5-2023

Career Related Stress and Faculty Work–Life Balance

Sarah Chipka
Taylor University

CAREER RELATED STRESS AND FACULTY WORK–LIFE BALANCE:

_____

A thesis

Presented to

The School of Social Sciences, Education & Business

Department of Higher Education and Student Development

Taylor University

Upland, Indiana

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Higher Education and Student Development

_____

by

Sarah J. Chipka

May 2023

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL
_____

MASTER'S THESIS
_____

This is to certify that the Thesis of

Sarah Jo Chipka

entitled

Career Related Stress and Faculty Work–life Balance

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the

Master of Arts degree
in Higher Education and Student Development

May 2023

_____   _____
Kelly Yordy, Ph.D.   Date   Drew Moser, Ph.D.   Date
Thesis Supervisor   Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

_____
Scott Gaier, Ph.D.   Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

_____
Skip Trudeau, Ed.D.   Date
Chair, M.A. in Higher Education and Student Development

Abstract

College faculty have a range of demands on their time in both their personal and professional lives. The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the effects of career related stress on faculty members' satisfaction with the balance between their personal and professional lives. This study focused on faculty at a small, faith-based, liberal arts institution in the Midwest. Data from the 2013–2014, 2016–2017, and 2019–2020 HERI Faculty Surveys were analyzed to determine if any of four independent variables—colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, or teaching load—significantly predicted the dependent variable, work–life balance. Gender was the only control variable used in this study in order to determine if the experience of male and female faculty differ in relation to career related stress and work–life balance. Results indicated that there is a significant difference in the experience of male and female faculty. For two of the three survey years, female faculty experienced higher career related stress related to working with students than male faculty. Additionally, teaching load was found to be a more significant predictor of lower work–life balance satisfaction for male faculty in two of the survey years. While no independent variable was a consistent predictor across all three survey years, the differences in experience between male and female faculty is significant and worth further exploration.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Descriptive Statistics Tables

OLS Multiple Regression Analysis Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Career related stress has been a cause for concern amongst the working population for many years. Job stress, as defined by the Center for Disease Control, is "the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker" (The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 1999). In a study conducted by the Families and Work Institute, over 2,800 workers were surveyed and 26% expressed that they were often or very often burned out by their work (Bond et al., 1997). More recently, in 2019, the World Health Organization classified burnout as an occupational phenomenon, classifying it as a vital problem to address. This study focused on career related stress and work–life balance for faculty at a small, private, faith-based, liberal arts institution in the Midwest. This quantitative study used data from the 2013–2014, 2016–2017, and 2019–2020 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Surveys (Eagan et al., 2014; Stolzenberg et al., 2017).

Statement of the Problem

In their student-serving role, faculty are asked to balance the demands of teaching, service, and research and often find themselves without the necessary support to do so (Eddy & Gaston-Gayles, 2008). The role of faculty in academia is incredibly important. Numerous studies have pointed to the positive correlation between students' development and faculty interaction (Kuh, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Faculty are

responsible for facilitating the learning environments that impact a student's intellectual, social, and moral development (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). It is reasonable to assume that career related stress for faculty would result in an impact on the educational environments they facilitate. In current higher education news, faculty burnout in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic is a heavily discussed topic.

In a study conducted by the Chronicle of Higher Education (2020), more than two-thirds of faculty members said that in the past month they have felt extremely or very stressed. An Inside Higher Ed article discussed the recent "mass resignation" happening in the wake of the pandemic (Flaherty, 2022). The article involved stories from multiple faculty members that either transferred out of their current role in academe or left higher education all together. Apryl Alexander, featured in this article, shared that she was leaving her current role due to concerns about workplace inequities, including the "invisible service labor" shouldered disproportionately by women and people of color in the institution (Flaherty, 2022). In a 2022 study done by a strategic and creative agency, Berlin Cameron, on the exhaustion gap between men and women, the company found that 66% of women have felt burnt out in the past 7 days and 64% of women wished they had more time for themselves (Berlin Cameron, 2022).

In 2022, Rebecca Pope-Ruark, director of the office of faculty professional development at the Georgia Institute of Technology, wrote a book called *Unraveling Faculty Burnout: Pathways to Reckoning and Renewal.* She details her experiences of chronic stress and the alarming impact it had on her ability to do her work and function well in her personal life (Pope-Ruark, 2022a). In an article written by Pope-Ruark following her book release, she explores the pathways that can lead to burnout, especially

in academia, saying, "The heart of academic culture is an orientation toward competitive productivity" (Pope-Ruark, 2022b, para. 9). The topic of faculty workplace stress is not a new topic, however, as it has been a topic of research for many years prior to the pandemic bringing it to the forefront of conversation.

