International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 5, Sep-OCt-2026, PP: 1-12

Work–Life Balance and Faculty Well-Being in Higher Education: The Role of Flexible Work Arrangements, Family Responsibilities, and Job Satisfaction

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 emerged as an important concern in higher education, where faculty members are expected to fulfil teaching, research, student mentoring, administrative, and institutional responsibilities while managing family commitments and personal well-being. The increasing availability of digital academic work and flexible work arrangements has created opportunities for greater autonomy, but it has also blurred the boundaries between professional and personal life. This study examines the relationship between flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, job satisfaction, and work–life balance among faculty members in Indian higher education institutions. Drawing on the Job Demands–Resources model, work–family interface perspectives, and organisational support theory, the study develops a quantitative framework to investigate how workplace flexibility, family-related demands, and job satisfaction relate to faculty work–life balance. A cross-sectional survey design is proposed, using a structured questionnaire and an illustrative sample of 300 faculty members from higher education institutions. A stratified sampling approach is outlined to support representation across institution types, academic designations, and experience levels. The proposed analysis includes demographic profiling, descriptive statistics, internal-consistency reliability, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression. In the illustrative results, flexible work arrangements and job satisfaction demonstrate positive associations with work–life balance, whereas family responsibilities demonstrate a negative association. The model illustrates how institutional flexibility and job-related satisfaction may contribute to a more sustainable academic work environment. As the numerical results are simulated, they should be interpreted as an analytical demonstration rather than evidence about the actual Indian faculty population. The study offers a framework for institutions seeking to develop faculty-centred policies concerning flexible scheduling, workload allocation, family support, and employee well-being.

Keywords: Work–life balance, faculty well-being, flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, job satisfaction, higher education, academic staff, India.

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions depend on faculty members to deliver quality teaching, conduct research, mentor students, contribute to academic administration, and participate in institutional development. Although these responsibilities are central to academic performance, they can create competing demands on faculty members' professional and personal lives. Teaching preparation, assessment, research publications, grant applications, accreditation activities, committee work, student consultations, and digital communication frequently extend beyond formally scheduled working hours.

Work–life balance refers to an individual's perceived ability to manage professional and personal responsibilities in a manner that is acceptable and sustainable. It does not necessarily require an equal division of time between work and personal life. Instead, it concerns the compatibility of different life roles, perceived control over time, and the ability to meet important work and family commitments without persistent conflict.

The issue is particularly relevant to indian higher education. Universities and colleges operate under different institutional arrangements, including central and state public universities, private universities, autonomous colleges, and affiliated colleges. Faculty members' workloads and support systems can therefore differ according to institutional policies, student strength, research expectations, employment arrangements, academic rank, and access to administrative assistance.

Flexible work arrangements may help faculty members coordinate their professional responsibilities with personal commitments. Examples include flexible starting and finishing times, limited remote work for suitable academic tasks, flexible research schedules, predictable timetables, and planned adjustments to teaching or meeting schedules. However, flexibility alone does not necessarily reduce workload. Where institutions expect faculty members to remain continuously available online, flexibility may

increase work intensity and weaken boundaries between work and personal life.

Family responsibilities represent another important dimension. Childcare, eldercare, household management, and support for dependent family members can create substantial time and emotional demands. These responsibilities may interact with inflexible timetables, lengthy commuting, weekend academic activities, and institutional expectations. The effect may differ across individuals depending on their family circumstances, available support, and control over work schedules.

Job satisfaction may also be associated with work–life balance. Faculty members who are satisfied with their work may experience greater motivation, organisational attachment, and perceived compatibility between professional expectations and personal goals. Conversely, dissatisfaction arising from excessive workload, limited autonomy, inadequate recognition, or insufficient institutional support may coincide with poorer work–life balance.

This study therefore examines three central factors—flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, and job satisfaction—in relation to work–life balance among faculty members in indian higher education institutions. The study aims to provide an evidence-oriented framework for institutional decision-making and future empirical research.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1. Work–life balance in academic employment

Academic work has characteristics that distinguish it from many other occupations. Faculty members often exercise professional autonomy over research and teaching preparation, but they may also face deadlines, publication expectations, fixed teaching schedules, student-related demands, and administrative assignments. The combination of autonomy and high demands can make the boundaries of academic work difficult to define.

The job demands–resources model proposes that job demands require sustained effort and may contribute to strain, while job resources can support goal achievement, learning, motivation, and well-being (bakker & demerouti, 2007). In an academic context, workload, time pressure, and conflicting responsibilities can be understood as demands, while schedule autonomy, supportive leadership, and access to appropriate resources can function as potential resources.

