

# An Empirical Study on Impact of Job Demands on Faculty Wellbeing in Higher Education

Nabila Parveen<sup>1</sup>, Dr. P. Rajeswari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D Research Scholar (Full-Time), PG & Research Department of Business Administration, Auxilium College (Autonomous), Vellore-632006, Affiliated to Thiruvalluvar University, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

<sup>2</sup>Research Supervisor & Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Auxilium College (Autonomous), Vellore-632006, Affiliated to Thiruvalluvar University, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

doi.org/10.64643/IJIRTV12I11-199585-459

**Abstract**—Faculty wellbeing is regarded as an important concern in Higher Education due to continuous transformation of academic roles. Today, Faculty members not only engage in teaching but also in research, administration, community service and student mentoring, all of which have significant impact on wellbeing. The present study examines the relationship between job demands and wellbeing among faculty members of Arts and Science Colleges in Vellore district drawing on Job demand Resource model and Challenge and Hindrance stressor framework. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire administered via google forms and 80 valid responses were received. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS with T-Tests, correlation and regression analysis used as tools to test the data. The results indicate a significant positive association between job demands and wellbeing of faculty members. Findings suggest that faculty members in this sample perceive their work demands as challenge rather than hinderance. This challenge aligned demands appear to enhance faculty member's work as purposeful and meaningful, thereby contributing to better wellbeing. This study highlights the importance of not looking at all demands as stressors and to understand and distinguish demands in fostering wellbeing. Implications for institution policy and future research directions are discussed.

**Index Terms**—Faculty Wellbeing, Higher Education, Job demands, JD-R Model.

## I. INTRODUCTION

India is undergoing rapid changes and is an important economy of the world. To drive this, education, especially higher education, including research and development, is most important. One of the key components of higher education is faculty. Faculty

wellbeing is related to sustainability and student success. The government too recognizes the role of faculties and in its latest National Education Policy (2020) has highlighted the need for safe, supportive and empowering work environment for teachers. To feed the country's ambitions, higher education landscape is also undergoing transformation. This is causing more demands to be placed on academics. There is an increase in research publication pressure, more administrative tasks due to NAAC accreditation and a shift towards online teaching and usage of digital technology. Due to this faculty members are required to perform multiple roles together and face time constraints.

Job demands have usually been associated with stress, exhaustion and other negative outcomes. But recent studies have given other contrarian results. The latest research suggests that the relationship between job demands and wellbeing is more nuanced, particularly in knowledge intensive occupations. In academic settings, certain demands may be viewed as meaningful, stimulating and aligned with professional identity rather than solely as stressors.

Well-being is a multidimensional construct reflecting positive mental health, vitality, and psychological functioning. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index conceptualizes well-being as a positive state rather than merely the absence of distress, making it particularly suitable for examining how work-related factors relate to overall psychological functioning.

In this backdrop, the present study analyses the impact of job demands as perceived by Arts and Science faculty members in Vellore district on their wellbeing. This study adopts a theoretically aligned approach to

understanding this relationship through contemporary works.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This review of literature was conducted to stream through and synthesize the existing research on job demands and wellbeing.

### A. Job Demands and Job Demands Resource Model

Demerouti and Bakker (2001) developed the Job demand and resource model and defined job demand as “the physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of a job that require sustained effort, which can lead to strain or burnout if they are too high”. According to them, when job demands are high, they lead to lower wellbeing and presence of job resources buffers the impact of job demands on wellbeing. Tadik et al. (2014) stressed that job demands are not inherently harmful, but their impact depends on individual assessment, resource availability and the characteristics of demands themselves. Recent research has extensively used Job demand and resource framework, especially after Covid 19. Karatuna et al. (2022) demonstrate that increased teaching workload and research pressure are tied to lower wellbeing, while resources like autonomy and support lead to better wellbeing outcomes.

### B. Job demand and Wellbeing

Mudrak et al. (2018) in their study on Czech university faculty found that quantitative demands, work-family conflict and job insecurity led to increase in stress levels and lower satisfaction. In a study by Zhou et al. (2024), Chinese teachers’ high working hours had a significant impact on subjective well-being also leading to poorer work-life balance. Joshi (2019) studied whether job stress was affected by job demands among faculty members in Indian colleges. The study posited that workload, administrative demands and job insecurity act as key stressors. Madigan and Kim (2021) reported that constant workload pressure among teachers led to emotional exhaustion and reduced wellbeing over time. In a large meta-analysis, Benevene et al. (2020) concluded that job demands are among the strongest covariate of reduced wellbeing among schoolteachers. Within higher education specifically, studies indicate that increasing performance expectations and workload

intensification negatively affect faculty wellbeing (Kinman and Wray, 2020).