Career Related Stress

Career related stress for faculty revolves around the roles and expectations that they hold in their jobs. Career related stress effects women differently than men, as noted in multiple studies, often due to the maternal roles that they play both on campus with students and off campus with their own families (Hall et al., 2004; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). There are many different elements of faculty work that can cause stress in the workplace such as negative experiences of collegiality, heavy teaching loads, and unclear expectations for publishing and research (Ambrose et al., 2005; Tomei, 2006). HERI defines career related stress in terms of eight contributing factors. These factors are: committee work, colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, institutional procedures/red tape, teaching load, lack of personal time, and self-imposed high expectations. For the purpose of this study, the focus was on four of these eight factors: colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, and teaching load.

Work–Life Balance

The term balance is widely used as a means to express the necessary time allotment that occurs within different roles a person holds. The term balance itself refers to an "*even* distribution of weight" (Merriam-Webster, 2023, emphasis added). It is important to note that it is unlikely that any faculty member would achieve an even distribution of time between their different roles; rather, taking into account the

understanding of balance in terms of its metaphorical context is important. This definition of balance refers to the idea of mental and emotional steadiness (Merriam-Webster, 2023). In this study, the term balance was used widely in the context of faculty pursuing mental and emotional steadiness and how career related stress may impact that pursuit.

In a study exploring job satisfaction for faculty members, Ambrose et al. (2005) found that there were four main themes in their participants' responses when asked about work–life balance. The themes related to levels of internal and external benefits. For faculty with both low internal and external benefits, job satisfaction was the lowest. This demographic reflected faculty that were part of minority populations, were unhappy with their departmental supports, felt isolated in their roles, and so forth (Ambrose et al., 2005). On the other end of the spectrum, Ambrose et al. found that faculty with both high internal benefits and high external benefits were the most satisfied with their jobs. Internal benefits might reflect the collegiality of their institution, benefits they receive, and relationships with students, while external benefits may refer to being happy with the city in which the faculty member lives and/or works, social life outside of work, and school systems for families (Ambrose et al., 2005). Universities may not have as much effect on external benefits directly, but there is certainly a correlation that can be assessed as institutions engage the conversation of work–life balance for their faculty members.

Purpose of the Study

The work of faculty at a university often falls outside of the nine-to-five normative work day. Teaching requires planning, grading, meetings with students, and research and publishing, and it looks different every day. This study will contribute to the literature for faculty work–life balance and career related stress in academia. The results

of this study will help administrators at small, private, faith-based, liberal arts institutions (and similar institutions) better recognize the need for policies and practices regarding work–life balance for their faculty. This will also help institutions to prioritize the health and well-being of their faculty which in turn has an effect on the well-being of the campus community as a whole. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of career related stress on faculty work–life balance. Specifically, this study examined whether colleagues, students, research and publishing demands, as well as teaching load influenced the achievement of balance in the personal and professional lives of the faculty at the small, private, faith-based, liberal-arts institution represented.

Model Study and Conclusion

While not a direct replication, this study followed similar procedures to one conducted by Yordy (2018) in which she also examined the relationship between career related stress and faculty work–life balance utilizing data from the HERI Faculty Survey. Yordy focused her study on a national level and used only the 2013–2014 survey. This study focused on a small, private, faith-based, liberal-arts institution in particular and compared data from three triennial faculty surveys. As this study examined the relationship between four career related stress factors and the achievement of balance in the personal and professional lives of faculty, the research question this study sought to address was: What are the effects of career related stress on faculty work–life balance at a small, private, faith-based, liberal arts institution?

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to review the relevant literature related to career related stress and work–life balance. The section regarding faculty career related stress will focus on four variables of career related stress as defined by HERI: colleagues, students, research and publishing demands, and teaching load. The work–life balance section of the literature review will address common themes found in the literature such as gender, tenure track, new faculty, and family structures. Additionally, due to the focus of this study being a small, private, faith-based, liberal-arts institution, this chapter will address career related stress and work–life balance at faith-based institutions. This chapter will conclude with a theoretical framework.

Faculty Career Related Stress

Faculty have a broad spectrum of roles that they must juggle simultaneously. For many of today's faculty, balancing the work of teaching with the demands of research is a requirement for the achievement of tenure status. This balancing of roles can lead to an increase in stress depending on the support and role congruity experienced by the individual. Stress in the workplace is cause for concern as it can greatly impact productivity, morale, and the general culture of the work environment. Stress itself is a part of the natural human response. Humans are designed to experience stress as it can aid in focus and reacting appropriately to certain stimuli. It can become a challenge when there is no respite from the experience of stress (Cleveland Clinic, 2021).

According to the Cleveland Clinic (2021), long-term or chronic stress can impact the body in detrimental ways and can cause individuals to experience significant health challenges such as anxiety and depression. Workplace stress places a significant burden on the psychological, physiological, and financial wellbeing of the employers and employees of an organization (Colligan & Higgins, 2005). It can lead to hostility and tension in the workplace, which in turn affects the overall culture of the institution (Colligan & Higgins, 2005). Stress itself has broad definitions and different areas of study operationalize the concept of stress differently. In terms of career related stress, HERI operationalizes this type of stress in terms of eight contributing factors. For the purpose of this study, the focus was on four of these eight factors: colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, and teaching load.