Work–family research also recognises that participation in one role may interfere with another. Greenhaus and beutell (1985) explain work–family conflict in terms of time-based, strain-based, and behaviour-based incompatibilities. These concepts are relevant to faculty members whose academic duties may extend into evenings, weekends, and periods normally reserved for family or personal activities.

2. Flexible work arrangements

Flexible work arrangements give employees some degree of control over when, where, or how work is performed. In higher education, flexibility may include adjustable working hours for non-teaching duties, research work undertaken away from campus when appropriate, advance publication of timetables, and the ability to rearrange meetings within reasonable institutional limits.

Flexibility is not equivalent to reduced workload. Its effectiveness depends on whether faculty members have genuine control over their schedules, whether teaching and student-support requirements are maintained, and whether managers respect boundaries outside agreed working periods. Institutions should therefore distinguish between schedule flexibility and an expectation of continuous availability.

3. Family responsibilities

Family responsibilities include childcare, eldercare, household management, and care for dependent relatives. These responsibilities may compete with teaching, research, travel, and administrative requirements. The impact is likely to depend on the intensity of care demands and the availability of formal or informal support.

Family responsibilities should not be treated as inherently detrimental to well-being. The relevant question is whether the demands associated with family roles are compatible with the timing, intensity, and predictability of academic work.

4. Job satisfaction and faculty well-being

Job satisfaction reflects an individual's evaluation of their work experience. It may be influenced by autonomy, recognition, compensation, leadership, collegial relationships, career development, workload, and perceived fairness. Satisfied faculty members may find it easier to maintain a positive relationship between professional and personal roles. However, the relationship may operate in both directions: work–life balance may also contribute to job satisfaction.

Consequently, a cross-sectional study can establish associations but cannot, by itself, establish whether job satisfaction causes better work–life balance or whether better work–life balance contributes to job satisfaction.

III. STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Despite the importance of faculty members' contribution to higher education, academic work can involve competing

professional and personal demands. Flexible work arrangements may help faculty members coordinate responsibilities, while substantial family demands may create scheduling conflicts. Job satisfaction may reflect how positively faculty members evaluate their work environment and its compatibility with personal life.

However, the presence of a formal flexibility policy does not guarantee that faculty members can use it, and family responsibilities may affect faculty members differently depending on their access to support. There is therefore a need to examine these factors together within an integrated analytical framework.

The research problem addressed in this paper is:

To what extent are flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, and job satisfaction associated with work–life balance among faculty members in indian higher education institutions?

The study focuses on these three relationships and does not claim to establish national prevalence or causal effects without representative data and an appropriate research design.

1. Objectives of the Study

The study has the following objectives:

- To examine the relationship between flexible work arrangements and work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- To assess the relationship between family responsibilities and work–life balance among faculty members.
- To investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and work–life balance among faculty members.

2. Importance of the Study

Academic importance

The study brings together workplace flexibility, family-related demands, job satisfaction, and work–life balance in a single analytical framework. It can help clarify how job resources and competing role demands relate to faculty members' perceptions of their professional and personal lives.

3. Institutional importance

The findings, once validated using actual data, may help universities and colleges review timetable planning, workload distribution, meeting schedules, leave policies, research expectations, and support mechanisms for faculty members.

4. Employee well-being

A supportive work environment may help faculty members manage professional demands without persistently sacrificing personal time. Understanding the relevant factors can inform staff-welfare initiatives and institutional well-being programmes.

5. Family and social importance

Faculty well-being is connected to family life and personal responsibilities. Workplaces that consider caregiving needs and promote predictable scheduling may help employees manage responsibilities across different life domains.

6. Policy importance

The study can provide a framework for reviewing institutional policies concerning flexibility, caregiving support, and job satisfaction. Any policy recommendations should, however, be interpreted in light of actual results, institutional resources, and the diversity of faculty members' circumstances.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review examines the theoretical foundations and empirical evidence concerning work–life balance, workplace flexibility, family responsibilities, and job satisfaction. It distinguishes established theoretical arguments from findings that require further testing in the indian higher education context.

1. Theoretical foundations

Job demands–resources model. Bakker and demerouti (2007) explain how job demands and job resources may influence employee strain and motivation. High workload, time pressure, and conflicting schedules can act as demands, while autonomy, supportive leadership, and flexible scheduling may serve as resources. The framework provides a theoretical basis for examining flexible work arrangements and family-related demands alongside faculty work–life balance.

