive demands.

5. Faculty Well-Being And Stress Management

Institutions can provide confidential counselling, employee assistance, stress-management programmes, peer support, and access to professional well-being resources. These measures should complement—not replace—organisational changes addressing excessive demands and inadequate resources.

6. Gender-Sensitive And Career-Stage-Sensitive Policies

Faculty members may have different work–life needs depending on caregiving responsibilities, career stage, disability, commuting arrangements, and other circumstances. Policies should be designed to provide fair access to support without relying on assumptions about any particular demographic group.

7. Continuous Monitoring

Institutions should periodically assess workload, institutional support, job stress, and work–life balance. Where appropriate, survey data can be considered alongside aggregate indicators such as staff turnover, absenteeism, leave use, and workload distribution. Longitudinal monitoring can help determine whether policy changes are followed by meaningful improvements.

IX. Theoretical Implications

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
ISSN: 2584-2455
Volume 4, Issue 3
May-Jun 2026, PP 1-19

The study contributes a proposed integrated application of the job demands–resources model, perceived organisational support theory, and work–family balance research to the Indian higher education context.

First, the JD–R model provides a basis for examining workload as a demand-related factor and institutional support as a resource-related factor. Second, perceived organisational support theory helps explain why employees' perceptions of organisational concern may be associated with more favourable work–life outcomes. Third, work–family balance research highlights the importance of employees' ability to participate satisfactorily in professional and personal roles.

The inclusion of job stress alongside workload is important because the two constructs should not be treated as equivalent. Workload concerns the demands placed on employees, while stress captures their experienced strain. Analysing both in the same model allows the researcher to examine their unique associations with work–life balance.

Nevertheless, the proposed direct-effects framework does not establish causal mechanisms. A longitudinal or multi-wave design would provide a stronger basis for examining whether workload predicts later stress and whether changes in institutional support correspond to subsequent changes in work–life balance.

X. Limitations And Future Research

Several limitations should be recognised.

First, the numerical results presented in this paper are simulated. They cannot be used as evidence of actual work–life balance among Indian faculty members. The primary requirement for an empirical publication is to collect valid data and replace the illustrative values with reproducible statistical results.

Second, a cross-sectional design cannot establish causality. Faculty members with poor work–life balance may report greater stress, but the direction and timing of the relationship cannot be determined from one survey.

Third, the use of self-reported questionnaire data may introduce social desirability, recall error, and common-method variance. Future studies could combine survey measures with workload records, timetable information, and longitudinal well-being assessments.

Fourth, faculty experiences vary across institutions, disciplines, academic designations, and career stages. Research based on a limited number of institutions should clearly state its geographic and institutional boundaries. Multi-institutional sampling would improve the basis for examining differences between public and private institutions.

Fifth, the model does not include all potentially relevant factors. Family responsibilities, autonomy, leadership quality, job security, commuting time, digital workload, and individual coping resources may also be associated with work–life balance. Future research could examine these variables when there is a clear theoretical rationale and sufficient sample size.

Finally, future studies should consider longitudinal designs, multi-level models for faculty nested within institutions, and carefully specified mediation or moderation analyses. Such designs could help distinguish individual-level perceptions from institution-level policies and practices.

XI. Conclusion

Work–life balance is an important concern for faculty members in higher education institutions because academic work combines teaching, research, student support, and administrative responsibilities. When these demands are difficult to manage, faculty

members may experience challenges in maintaining personal and professional responsibilities.

This paper proposes a framework examining workload, institutional support, and job stress as predictors of faculty members' work–life balance. The theoretical framework draws on the job demands–resources model, perceived organisational support theory, and work–family balance research. The methodology and statistical tables demonstrate how a quantitative study could assess the proposed relationships.

The illustrative results show a hypothetical pattern in which workload and job stress are negatively associated with work–life balance, while institutional support is positively associated with it. They also demonstrate how descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation, regression, and hypothesis testing can be presented in an empirical manuscript. These values are not actual findings and must be replaced with analyses of real survey responses.