Colleagues

Working as a faculty member in an institution inevitably requires a certain amount of collegiality and proximity to others. Many studies concluded that challenges with colleagues is the single most cited issue for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Ambrose et al., 2005; Barnes et al., 1998; Mukhtar, 2012). Relationships within the institution and department matter a great deal to the quality of an individual's work life and are vital to retention (Barnes et al., 1998). These collegial relationships take place in many different formats such as peer-to-peer interactions as well as mentoring relationships and are often different for individuals in the tenure versus pre-tenure position. According to August and Waltman (2004), collegial peer relationships are incredibly significant to non-tenured women as they allow for companionship and shared experience in the workplace.

Mentorship and interest shown by senior faculty to junior faculty creates a sense of collegiality and connection in the workplace (Ambrose et al., 2005). Ambrose et al. explained the value of different types of mentorship such as intellectual, professional or career development, and departmental politics. In their research, the areas of mentorship found to be missing most often in workplace setting were career development and political mentoring which "helps to correct naïve assumptions" about the workplace culture and expectations (Ambrose et al., 2005, p. 816). The value of mentorship is echoed by many other studies regarding new faculty and retention. New faculty express a desire that mentors show them the common practices of the role and introduce them to the culture of the institution (Ponjuan et al., 2011).

In a study by Ambrose et al. (2005), lack of collegial relationships was the leading cause of job dissatisfaction in the workplace. Ninety-nine of their 123 respondents discussed the value of collegiality, noting especially that tension and stress can come from a lack of collegial relationships and the presence of intradepartmental tensions. In this study, faculty described the welcoming atmosphere when they first arrived on campus and how that impacted their positive view of their job. Some faculty, however, shared that when they arrived to their job and noticed senior faculty being more absorbed in their subfield and less interested in collegiality, there was a more negative view of their role.

Students

The teaching, mentoring, and advising relationships with students that faculty hold are important to the value that they feel for their work (August & Waltman, 2004). Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) highlight the value of relationships between faculty and

students as central to the college experience. For many faculty, there is overlap of their work and personal roles when they have meals with students and meet with them outside of the classroom (Bracken, 2006). While the role of mentor may not be explicitly stated in job descriptions for faculty, it is often an additional role that they take on as students seek them out for advice or answers (Bracken, 2006).

When faculty achieve tenure, their roles shift, and they may have a broader array of students that they are teaching (Bracken, 2006). This increased diversity of students requires more preparation and awareness on the part of the faculty. There are several sources of stress that correlate with the practice of student-centered teaching (Eagan & Garvey, 2015). These sources, according to Eagan and Garvey (2015), include change in work responsibilities, intuitional budget cuts, and family obligations. When functioning in a student-centered environment, these events carry a great deal of weight for the faculty in employment. In these student-centered environments, faculty feel as though their intentional engagement with their students is important if they aim to impact the holistic development of their students (Trautvetter et al., 2008). There is a "need to know who the student is" in order to be present to them and engage in deep and meaningful conversations (Trautvetter et al., 2008).

Research or Publishing Demands

Pressures to publish look different at different types of universities. At public research institutions, the central focus of faculty work is the research, whereas at private liberal arts institutions, the focus is often more student-centered and specifically focused on teaching. For many faculty, research regarding a topic that they value increases their satisfaction in their work and reduces their desire to leave an institution (Smart, 1990).

Additionally, according to Ambrose et al. (2005), there is a perception amongst faculty members that in pursuit of tenured positions or other promotions, research and publishing is an integral part of their work. This pursuit has grown recently as has the notion that faculty are expected to produce more research to keep up with the competitive nature of publishing (Ambrose et al., 2005). This increase in pursuit of publishing can be credited to the increase in demands and pressure to publish from institutions (Miller et al., 2011). This "publish or perish" mentality as described by Miller et al. (2011) pushes for the production of articles for peer reviewed journals, increase in publications by women, as well as more tenured faculty submissions.

Some studies have identified differences in the research and publishing experiences of people of different genders and races. Women working in higher education institutions that have high levels of research productivity are shown to be more satisfied than their colleagues in disciplines with lower levels of research productivity (Seifert & Umpback, 2008). For women working in environments where scholarship is encouraged, the rates of satisfaction increase (Seifert & Umpback, 2008). The ratio of male to female faculty research, however, is weighted much heavier on the side of male faculty who report engaging in more research-oriented tasks, while their female counterparts engage in more service-oriented tasks such as advising and teaching (Guarino & Borden, 2017; O'Meara et al., 2017). For faculty of color, there is far less production of published work than their White counterparts (Eagan & Garvey, 2015).