Work–family conflict theory. Greenhaus and beutell (1985) identify time-based, strain-based, and behaviour-based conflict between work and family roles. For faculty members, time-based conflict may arise when classes, meetings, or research deadlines overlap with family responsibilities. Strain-based conflict may occur when exhaustion from one role reduces the capacity to fulfil another.

Organisational support perspective. Perceived organisational support concerns employees' beliefs about whether their organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being (eisenberger et al., 1986). In higher education, a supportive environment may be reflected in transparent workload allocation, reasonable scheduling, access to leave,

and fair consideration of caregiving responsibilities. Support may make formal flexibility more usable, although the present model does not test organisational support as a separate variable.

2. Flexible work arrangements and work–life balance

Flexible work arrangements can give faculty members greater control over when they complete tasks that do not require physical campus presence. Research preparation, academic writing, data analysis, and some administrative activities may be suitable for flexible scheduling. Such arrangements may allow faculty members to coordinate personal appointments, childcare, and commuting with academic duties.

Nevertheless, flexibility is not automatically beneficial. If flexible arrangements increase expectations of evening availability or require faculty members to complete the same workload within fewer protected hours, they may intensify rather than reduce work–family conflict. The relationship therefore depends on the quality and practical implementation of flexibility.

Recent indian research has examined hybrid work models and faculty well-being. For example, makwana's study, based on 55 faculty members, considers hybrid work in relation to faculty well-being and work–life balance. Its small sample provides context-specific evidence but should not be treated as nationally representative.

Research implication: flexible arrangements should be assessed in terms of actual access, schedule control, and boundary protection, rather than simply whether an institution has a written flexibility policy.

3. Family responsibilities and work–life balance

Family responsibilities may include childcare, eldercare, household management, and care for dependent relatives. Their effects depend on the amount of time required, the predictability of care needs, the availability of support, and the extent to which academic schedules can accommodate them.

Greenhaus and beutell's (1985) framework suggests that family responsibilities may contribute to work–family conflict when time or strain associated with one role interferes with another. In academia, late meetings, weekend events, conference travel, examination duties, and short-notice administrative work may make such conflicts more difficult to manage.

Indian research focusing on women faculty has explored the antecedents and outcomes of work–life balance. Jamunarani and syed (2024) examine this issue among women faculty in higher education institutions in india, highlighting the importance of considering faculty members' circumstances rather than assuming that the same arrangements work equally well for everyone.

It is important, however, not to equate family responsibilities exclusively with women's responsibilities. Caregiving can affect faculty members of any gender. The relevant empirical questions concern the intensity of responsibilities, available support, and compatibility between family demands and institutional schedules.

4. Job satisfaction and work–life balance

Job satisfaction reflects employees' overall evaluation of their work and work environment. Among faculty members, satisfaction may depend on autonomy, professional recognition, collegial relationships, career development, workload, leadership, and opportunities to undertake meaningful academic work.

Job satisfaction and work–life balance may be positively associated because employees who feel respected and supported may perceive greater compatibility between work and personal life. However, reverse direction is plausible: faculty members who achieve a satisfactory work–life balance may also evaluate their jobs more positively. A cross-sectional survey cannot distinguish these directions conclusively.

Research on indian higher education faculty has examined the relationship between work–life balance and job satisfaction. Negi (2025), for example, discusses faculty work–life balance and job satisfaction in the indian context. The article provides relevant context, but its review-oriented observations should not be treated as a substitute for the results of the present proposed survey.

Arunachalam et al. (2024) Studied quality of work life among faculty in indian higher education institutions using responses from 547 faculty members. Their work broadens the context beyond a single work–life measure and underscores the relevance of examining faculty members' experiences across multiple dimensions of working life.

5. Indian evidence and research gap

The indian literature relevant to this topic includes studies of work–life balance, quality of work life, faculty well-being, hybrid work, and job satisfaction. These strands collectively suggest that faculty well-being should be considered in relation to institutional practices and competing work and family demands.

The present paper proposes a focused model that examines three explanatory factors together: flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, and job satisfaction. This is a study-specific analytical focus, not a claim that no previous research has examined these variables. Existing studies overlap with some of the proposed relationships, so

any stronger novelty claim would require a systematic and current review of the relevant evidence.

The practical research gap is therefore framed as follows: to estimate the direction, magnitude, and relative contribution of these three factors to faculty members' reported work–life balance within a defined indian higher education sample.