Despite strong evidence of negative effects, recent literature has increasingly distinguished between hindrance demands and challenge demands, offering a more nuanced understanding of job demands and wellbeing relationships. Huang et al. (2022) found that emotional exhaustion and organizational commitment were outcomes of job demands and faculty in “accelerating academia” felt more drained but also more committed. But Han et al. (2020) examined effect of challenge job demands (new tasks, complex roles) on work engagement and found negative influence of challenge job demand on work engagement. Bakker et al. (2022) using qualitative analysis of literature found that combination of challenge job demands and job resources lead to positive wellbeing of employees.

### C. Wellbeing

Halat et al. (2023) explained in their narrative review that well-being is important to maintain teaching effectiveness, research and mentorship. Roos and Borkoski (2021) state that faculty wellbeing is important for both individual health and student outcomes. Vela (2025) in her systematic review on occupational wellbeing concluded that comprehensive wellbeing policies improve faculty quality of life and enhance educational sustainability. Shetty (2023) argues that healthy faculty show better job satisfaction and higher productivity in their personal and professional aspects.

The above review shows that though job demands and wellbeing have been extensively studied, there have been varying results depending on the type of demands and perception of faculty on their work and support offered by their institutions. Also, there is limited study in Arts and Science colleges in Vellore district. Therefore, this empirical study is being conducted to address this gap.

### D. Research Objectives

1. To examine differences in faculty job demand and well-being based on selected demographic variables.
2. To analyze the impact of job demand on wellbeing among Arts and Science college faculty members in Vellore district.

E. Research Hypotheses

Based on the above objectives, the following hypotheses have been framed.

H1: There is significant difference in job demand and wellbeing between married and unmarried college faculty.

H2: There is significant difference among age groups with respect to job demand and wellbeing.

H3: There is significant difference among years of experience with respect to job demand and wellbeing.

H4: There is significant correlation between job demands and wellbeing among college faculty members.

H5: Job demand significantly predicts wellbeing among college faculty members.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses quantitative cross-sectional design. A structured questionnaire was administered using google forms. A purposive sampling technique was employed to select faculty from arts and science colleges in Vellore and survey was randomly distributed. Data was collected using self-reported questionnaire measuring demographic data, job demands and wellbeing. 80 complete responses were obtained and used for analysis.

A. Measurement Scale

Standard five-point Likert scales were used to measure the variables. The job demand was measured using perceived work demand scale of Boyar et al. (2007). A modified WHO-5 Wellbeing scale was used for measuring Wellbeing.

B Scale Reliability and Validity

All constructs exhibited strong reliability, with Cronbach’s alpha values for Job demand(5 items,  $\alpha = 0.991$ ) and Wellbeing (5 items,  $\alpha = 0.874$ ) exceeding the suggested threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al. 2009).

C Research Tools

In this paper, the research tool used is SPSS23.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table I gives the demographic statistics. It is seen that in this sample, female faculty members are more than

male. Most people belong to the age group of 31 to 40 years and have less than 5 years of experience (35%). Most of the faculty members are married (82.5%). Most of the faculty members are working in self-financing colleges.

Table I: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	12	15
Female	68	85
Age in Years		
Less than 30 years	19	23.8
31-40 years	28	35.0
41-50 years	25	31.3
51 and above	8	10.0
Experience in Years		
Less than 5 Years	30	37.5
5-10 Years	12	15.0
10-15 Years	19	23.8
More than 15 Years	19	23.8
Marital Status		
Married	66	82.5
Unmarried	14	17.5
Type of Institution		
Government	4	5.0
Government-Autonomous	3	3.8
Government Aided-Autonomous	13	16.3
Self Financing	60	75.0

Table II: Independent Sample t Test – Marital Status Difference

	Marital Status				T Value	P value
	Married		Unmarried			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Well-being	3.52	1.042	2.59	1.054	3.023	0.007
Job demand	3.98	0.922	3.26	1.111	2.271	0.036

\*Denotes significance at 5% level

Among college faculty members in Vellore, the independent samples t-test (table II) showed that marital status significantly influenced both job demand and well-being (p value less than 0.05). Married faculty (mean 3.98) reported significantly higher job demand compared to unmarried faculty (mean 3.26), indicating that they perceive greater work-related demands. At the same time, married faculty also demonstrated significantly higher levels of well-being (mean 3.52) than their unmarried (mean 2.59) counterparts.

This suggests that although married college faculty members experience higher job demands, they may also benefit from stronger social or family support systems that help them maintain better overall well-being despite increased work pressures. This also implies that married teachers may possess more effective coping mechanisms and resilience that help them manage occupational stress more successfully.