Teaching Load

According to Russell (2010) the root of workplace dissatisfaction is likely related to the demands of publishing and scholarly research; however, it is also related to the

additional role of teacher that they must balance. Today, the role of "faculty" looks widely different across the board. Recently, there has been a reduction in full-time faculty. As full-time faculty leave their jobs or retire, they are replaced by part-time or adjunct faculty (Ott & Cisneros, 2015). In some instances, in-person teaching faculty have been replaced by online versions of lectures and discussions. This decentralization of education has had an impact on the demands of teaching faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). In a study on the impact of distance learning on teaching load, Tomei (2006) found that teaching load for traditional in-person class was around 41.25 hours, while the same course offered through a distance learning platform added to the load so that the hours were closer to 59.18 (Tomei, 2006). In the same study, Tomei looked at other implications and found that online advising required additional time (16.3% more hours). However, assessment was a slight decrease in hourly load (7.9% decrease in hours; Tomei, 2006, p. 539).

Typically, lighter teaching loads are reflective of larger research institutions as there is more of a push for scholarship, while smaller schools tend to have faculty with more teaching load (Keys & Devine, 2006). A 2006 study by Schuster and Finkelstein found that women and new faculty sit at the high end of the teaching load scale, meaning they are often expected to teach more, compared to their male or senior counterparts. However, that appears to be trending more equitably according to the study. More current studies continue to show that women often have a higher teaching load in undergraduate instruction compared to men who have a higher teaching load in graduate instruction (Carrigan et al., 2017). Studies have also shown that women and faculty of color are more likely to be engage in service roles on campus than their White male counterparts

(Carrigan et al., 2017; Guarino & Borden, 2017; O'Meara et al., 2017). Because faculty with higher teaching loads publish less, the department or institution where they are employed will likely tailor the load requirements depending on the need for scholarship (Bergeron & Liang, 2007).

Career Related Stress at Faith-Based Institutions

Faculty at faith-based institutions are found to have a higher teaching load but fewer research requirements compared to those at larger research universities (Trautvetter et al., 2008). New faculty in these institutions struggle with many of the same challenges as their colleagues at secular institutions such as collegiality, student relationships, publishing demands, and balancing their work and family life (Trautvetter et al., 2008). Similarly, new faculty have expressed an increase in stress if they do not feel like they have a grasp on the culture of the institution of which they are a part (Trautvetter et al., 2008). For faculty at faith-based institutions, there is a perceived need for active and intentional engagement with students in order to support them in their holistic engagement through offering office hours, prompts for self-reflection, and discussions on social issues (Trautvetter et al., 2008).

For female faculty in particular, Hall et al. (2004) found that a majority of the female faculty members interviewed in their study shared a common conviction that they would stop working immediately if they felt as though that is what their child needed. Hall et al. hypothesized that this could be because of the more traditional perceptions of the mothering role found in Christian contexts. Many of the women in this study indicated that the reason they chose a Christian work environment was for the expected congruence in values around family roles in relation to academic. If there is dissonance in

that expectation and reality of the work environment, the faculty member often has to weigh their values in terms of employment and work–life balance.

According to Trautvetter (2008), faculty stress in faith-based institutions is often influenced by a number of factors such as: "(1) mission and identity; (2) role modeling; (3) faculty role of teaching and mentoring; (4) faculty role of research and creative activities; (5) faculty citizenship in the college community; and (6) faculty engagement in external communities" (p. 137). Each faculty member (especially the new faculty) is searching out their roles and how they fit into the broader mission and function of the institution they are a part of.

Work–Life Balance

Currently, the literature on faculty work–life balance is focused primarily on faculty that are parents and how they balance their schedules at work and at home with their kids. There is, however, an important demographic missing from these studies, which are individuals with different relational, familial, and social statuses from the parent in the workplace (Denson & Szelényi, 2020). In a study on the demands of balancing career and family life, Wilton and Ross (2017) found that three main themes emerged in their research: flexibility, sacrifice, and insecurity.

The theme of flexibility is a positive element of faculty work, meaning that there is flexibility of schedule to balance both time at work and time for family or outside commitments (Wilton & Ross, 2017). Sacrifice and insecurity both play a significant role in the job satisfaction of the faculty member. The need to sacrifice certain elements of family or social life for career, the general unknowns that accompany faculty roles, and competitive culture can all lead to strain in searching for work–life balance (Wilton &

Ross, 2017). Yordy (2018), found that there were factors that influenced a faculty member's ability to attain a healthy work–life balance such as institutional procedures, collegiality, and research and publishing demands. As faculty attempt to create a balanced life where work, family, social, and other spheres all coexist together, there are vastly different expectations for what that balance looks like from an institutional as well as personal perspective.