6. Summary of literature

Author(s)	Focus	Relevance to the present study
Greenhaus and Beutell (1985)	Work–family role conflict	Explains how time and strain can create conflict between roles
Bakker and Demerouti (2007)	Job Demands–Resources model	Provides a framework for demands, autonomy, and workplace resources
Eisenberger et al. (1986)	Perceived organisational support	Explains why perceived care and organisational support matter
Jamunarani and Syed (2024)	Work–life balance among women faculty in India	Provides Indian higher education context
Arunachalam et al. (2024)	Quality of work life among Indian faculty	Broadens the focus to faculty working-life experiences
Makwana (recent study)	Hybrid work and faculty well-being	Provides context on flexibility and hybrid academic work
Negi (2025)	Job satisfaction and work–life balance among Indian faculty	Provides related evidence on the focal outcomes

V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework positions work–life balance as the dependent variable and the other three constructs as explanatory variables.

1. Flexible Work Arrangements (FWA)
Schedule control, flexibility, access to suitable remote work

2. Work–Life Balance (WLB)
Perceived compatibility of work, family, and personal responsibilities

3. Family Responsibilities (FR)
Care demands and competing time commitments Expected negative association with wlb

4. Job Satisfaction (JS)
Evaluation of work and the work environment

Expected positive association with wlb

Conceptual illustration: the arrows indicate proposed relationships, not established causal effects. The three predictors are tested simultaneously in the regression model.

VI. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The study tests three hypotheses.

- H1: flexible work arrangements are significantly and positively associated with work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- H2: family responsibilities are significantly and negatively associated with work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- H3: job satisfaction is significantly and positively associated with work–life balance among faculty members in higher education institutions.
- For statistical testing, each alternative hypothesis is evaluated against a corresponding null hypothesis of no association, conditional on the other predictors in the multiple regression model.

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Research design
The study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional, descriptive and correlational research design. A structured questionnaire is proposed to collect information from faculty members at a single point in time.

The descriptive component summarises participants' demographic characteristics and responses to the focal constructs. The correlational component assesses the strength and direction of relationships between the constructs. Multiple regression estimates the unique statistical association of each explanatory variable with work–life balance while holding the other two predictors constant.

Because the proposed design is cross-sectional, the findings cannot establish temporal order or causality.

2. Research approach
A deductive approach is adopted. The hypotheses are derived from established work–family conflict and job demands–

resources perspectives and are evaluated using quantitative statistical techniques.

3. Study population

The target population comprises faculty members employed in recognised higher education institutions in india, including:

- Assistant professors
- Associate professors
- Professors
- Faculty members with teaching and research responsibilities in colleges and universities

The operational population should be narrowed to a defined set of institutions, districts, or states before data collection. A sample drawn only from one city or region cannot automatically be considered representative of all indian higher education faculty.

4. Sources of data

Primary data: responses collected through a structured faculty questionnaire.

Secondary data: peer-reviewed journal articles, theoretical publications, and relevant research on work–life balance, job satisfaction, faculty well-being, flexible work arrangements, and family responsibilities.

5. Research instrument and measurement

A structured questionnaire using a five-point likert scale is proposed, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Items below are draft items for the study; they should be reviewed by subject experts and pilot-tested before being used as a validated instrument.

Construct	Suggested indicators	Number of draft items
Flexible work arrangements	Schedule control, flexibility for non-teaching duties, access to suitable remote work, predictability of schedules	4
Family responsibilities	Caregiving demands, competing time commitments, difficulty coordinating family and work schedules, family-related time pressure	4
Job satisfaction	Satisfaction with work, recognition, autonomy, and the overall academic work environment	4
Work–life balance	Compatibility of work and personal life, time for family, ability to manage responsibilities, overall balance	4

Scoring note: family-responsibility items should measure the intensity of demands or time pressure, not simply whether respondents have family members. Higher scores should consistently indicate greater demands. Work–life balance items should be coded so that higher values indicate better balance. The instrument should be checked for content validity and construct validity before substantive conclusions are drawn.

6. Pilot study

A pilot study of approximately 25–30 faculty members is recommended to assess item clarity, response time, ambiguity, and preliminary reliability. Pilot participants should ideally be excluded from the main sample if the questionnaire changes materially after the pilot.

The pilot should examine whether faculty members interpret “flexible work arrangements” consistently and whether family-responsibility items distinguish the existence of responsibilities from their actual intensity.

7. Ethical considerations

Participation should be voluntary and based on informed consent. Respondents should be told the purpose of the research, how their data will be used, and whether any identifying information will be collected. Individual responses should not be shared with employers in identifiable form. Institutional approval should be obtained where required.

VIII. SAMPLING TECHNIQUE AND SAMPLE SIZE

1. Proposed sampling technique

The preferred design is stratified sampling, with strata defined by institution type and, where feasible, region or academic designation. Within each stratum, faculty members can be selected randomly from an eligible sampling frame.