Table III: One-way ANOVA by Age Group

Factors	Age Group in Years				F Value	P Value
	Less than 30	31-40	41-50	Above 51		
Job Demand	3.38 (1.013)	3.73(1.017)	4.28(0.810)	4.03(0.888)	3.614	0.017*
Well-being	2.88 (1.076)	3.58(1.137)	3.39(1.087)	3.60(0.842)	1.742	0.165

Note : 1. The value within bracket refers to SD  
2.\* denotes significant at 5% level

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine differences in job demand and wellbeing across age groups. Table III shows a statistically significant difference in job demand among the age groups,  $f = 3.61, p = .017$ , with mean scores generally increasing with age and the highest scores observed among participants aged 41–50 years. In contrast, no significant difference was found in job demand across age groups,  $f = 1.74, p = .165$ , indicating that job demand levels were relatively similar regardless of age. It can be inferred that with age, professional responsibilities increase with more administrative load and leadership responsibilities. The well-being being

the same across age groups could indicate there may be other factors like better institutional support.

Table IV: One-way ANOVA by Years of Experience

Factors	Experience in Years				F Value	P Value
	Less than 5	5-10	10-15	Above 15		
Job Demand	3.37(1.095)	3.92(0.751)	4.27(0.608)	4.15(0.993)	4.634	0.05*
Well-being	3.16(1.161)	3.67(1.192)	3.64(0.983)	3.19(1.019)	1.226	0.306

Note : 1. The value within bracket refers to SD  
2.\*\* denotes significant at 1% level

From table IV, the results show that job demand tends to increase with years of experience, rising from a mean of 3.37 among those with less than five years of experience to a peak of 4.27 in the 10–15 years group, before slightly decreasing to 4.15 among those with more than 15 years, with an overall mean of 3.85; in contrast, wellbeing remains relatively stable across experience groups, with means ranging from 3.16 to 3.67 and an overall mean of 3.36. The one-way ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference in job demand across years of experience,  $F = 4.63, p = .005$ , suggesting that experience level has a meaningful effect on work demand, whereas the ANOVA for wellbeing was not significant,  $F = 1.23, p = .306$ , indicating that wellbeing does not differ significantly by years of experience in this sample.

This implies that more experienced faculty members report higher job demand. As experience increases, faculty have more roles and responsibilities. They are part of leadership, committees and involved in community service as well as mentoring and guiding Ph.D students. The above result also conveys that faculty perceive their job demand as challenging with viewing the above responsibilities as purposeful.

A Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between job demand and wellbeing. From table 5 Correlation Coefficient between job demand and wellbeing is 0.544 which indicates (0.544<sup>2</sup>=0.296) 29.6% positive relationships between job demand and wellbeing and is significant at 1% level. The above result demonstrates the positive relationship between job demand and wellbeing, may be explained by the nature of the job demands experienced by participants. When job demands are perceived as challenges rather than hindrances, they can enhance motivation, engagement, and a sense of accomplishment, thereby improving wellbeing.

Table VI: Regression: Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.544 <sup>a</sup>	.296	.287	.927
a. Predictors: (Constant), job demand				

Table VI shows R=0.544. Hence there is a moderate positive relationship between job demand and wellbeing. The coefficient of determination R<sup>2</sup>=0.296. This shows that job demand explains 29.6% of the variance in the dependent variable. This means that there are few other factors that are influencing wellbeing. Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> is 0.287. After adjusting for sample size, the model still explains 28.7% of the variance. This is moderate and is acceptable in well-being research.

Table VII: ANOVA Result

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	28.197	1	28.197	32.837	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	66.978	78	.859		
	Total	95.175	79			
a. Dependent Variable: wellbeing						
b. Predictors: (Constant), job demand						

Table VII shows that the ANOVA result indicates that job demand has a statistically significant effect on wellbeing (F = 32.837, p < 0.001).

Table V: Correlations between Job demand and Wellbeing

		Job Demand	Wellbeing
Job Demand	Pearson Correlation	1	.544**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
Wellbeing	Pearson Correlation	.544**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

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

From below Table VIII, Unstandardized coefficient B is 1.031 and standardized coefficient beta is 0.544, p value is 0.000, which shows significance. The regression equation is Wellbeing = 1.031+0.604 (job demand)

Table VIII: Regression Coefficient

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.031	.419		2.462	.016
	Job demand	.604	.105	.544	5.730	<.000
a. Dependent Variable: wellbeing						

The estimated positive sign implies that such effect is positive, that wellbeing would increase by 0.604 for every unit increase in job demand and this coefficient value is significant at 1% level.

Job Demand is a significant positive predictor of the dependent variable. Although the model explains a modest proportion of variance, the relationship is meaningful and statistically reliable.