Gender

The proportion of women among full-time faculty has grown significantly according to Schuster and Finkelstein (2006). Women, however, are still disproportionately represented in full-time faculty. While there are a high number of full-time female faculty, they are more likely to be found in nontenure-track positions such as instructors or lecturers (Harper et al., 2001). These positions often lack both job security and ability for promotion and tenure in addition to being lower paid than their male counterparts (Harper et al., 2001). Women in faculty positions also value having a senior colleague to introduce them to the culture of the university (August & Waltman, 2004). The idea of mentorship was a theme throughout the literature in its support of positive mentoring relationships with senior faculty encouraging women to be "both an intellectual and a mother at the same time" (Hall et al., 2004).

For women, the role of mother is significant in the literature regarding work–life balance. While there are certainly other partners that can carry the load of child-care, the responsibility most often falls on the mother. Historically, women have been "relegated to doing their work in the private sphere, in the home, while men were expected to do their work in the public sphere, outside the home" (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012, p. 32).

Today, there have certainly been steps to secure more equitable footing for women in the academic sphere, however there are still significant barriers that women must overcome in order to find a place in a sphere designed primarily for men. The traditional tenure timeline, for example, does not account for women faculty who may have a child as it was designed when men were the sole proprietors of academia (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Gender schemas, which are ways that people expect men and women to fulfil their societal roles, often find women being narrowed into traditional categories of motherhood, which can greatly affect the ability for those women to continue to advance in the competitive academic realm (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2012) note that these schemas are often found in environments that seek to be gender equitable (such as higher education), however it causes these institutions to look over micro-inequalities that can greatly impact the advancement of the women faculty.

Tenure Track

The process of tenure is often considered ambiguous, intimidating, and an unknown. The tenure-track faculty are navigating this complex process without clear guidelines and expectations, and the tenured faculty are then pushed to produce more scholarship and leadership activities (Eddy & Gaston-Gayles, 2008; Owens et al., 2018). The tenure environment and collegiality are often intertwined with the culture of the institution. In institutions where competition is prevalent, it can create job dissatisfaction for tenure-track faculty (Wilton & Ross, 2017). In looking at trends, there has been an increase recently in nontenure-track faculty in recent years as states cut funding and nontenure-track positions are cheaper to fund than tenure-track positions (Ott & Cisneros, 2015).

As noted above, women are underrepresented in tenure-track and tenured positions at institutions. For many universities, tenure is only available to full-time faculty, so for women that reduce their hours for motherhood, they often lose eligibility for tenure (Hall et al., 2004). This notion, however, could also apply to fathers that want to take more time for their families, or other individuals who have viable reasons for cutting back on heavy workloads. The tenure process appears to have other challenges as explored by Ambrose et al. (2005), who found that there were significant issues with the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. In a study of 123 faculty members, both formerly tenured and tenure-track, these issues included the fact that faculty members seemingly meeting all of the tenure eligible criteria were not offered tenure, and there was a significant lack of communication regarding the tenure-track process (Ambrose et al., 2005).

New Faculty

The demographic of the population seeking tenure-track positions is shifting. More women and people of color are entering into tenure-track roles in academia than ever before (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). New faculty are faced with a number of challenges as noted by Eddy and Gaston-Gayles (2008), such as finding balance between their many role contexts as well as learning the culture of the university. New faculty often feel guilty for taking vacations or time off and feel as though there is always another project that is more important (Eddy & Gaston-Gayles, 2008). Additionally, new faculty, while confident in their research abilities, often feel less prepared for the role of teaching (Austin, 2003; Eddy & Gaston-Gayles, 2008). Austin (2003), in her research on new faculty, noted that there is a gap in graduate preparation for the professoriate. More

of their support comes from colleagues rather than their professors in their doctoral programs and that continues into their early faculty years as many of the participants reflected a general lack of feedback and communication regarding their role as new faculty (Austin, 2003).

Family Structures

Family structure relates to the marital status, parental role, or other familial responsibility an individual may carry. In a study by Eddy and Gaston-Gayles (2008), participants shared that finding a work–life balance is challenging when single as there is more of a push (whether internally or externally) for individuals to stay extra hours or take on more responsibility. On the other hand, faculty with children are reporting that there are certain challenges associated with balancing their role as faculty and that of parent. Hall et al. (2004) focused their study on faculty women and balancing the role of motherhood and found that there were certain needs that were identified by the participants: first-order and second-order needs. The first-order needs center around the idea of identity and balancing the identity of being an academic and mother, while the second-order needs are more centralized around practical needs such as flexibility and boundaries. These needs may look different for different institutions, however as a whole, the system is not currently designed to meet these needs explicitly (Hall et al., 2004).

Studies have found that male faculty research output was increased if they were married or with a partner (Matheson & Rosen, 2012; Sax et al., 2002). Women, on the other hand have been shown to experience greater challenges with the expectations of tenure and research (Hall et al., 2004). This discrepancy highlights the need for policies

addressing the support of individuals with families, as well as singles (Eddy & Gaston-Gayles, 2008).