A practical sequence is:

- Identify eligible institutions in the defined study area.
- Classify them by public/private status and other relevant institutional characteristics.
- Obtain an eligible faculty sampling frame, subject to institutional permission.
- Determine the sample allocation for each stratum.
- Randomly select faculty members within each stratum.
- Record response and non-response rates and, where possible, compare respondents and non-respondents on available non-sensitive characteristics.

If institutions are selected by convenience and faculty members volunteer through an online survey, the study should instead be described as convenience or volunteer sampling. The researcher should not call such a sample random or nationally representative.

2. Sample size

The paper uses an illustrative sample of 300 faculty members to demonstrate the statistical analysis. This is a planning assumption, not a claim that 300 responses have actually been collected.

For a large population, cochran's formula for estimating a proportion under simple random sampling is:

\[N_0=\frac{z^2p(1-p)}{e^2} \]

Where:

\(Z=1.96\) For a 95% confidence level

\(P=0.50\), The conservative assumed proportion

\(E=0.06\), The desired margin of error of 6 percentage points

\[N_0=\frac{1.96^2(0.50)(0.50)}{0.06^2} \Approx 267 \]

Thus, approximately 267 completed responses would be required under these assumptions for estimating a population proportion using simple random sampling. A target of 300 completed responses provides a modest allowance above that calculation.

This formula does not automatically establish adequate power for every regression effect. Final sample-size planning should also consider the expected effect size, number of predictors, significance level, desired statistical power, sampling design, and expected non-response. Where sampling is clustered by institution, the effective sample size may be lower than the raw number of respondents suggests.

3. Proposed sample allocation

The following is an illustrative allocation, not a record of actual respondents.

Institution type	Proposed respondents	Percentage
Public universities and colleges	120	40.00%
Private universities and colleges	180	60.00%
Total	300	100.00%

The final allocation should reflect the actual sampling frame and the chosen sampling design. The table should not be presented as evidence of the actual distribution of indian faculty members.

IX. Data Analysis and Results

1. Data analysis plan

The following statistical procedures are proposed:

- Data screening: check missing values, duplicate responses, inconsistent coding, and implausible response patterns.
- Demographic analysis: summarise respondents by age, gender, academic designation, institution type, experience, and family-care responsibilities.
- Descriptive analysis: calculate means and standard deviations for the four study constructs.
- Reliability analysis: estimate cronbach's alpha for each multi-item construct.
- Correlation analysis: use pearson correlation to assess bivariate relationships between the study variables.
- Multiple regression: estimate the unique associations of flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, and job satisfaction with work–life balance.
- Diagnostic assessment: examine residuals, multicollinearity, influential observations, and model assumptions before interpreting regression results.

All results in the following tables are illustrative. They demonstrate how the findings could be reported if an actual dataset produced similar statistics.

2. Demographic analysis

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

Demographic variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Men	156	52.00%
	Women	141	47.00%
	Prefer not to say/other	3	1.00%

Demographic variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Below 30 years	42	14.00%
	30–39 years	105	35.00%
	40–49 years	90	30.00%
	50 years and above	63	21.00%
Designation	Assistant professor	165	55.00%
	Associate professor	81	27.00%
	Professor	54	18.00%
Institution type	Public	120	40.00%
	Private	180	60.00%
Teaching experience	Below 5 years	72	24.00%
	5–10 years	93	31.00%
	11–15 years	69	23.00%
	Above 15 years	66	22.00%

Note: illustrative frequencies have been constructed to total 300 respondents.

The illustrative profile includes 156 men (52.0%) And 141 women (47.0%), With three respondents (1.0%) In the prefer-not-to-say/other category. The largest age group is 30–39 years (35.0%), Followed by 40–49 years (30.0%). Assistant professors account for 55.0% Of the hypothetical sample, while associate professors and professors account for 27.0% And 18.0%, Respectively.

Private institutions account for 60.0% Of the illustrative respondents and public institutions for 40.0%. Regarding experience, the largest group has 5–10 years of teaching experience (31.0%). These distributions illustrate how a sample profile can be reported; they do not describe the actual composition of the faculty workforce.

3. Family-responsibility profile

For the final survey, family-responsibility intensity should be measured separately from demographic categories such as marital status or whether a respondent has children.

Table 2. Suggested family-responsibility classification

Category	Operational definition	Reporting method
Low	Limited regular caregiving or household time demands	Number and percentage
Moderate	Regular family responsibilities requiring scheduled time	Number and percentage
High	Substantial or frequent caregiving demands that compete with work schedules	Number and percentage

This classification can help describe the family circumstances of respondents, but the thresholds should be defined before data collection. The main hypothesis test should use the continuous family-responsibility scale, because categorising a continuous score can discard information and reduce statistical power. The demographic table should not be populated with invented frequencies for these categories.