The result may be explained with recent study by Bakker (2022) which shows that combination of challenge job demand and resources lead to better wellbeing. Teaching being a knowledge intensive profession, faculty members internalize their demands as being challenging, which leads to demands being perceived as meaningful, furthering career growth and hence indicating better wellbeing.

#### V. LIMITATIONS, SUGGESTIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

This study provides evidence of the relationship between job demands and well-being, but there are few limitations. The results have limitations that only a smaller sample size and usage of a self-reported

questionnaire. The model explains about 29.6% of the variance, indicating there are other factors like job resources, personal coping styles and organizational support that may influence well-being. The cross-sectional design is another disadvantage because it prevents drawing causal conclusions. This empirical research suggests that institutions can design workloads that are stimulating and purposeful and that will enhance the skills of faculty. The findings indicate that unmarried faculty have less well-being than married faculty. This can be addressed by promoting team building exercises and encouraging collaborations. High demand could be paired with more autonomy and provision of adequate resources, that will help faculty navigate demands. In the future, researchers can explore other factors that may affect wellbeing along with job demands. Also, researchers can look at various moderators and mediators like perceived organizational support and professional identity.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The study investigated the relationship between job demands and well-being among Art and Science college faculty members in Vellore district. The results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between job demands and well-being. The present study suggests that job demand perception impacts wellbeing. If job demands are perceived as challenging rather than hindering, faculty members experience them as engaging, professionally valuable, meaningful and purposeful. This could contribute to enhanced well-being. There may be other factors, such as job and personal resources, that lead to the result. Factors like autonomy, job security, institutional and peer support, emotional intelligence and coping strategies accumulated over time can influence wellbeing. The findings expose that instead of merely viewing job demand as a stressor, it may also be viewed as a potential source of professional growth and satisfaction. This study brings attention to the well-being of college faculty members, which is important for the sustainability of education and for student success.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2022). Job Demands–Resources Theory: Ten Years Later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>.
- [2] Benevene, P., De Stasio, S., & Fiorilli, C. (2020). Editorial: Well-Being of school teachers in their work environment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1239. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01239>
- [3] Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- [4] Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2022). Job demands-resources theory in times of crises: New propositions. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 13(3), 209–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386622113502> 2 (Original work published 2023)
- [5] Halat, D. H., Soltani, A., Dalli, R., Alsarraj, L., & Malki, A. (2023). Understanding and Fostering Mental Health and Well-Being among University Faculty: A Narrative Review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 12(13), 4425. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134425>
- [6] Huang, Y., & Wang, C. (2022). Surviving and thriving in “accelerating” academia: toward a job demands-resources model of faculty well-being. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09769-2>.
- [7] Joshi, R. (2024). An Empirical Study On Job Stress Among Members Of Faculty With Respect To Higher Education In Telangana Region. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.5627>.
- [8] Karatuna, I., Jönsson, S., & Muhonen, T. (2022). Job Demands, Resources, and Future Considerations: Academics' Experiences of Working From Home During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 908640. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.908640>

- [9] Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2020). Well-being in academic employees – a benchmarking approach. . <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788970358.00019>.
- [10] Madigan, D.J. and Kim, L.E. (2021) Towards an Understanding of Teacher Attrition: A Meta-Analysis of Burnout, Job Satisfaction, and Teachers' Intentions to Quit. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, Article ID: 103425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103425>
- [11] Mudrak, J., Zábrowská, K., Květon, P., Jelínek, M., Blatný, M., Šolcová, I., & Machovcová, K. (2018). Occupational Well-being Among University Faculty: A Job Demands-Resources Model. *Research in Higher Education*, 59, 325-348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9467-x>.
- [12] Roos, B. H., & Borkoski, C. C. (2021). Attending to the Teacher in the Teaching: Prioritizing Faculty Well-Being. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 6(4), 831–840. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2021\\_persp-21-00006](https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_persp-21-00006)
- [13] S, M. O. S. G. B. (2023). Faculty Wellness in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of the concept. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*, 44(6), 3389–3414. <https://doi.org/10.52783/tjjpt.v44.i6.3941>
- [14] Tadić, M., Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. G. M. (2014). Challenge versus hindrance job demands and well-being: A diary study on the moderating role of job resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(4), 702–725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12094>
- [15] Vela, E. (2025). Occupational well-being in higher education teachers: a systematic review. *Sapienza: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.51798/sijis.v6i2.1061>.
- [16] Zhao, P., Yuan, J., & Hu, Y. (2024). Work Hours, Job Resources and Subjective Well-Being of Chinese Faculty: An Empirical Analysis Based on a Sequential Mediation Model. *Research in Higher Education*, 65, 965 - 988. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-023-09770-7>.