Work–Life Balance at Faith Based Institutions

For women in faith-based institutions, there is an expectation that those institutions would mirror their family values. Hall et al. (2004) explain that "Christian subculture may differ in displaying tensions consistent with gender-role ideologies that are more conservative than those of the larger society." (p. 41). They go on to explain that taking time out for childbearing and childrearing can be difficult to manage with the schedule of the institution they are a part of. Because of this difference in experience for female faculty, there is a hope that the tenure track design would be amended to allow for more flexibility for women in motherhood.

National Higher Education Associations

Higher education associations include organizations that establish regulations around work environments, policies, discrimination, and other issues in higher education settings. The organizations represented in this section specifically address the topic of academic workload and work–life balance for faculty members.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was founded in 1915 and released the Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work in 2001. In it, the salary gaps between male and female faculty are addressed. The gap is largest at the rank of full professorship (AAUP, 2001). The statement documents the disparity between policies around family responsibilities and the expectations of the academic workload. For faculty—both male and female—that desire to stay home to care for newborn or young children, the tenure clock is working against them, risking the loss

of academic freedom for those individuals (AAUP, 2001, p. 342). The statement calls for flexibility of work policies and schedules, childcare, and elder family care.

The College and University Work–Life–Family Association (2020) seeks to "provide leadership in facilitating the integration of work and study with family/personal life at institutions of higher learning" (para. 1). The three key objectives of their organization include offering professional support, gathering information on emerging issues relevant to campus programs, and contributing to the understanding and development of the family-work field (College and University Work–Life–Family Association, 2020).

Theoretical Framework

While there are few theories that address the relationship between work–life balance and career related stress, there are many theories that incorporate elements from these constructs. Role Strain Theory (Goode, 1960), Perceived Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 1997), and Family-Supportive Organization Perceptions Theory (Allen, 2001) are theories that address the roles that individuals experience within an organization and how expectations from those roles effect workplace and overall life satisfaction.

Role Strain Theory

In 1960, Goode introduced the concept of role strain as "the felt difficulty in fulfilling role obligations" (p. 483). Individuals are born with and will take on certain roles in their lives such as child, congregation member, parent, professor, and volunteer, and each of these roles carries certain expectations. Individuals will likely experience different role demands and conflicts when certain obligations do not line up across roles

(Goode, 1960). Allocation is a conflict that Goode (1960) identifies as a common

experience for many individuals. Determining the allocation of time, energy and

resources will likely be determined by both the external and internal expectations placed

on the individual within that role (Goode, 1960). When the expectations from different

roles clash, the individual can experience anxiety and worry regarding the ability to carry

in on those roles. This requires the process of selection and allocation in order to balance

the roles an individual holds (Goode, 1960).

Perceived Organizational Support

The theory of perceived organizational support illustrates the assumption that

employees have regarding how their employers value their contributions. It highlights the

idea that if the organization cares well for its employees, then by reciprocity norm, the

employees will care well for the organization of which they are a part (Eisenberger et al.,

1997). This idea of reciprocity would continue to keep employees committed to their

organization. Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) describes perceived organizational support

as an experience-based attribution of the organization which requires a careful look at the

policies, norms, and procedures implemented by the institution and how those each affect

the constituents of the organization. If perceived organizational support is high, it can aid

in strengthening the confidence that individuals have in the places that they work. When

organizations provide assurance regarding their desire to support their employees, and

that assurance is grounded in policy and practice, employees feel confident in that

organization (Eisenberger et al., 2001). Perceived organizational support is strongly

related to employer actions and the policies they put in place to support their employees.

Family-Supportive Organization Perceptions

Family-Supportive Organization Perceptions Theory was developed by Allen (2001) and focuses on organizations being supportive of their employees finding time for both their work and their families. This theory moves away from the idea that long and late hours (overtime) mean that the employee is committed to their work; rather it encourages the use of additional and alternative metrics to measure organizational commitment. According to Allen's 2001 study, she found that employees working in an institution that they perceived as family-friendly reported less work–family conflict (Allen, 2001; Lapierre et al., 2008). Work–family conflict correlates with the idea of role strain as it represents an "incompatibility between the demands of two roles" (Allen, 2001, p. 95). Work–family conflict can affect the job satisfaction of individuals as it causes tension between the role of work and those held outside of the office. This research supported the idea that "work environments viewed as more family-supportive could reduce employees' fear that devoting time and energy to their family could hurt their career" (Lapierre et al., 2008, p. 94). A key component of this family-supportive work environment is the role that the supervisor plays. If the supervisor projects the family-supportive ideals, the employees will likely have a greater appreciation for the organizational culture (Allen, 2001). The practical implications of Family-Supportive Organization Perceptions Theory will likely look different for each organization depending on the demographics of the population and the nature of the work.