4. Descriptive statistics

Table 3. Illustrative descriptive statistics for the main constructs

Construct	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Illustrative interpretation
Flexible work arrangements	300	3.48	0.76	Moderately favourable perceived flexibility
Family responsibilities	300	3.62	0.81	Moderately high reported demands
Job satisfaction	300	3.71	0.69	Moderately favourable satisfaction
Work–life balance	300	3.34	0.78	Moderate perceived balance

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree. Family-responsibility scores are coded so that higher values represent greater demands.

The illustrative mean for flexible work arrangements is 3.48, Suggesting moderately favourable perceptions of flexibility. The family-responsibility mean of 3.62 Indicates moderately high reported demands, assuming the items consistently measure intensity of responsibilities. Job satisfaction has a mean of 3.71, While work–life balance has a mean of 3.34.The relatively lower work–life balance mean suggests that respondents in this hypothetical dataset perceive less favourable balance than job satisfaction. The differences in means should not be interpreted as statistically significant without appropriate tests. The standard deviations indicate

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 5, Sep-OCt-2026, PP: 1-12

variation in responses, but they do not establish the causes of that variation.

5. Reliability analysis

Table 4. Illustrative internal-consistency reliability

Construct	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha	Illustrative assessment
Flexible work arrangements	4	0.84	Good internal consistency
Family responsibilities	4	0.81	Good internal consistency
Job satisfaction	4	0.86	Good internal consistency
Work–life balance	4	0.88	Good internal consistency

Note: alpha values are simulated for demonstration. They must be calculated from actual item-level responses.

The illustrative alpha values range from 0.81 To 0.88, Exceeding the commonly used preliminary benchmark of 0.70. If actual data yielded these values, the scales would generally demonstrate acceptable internal consistency for exploratory or applied research.

Cronbach's alpha alone does not establish validity or unidimensionality. The researcher should inspect item-total correlations, inter-item correlations, and whether the items capture the intended construct. If family-responsibility items measure distinct types of care demands rather than a single coherent dimension, a high alpha should not be pursued at the expense of conceptual validity.

6. Correlation analysis

Table 5. Illustrative Pearson correlation matrix

Variable	FWA	FR	JS	WLB
Flexible work arrangements (FWA)	1	−0.22	0.39	0.46
Family responsibilities (FR)	−0.22	1	−0.25	−0.38
Job satisfaction (JS)	0.39	−0.25	1	0.52
Work–life balance (WLB)	0.46	−0.38	0.52	1

Note: values are illustrative correlations, not computed from respondent-level data. For the eventual empirical analysis, report exact p-values or confidence intervals for the correlations.

Flexible work arrangements have an illustrative positive correlation with work–life balance (\(r=0.46\)). This suggests that respondents who report greater flexibility also tend to report better work–life balance. Family responsibilities show an illustrative negative correlation with work–life balance (\(r=-0.38\)), Consistent with the possibility that more intense family demands coincide with greater difficulty balancing roles. Job satisfaction has a positive correlation with work–life balance (\(r=0.52\)), Indicating that respondents who evaluate their jobs more favourably also tend to report better balance.

The correlations among the predictors are moderate in magnitude in this example. Nevertheless, the actual data must be checked for multicollinearity. Correlation does not establish causality, and the bivariate relationships may change after the three predictors are entered into a multiple regression model.

7. Multiple regression and hypothesis testing

Multiple regression is proposed to estimate the association of each predictor with work–life balance, controlling for the other predictors.

Table 6. Illustrative regression model summary

Statistic	Illustrative value
Sample size	300
Multiple correlation (R)	0.69
R-squared	0.476
Adjusted R-squared	0.471
Standard error of estimate	0.567
F-statistic	89.7
Degrees of freedom	3, 296
Model significance	\(p<0.001\)

The illustrative \(r^2\) of 0.476 Indicates that the three predictors collectively account for approximately 47.6% Of the variance in work–life balance in the hypothetical sample. The adjusted \(r^2\) of 0.471 Adjusts for the number of predictors relative to the sample size.

The illustrative f-statistic indicates that the model as a whole is statistically significant at the 0.001 Level. This means that the three-predictor model performs better than an intercept-only model under the assumptions of the regression test. It does not mean that the model explains all relevant influences on work–life balance, and the unexplained variance may reflect factors such as workload, leadership, institutional climate, commuting, health, or personal circumstances.

The model statistics are demonstration values and should not be treated as observed evidence.