For higher education institutions, the central implication is that faculty well-being requires coordinated organisational action. Fair workload allocation, effective administrative support, supportive academic leadership, predictable working arrangements, and attention to occupational stress may help create conditions in which faculty members can sustain both professional effectiveness and personal well-being. The extent to which these factors predict work–life balance in a particular setting must be established through valid empirical research.

References

1. Indian studies
2. Aarthy, M., & Nandhini, M. (2016). A study on quality of work life among the engineering college faculty members in Coimbatore district. International Journal of Management Research & Review, 6(8), 1051–1057.
3. Arunachalam, A., Subbarayalu, A. V., Ramalingam, B., Prabaharan, S., Samiappan, D., Marimuthu, P. R., Chinnusamy, S., Shanmugavelu, G., Neethidoss, P., Ganesan, B., & Jayaseeli, N. (2024). Quality of work life among the faculty members of higher education institutions in India. Asian Journal of University Education, 20(3), 582–597. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v20i3.27867
4. Abbas, S., Khullar, S., & Sachdeva, A. (2017). Motivational and satisfaction level among medical teachers in India: A questionnaire-based survey. International Journal of Current Research and Review, 9(18), 18–25. https://doi.org/10.7324/IJCRR.2017.9185
5. Dewangan, R. L., & Goswami, T. (2025). Organizational role stress, quality of work life, organizational citizenship behavior, and psychological well-being among university faculty members. BMC Psychology, 13, Article 538. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02883-x
6. Jamunarani, H. S., & Syed, R. (2024). Antecedents and outcomes of work-life balance for women faculty members in India. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 22(4), 324–339. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22(4).2024.25
7. Kashyap, V., Nakra, N., & Arora, R. (2022). Do “decent work” dimensions lead to work engagement? Empirical evidence from higher education institutions in India. European Journal of Training and Development, 46(1/2), 158–177.
8. Leena, Singh, R. P., & Kaur, K. (2024). Assessing life satisfaction among higher education faculty: The relationship between work-life balance, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and life satisfaction. Economic Sciences. https://doie.org/10.1001/ES.2024328167

9. Punia, V., & Kamboj, M. (2013). Quality of work-life balance among teachers in higher education institutions. Learning Community: An International Journal of Educational and Social Development, 4(3), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.5958/j.2231-458X.4.3.010
10. Priya, K., & Ahamed, I. (2025). The pedagogical assessment of work-life balance and its impact on the domestic life of women faculty in higher educational institutions of Kerala. Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 15(2), 224–235. https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2025.IJISS.15.2.30
11. Ramegowda, K. V., & Kumari, A. (2024). Measuring quality work-life of teachers in higher institutions—An Indian perspective. Journal of Ecohumanism, 3(3), 1896–1904. https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i3.3489
12. Rao, T. N., Rajani, S., & Ravi, J. (2025). A study on occupational stress among faculty in higher educational institutions in Northern Coastal Districts of Andhra Pradesh. International Journal of Management and Humanities. https://doi.org/10.35940/ijmh.A1836.12010925
13. Savitha, S., & Krishna Kumar, K. (2023). A comprehensive study of work-life dynamics: Understanding job stress, work-life balance, and faculty engagement in Dharmapuri's higher education sector. Journal of Research Administration, 5(2), 9919–9924.
14. Sharma, S., & Sengupta, S. (2025). From pressure to progress: Examining teaching demands and resources in private higher education institutes of India. Higher Education Research & Development, 44(7), 1742–1756. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2025.2486186
15. Solanki, S., & Mandaviya, M. (2021). Does gender matter? Job stress, work-life balance, health and job satisfaction among university teachers in India. Journal of International Women's Studies, 22(7).
16. Sharma, U., & Sinha, B. C. (2025). Impact of work-life balance on faculty outcomes and institutional performance: An empirical study of higher education institutions in Delhi NCR. Decision Making: Applications in Management and Engineering, 8(1). Theoretical and methodological references
17. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115
18. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500
19. Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63(3), 510–531. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8
20. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287
21. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326