Conclusion

This chapter explored the relevant literature related to faculty work–life balance and career related stress. It began with a thorough explanation of career related stress

before defining the four factors of career related stress addressed in this study. These factors were colleagues, students, teaching load, and research or publishing demands. Work–life balance was then explored through the lens of four prominent themes in the literature: gender, tenure track, new faculty, and family structures. Literature for career related stress and work–life balance as related to working in a faith-based institution were also included as the institution in this study is faith-based. Finally, three theories were offered to help guide the research and offer foundational support to the study. These were Role Strain Theory, Perceived Organizational Support, and Family Supportive Organization Perceptions. Each of these related to the experience of employees working within an organization and how they experience their roles and value in the context of that organization. The next chapter will explain the methodology of the study and how the data were analyzed.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to lay out the methodology of the study. It will illustrate the process used to examine the relationship between career related stress and faculty work–life balance at a small, faith-based, liberal arts institution in the Midwest. The research question used to guide this research approach was: What are the effects of career related stress on faculty work–life balance at a small, private, faith-based, liberal arts institution?

Research Design

This quantitative study utilized an ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression analysis, assessing the relationship between multiple variables. A multiple regression analysis is a correlational study which seeks to predict an outcome based on the impact of the variables present (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). The correlation between the four career related stress factors and faculty perception of their ability to balance their professional lives and personal lives was explored in the analysis of the data. The assessment of surveys addressed four of the variables—students, colleagues, teaching load, and research and publishing demands—and their relationship to work–life balance.

Independent Variables

The independent variables present in this study were derived from the constructs of career related stress factors found in the HERI Faculty Survey. (See Appendix A,

Appendix B, and Appendix C for links to the survey instruments from each of the years included in this analysis.) In the survey, participants are asked to "Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of stress for you during the past two years" (Stolzenberg et al., 2017, p. 36). These independent variables are operationally defined by HERI using a three-point scale with responses of "Extensive" (3), "Somewhat" (2), and "Not at all" (1).

Dependent Variable

Work–life balance—which was operationally defined in the 2013–2014 survey using a three-point scale with responses of "to a great extent," "to some extent," or "not at all" to the statement: "I achieve a healthy balance between my personal life and my professional life"—will serve as the dependent variable in this study. In the 2016–2017 and 2019–2022 surveys, the scale was updated to a four-point scale with responses of "strongly agree," "somewhat agree," "disagree somewhat," or "disagree strongly." The same statement is used in each of the three survey instruments.

Control Variables

The control variable of gender was the only control variable used in this study. Previous research has shown differences in male and female faculty experiences in the institution; therefore, the analysis examined the differences between male and female faculty. The gender control variable was operationalized from the HERI data on a dichotomous scale where 1 = female and 0 = male

Instrumentation

This study utilized the HERI Faculty Survey data from the 2013–2014, 2016–2017, and 2019–2020 data regarding the institution. The triennial faculty survey has been

administered by HERI since 1978. The data are embargoed for three years until the next

survey results are released; thus, the most recent data are from the 2019–2020 survey.

The HERI Faculty Survey identifies eight variables that comprise the career related stress

construct that faculty assess. This allows for depth of understanding of the experience of

stress as it is a term with a broad definition. This study focused on four of the eight career

related stress variables due to the scope of the study and the type of institution analyzed.

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) is a nationally

recognized program that is widely well-respected and produces surveys that are designed

and tested thoroughly. The HERI Faculty Survey designed by HERI and CIRP is

distributed nationwide to faculty at many different institutions with a broad spectrum of

demographic features. The constructs addressed in this study—colleagues, students,

teaching load, and research or publishing demands—are part of the broader career related

stress global construct by HERI. To score these constructs, HERI uses Item Response

Theory which is "a modern psychometric method that uses response patterns to derive

construct scores estimates" (Higher Education Research Institute, n.d., para. 3). This

theory was chosen because it "involves deriving a maximum likelihood score estimate

based on the pattern of the person's responses to the entire set of construct questions"

which is a more reliable analysis than taking each construct separately (Higher Education

Research Institute, n.d., para 3). Because of the validity of this survey, it provided reliable

results to assess in relating career related stress factors to faculty work–life balance at the

institution.

Participants

  The study particularly focused on the full-time faculty at a small, liberal arts, faith-based institution in the Midwest as they represent the teaching faculty that engage with all four of the career related stress measures addressed in this study. The sample of the full-time faculty participants for the 2013–2014 data is comprised of 92 faculty members (61 male, 30 female, and 1 did not disclose gender), the 2016–2017 survey was completed by 117 faculty members (74 male and 43 female), and finally, the 2019–2020 survey results comprise of the responses of 112 faculty members (70 male, 40 female, and 2 did not disclose gender).

Data Analysis

  This study was analyzed quantitatively using appropriate analysis techniques. The quantitative descriptive statistics model was the method used as it describes the characteristics of the population. This study presented the results of the 2013–2014, 2016–2017, and 2019–2020 Faculty Survey and then described trends in the data relating to the male and female experience in addition to the multiple regression analysis of the three separate surveys. The multiple regression analysis assessed the relationship between the dependent variable—work–life balance—and the four independent variables of students, teaching load, colleagues, and research or publishing demands for both male and female faculty.