Table 7. Illustrative regression coefficients and hypothesis testing

Hypothesis	Predictor	Standardised Beta (β)	t-statistic	p-value	Expected Direction	Illustrative Decision
H1	Flexible Work Arrangements	0.28	5.72	< 0.001	Positive (+)	Supported / Accepted

However, the relationship should not be interpreted as evidence that faculty members with families necessarily experience poor balance. Family circumstances differ substantially, and caregiving may be supported by partners, extended family, formal care services, or institutional policies.

The key issue for institutions is the compatibility of work requirements with employees' personal circumstances. Predictable timetables, transparent leave procedures, advance notice of meetings, and equitable allocation of weekend duties may reduce avoidable conflict without lowering academic standards.

8. Job satisfaction and work–life balance

The illustrative positive association between job satisfaction and work–life balance is consistent with research that considers employee attitudes alongside working conditions. Faculty members who experience autonomy, fair treatment, professional recognition, and supportive leadership may perceive their professional lives more positively.

The result must nevertheless be interpreted cautiously. Job satisfaction and work–life balance may influence each other, and both may reflect other factors, such as workload, pay, leadership quality, employment security, or institutional culture. A cross-sectional regression cannot isolate these causal pathways.

Future studies could use longitudinal data to examine whether improvements in job satisfaction precede improvements in work–life balance, whether the reverse relationship also exists, or whether both are influenced by changes in institutional conditions.

9. Interpreting the combined model

The illustrative regression model explains a substantial proportion of variance within the simulated dataset, but its explanatory power cannot be generalised to the indian higher education sector. Actual results may differ by region, institution type, academic designation, employment status, caregiving demands, and the availability of workplace flexibility.

The model also omits potentially relevant factors, including teaching workload, research publication pressure, administrative assignments, commuting time, leadership support, employment security, and access to childcare or eldercare. These variables may be considered in future studies, provided the expanded model has a clear theoretical justification and an adequate sample size.

The most important contribution of the proposed study is therefore its integrated framework and testable hypotheses. Its empirical contribution will depend on data quality, sampling transparency, valid measurement, and the extent to which the results add to the existing indian literature.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are proposed for consideration by higher education institutions. They should be adapted to institutional circumstances and evaluated using actual evidence.

1. Introduce structured flexibility

Universities and colleges should consider flexible starting and finishing times for suitable duties, planned flexibility for research activities, and reasonable adjustments to meeting schedules. Institutions should define which activities require physical presence and which can be performed remotely.

2. Improve timetable predictability

Institutions should publish teaching schedules as early as reasonably possible and minimise unnecessary last-minute changes. Academic meetings, examinations, accreditation activities, and institutional events should be scheduled with due consideration for existing teaching commitments.

3. Develop caregiving-sensitive policies

Institutions should review leave arrangements, emergency leave procedures, timetable adjustment mechanisms, and support for employees with substantial caregiving responsibilities. Policies should be accessible to eligible employees without reinforcing gender stereotypes.

4. Review workload distribution

Faculty workload should be evaluated across teaching, research, administration, mentoring, assessment, and committee work. Institutions should consider whether administrative tasks can be simplified or redistributed and whether workload expectations are transparent and equitable.

5. Strengthen job satisfaction

Institutions should improve communication between faculty members and academic leaders, provide fair recognition for teaching and research contributions, and create transparent

procedures for professional development and career progression.

6. Establish clear boundaries for digital communication
Institutions should clarify expectations concerning emails, messaging applications, online meetings, and after-hours responses. Emergency communication requirements should be distinguished from routine academic communication.

7. Monitor faculty well-being
A confidential periodic survey can help institutions identify concerns relating to work–life balance, flexibility, workload, family demands, and job satisfaction. Results should be reported in aggregate form, and any interventions should be evaluated over time.

8. Evaluate policies before scaling them
Institutions should pilot selected interventions, document participation and outcomes, and assess whether they improve reported balance without adversely affecting teaching access, student support, or academic responsibilities.

XI. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Theoretical implications
The proposed model brings together job resources, family-related demands, and job satisfaction to examine faculty work–life balance. It applies the job demands–resources model and work–family conflict theory to a higher education setting while recognising that job satisfaction may be both a correlate and a possible consequence of work–life balance.

2. Managerial implications
The framework directs academic leaders to consider the practical usability of flexibility policies rather than treating policy availability as sufficient. It also highlights the value of predictable scheduling, transparent workload distribution, and attention to faculty members' varying circumstances.

3. Policy implications
The proposed relationships can inform institutional reviews of staff-welfare policies. However, national or state-level policy recommendations should be based on representative evidence, institutional feasibility, and evaluation of intended and unintended effects.

4. Limitations of the Study
The study has several anticipated limitations.

- First, the numerical results are illustrative. The statistics in this draft were not calculated from actual respondent-level data. They cannot be used as empirical evidence, and all statistical conclusions must be recalculated from genuine observations.
- Second, the cross-sectional design limits causal inference. A single survey can establish associations but cannot reliably determine temporal direction or exclude reverse relationships.
- Third, self-reported measures may introduce bias. Respondents may differ in how they interpret flexibility, family responsibilities, satisfaction, and work–life balance. Common-method bias is also possible when all variables are measured through one questionnaire at the same time.
- Fourth, the sample may not be representative. A sample of 300 is an illustrative planning choice. Representativeness depends on the sampling frame, selection process, response rate, regional coverage, and institutional distribution—not merely the number of participants.
- Fifth, measurement validity requires further assessment. The proposed questionnaire items are draft indicators. Expert review, pilot testing, and appropriate validity assessments are required before the scales can be treated as suitable research instruments.
- Sixth, omitted variables may affect the relationships. Teaching load, research expectations, institutional leadership, commuting time, employment status, and availability of family support may be relevant confounders.

Finally, the findings may not generalise to all academic settings. Faculty members in research-intensive universities, professional colleges, affiliated colleges, and institutions with substantial practical or clinical teaching requirements may have different opportunities for flexible work.

5. Scope for Future Research

Future research could extend the proposed study in the following ways:

- Conduct a multi-state study with a clearly defined and appropriately selected faculty sample.
- Compare public and private institutions while controlling for differences in designation, experience, discipline, and workload.
- Examine whether gender, caregiving intensity, or academic designation moderates the relationship between flexible work arrangements and work–life balance.

- Use longitudinal surveys to examine changes in work–life balance and job satisfaction over time.
- Evaluate an institutional flexibility intervention using pre- and post-intervention measurements and, where feasible, a comparison group.
- Extend the model to include workload, organisational support, burnout, or organisational commitment where justified by theory.
- Use validated scales and appropriate confirmatory factor analysis before testing structural relationships.
- Compare the experiences of faculty members with different types of caregiving responsibility rather than relying only on marital status or parental status.

XII. CONCLUSION

Work–life balance is an important consideration in the sustainable management of higher education institutions. Faculty members are expected to fulfil teaching, research, mentoring, and administrative responsibilities while managing their family and personal lives. Flexible work arrangements, family responsibilities, and job satisfaction offer three relevant perspectives for understanding how these demands and resources may relate to faculty well-being.

This paper proposes a quantitative framework for examining the three relationships in indian higher education institutions. The illustrative results demonstrate how descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation, regression, and hypothesis-testing tables can be integrated into a research paper. In the hypothetical model, flexibility and job satisfaction are positively associated with work–life balance, whereas family responsibilities are negatively associated with it.

These numerical results are not empirical findings and should not be presented as such. The study's substantive conclusions must be established through genuine data collection, valid measurement, transparent sampling, and appropriate statistical analysis.

If supported by actual evidence, the framework could help institutions assess flexible scheduling, caregiving-sensitive policies, equitable workload allocation, and measures to improve faculty job satisfaction. Ultimately, the aim should be to develop academic working environments that support faculty members' well-being while maintaining educational quality and institutional effectiveness.

REFERENCES

1. The following references provide a foundation for the proposed paper. Indian studies are included alongside foundational theoretical sources. Bibliographic details should be checked against the original publications before journal submission, particularly where the publisher's complete record has not been independently confirmed.
2. Arunachalam, A., Subbarayalu, A. V., Ramalingam, B., Prabaharan, S., Samiappan, D., Marimuthu, P. R., Chinnusamy, S., Shanmugavelu, G., & 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://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/111512/ UiTM Institutional Repository
3. 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 Emerald Publishing+1
4. 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
5. Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352 Drexel University+1
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 businessperspectives.org
7. Makwana, F. (2026). Hybrid work models in higher education: Implications for faculty well-being and productivity. Journal of Global Economy, 22(3). https://doi.org/10.1956/jge.v22i3.889 Journal of Global Economy
8. Negi, A. (2025). An empirical study of job satisfaction and work-life balance among Indian higher education faculty. NOLEGEIN Journal of Entrepreneurship Planning, Development and Management. Publisher record: https://mbajournals.in/index.php/JoEPDM/article/view/1763 mbajournals.in
9. 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). Publisher record: https://dmame-journals.org/index.php/dmame/article/view/135 dmame-journals.org