Conclusion

  This chapter outlined the methodology that was used to examine the relationship between four career related stress variables—colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, and teaching load—and faculty's perception of their work–life balance

satisfaction. The instrumentation of the HERI Faculty Survey was addressed and the variables of career related stress and work–life balance were operationally defined. The OLS multiple regression analysis was described as the method of analysis for this study.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the career related stress variables of colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, and teaching load were predictors of work–life balance satisfaction for faculty at a small, faith-based, liberal arts institution in the Midwest. This chapter is broken up into four distinct sections: a review of the survey years, descriptive statistics, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis, and data pre-screening for assumptions. The results of the descriptive statistics and OLS regression analysis are presented in models below.

Survey Years

The three survey years differed slightly. In 2013–2014, the HERI Faculty Survey included colleagues as a career related stress factor but omitted it in the following two surveys; therefore, data on the variable of colleagues will be present in only the 2013–2014 data table. The response options for the question of work–life balance also differed between the three survey years. In 2013–2014, the response to the prompt "Achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life", participants could select to a great extent = 3, to some extent = 2, or not at all = 1. In both 2016–2017 and 2019–2020, the responses to the question "I achieve a healthy balance between my personal life and my professional life" included strongly agree = 4, somewhat agree = 3, disagree somewhat = 2, disagree strongly = 1. The scales for the independent variables were consistent between all three survey years.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics are presented with participant numbers (*n*), mean (*M),*

and standard deviations *(SD)* for the dependent and independent variable in Table 1,

Table 2, and Table 3.

Table 1

2013–2014 Survey Descriptive Statistics

Dependent variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Balance between personal life and professional life	2.27	0.64	92
Males	2.39	0.64	61
Females	2.03	0.61	30
Independent variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Colleagues	2.48	0.56	92
Males	2.38	0.52	61
Females	2.67	0.60	30
Students	2.64	0.50	92
Males	2.59	0.52	61
Females	2.77	0.43	30
Research and publishing demands	2.57	0.74	92
Males	2.59	0.66	61
Females	2.50	0.90	30
Teaching load	2.92	0.63	92
Males	2.89	0.60	61
Females	2.97	0.66	30

Note: Dependent variable scale = 1 (Not at All) to 3 (To a Great Extent)

Table 2

2016–2017 Survey Descriptive Statistics

Dependent variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Balance between personal life and professional life	2.70	0.86	117
Males	2.80	0.84	74
Females	2.53	0.88	43

Independent variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Students	2.81	0.49	117
Males	2.88	0.49	74
Females	2.70	0.46	43
Research and publishing demands	2.56	0.68	117
Males	2.55	0.66	74
Females	2.56	0.73	43
Teaching load	2.86	0.73	117
Males	3.00	0.70	74
Females	2.63	0.72	43

Note: Dependent variable scale = 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)

Table 3

2019–2020 Survey Descriptive Statistics

Dependent variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Balance between personal life and professional life	2.59	0.88	112
Males	2.70	0.90	70
Females	2.42	0.81	40

Independent variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Students	2.74	0.56	112
Males	2.71	0.56	70
Females	2.80	0.56	40
Research and publishing demands			
Males	2.33	0.74	112
Females	2.34	0.67	70
	2.25	0.80	40
Teaching load			
Males	2.87	0.77	112
Females	2.94	0.75	70
	2.73	0.78	40

Note: Dependent variable scale = 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)

Assumptions

It is important to check assumptions in an OLS multiple regression analysis. According to Mertler and Reinhart (2017) there are four components of screening the data. These include (a) assessing the accuracy of the data collected, (b) addressing missing data, (c) assessing the presence and effects of outliers, and (d) checking assumptions, which include normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. All assumptions were met in this study for the results represented in the following tables (Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6). Assumptions were not met for the variables of students and colleagues in the 2013–2014 analysis and the variable of research and publishing demands in the 2016–2017 analysis, therefore those variables were removed, and the data were analyzed again. This analysis is represented in the adjusted model.

Regression Analysis

After all assumptions were met for the remaining variables, the analysis was conducted using an OLS Multiple Regression analysis. This analysis would determine whether or not the dependent variable (achieving a healthy balance between personal and

professional life) is predicted by the independent variables (colleagues, students, research
and publishing demands, and teaching load) and to what extent. Colleagues were only
included in the 2013–2014 HERI survey as a career related stress factor and did not meet
the assumptions, therefore it was removed from the model. The control variable of gender
is also included in the models to offer a view of the differing experiences of male and
female faculty on this college campus. In 2013–2014, one participant did not report their
gender identity and in 2019–2020, two participants did not report their gender identity.
This is represented in the *n* column of the descriptive statistics table (Table 1 and Table 3,
respectively).

Table 4

2013–2014 Survey Regression Analysis

Independent variable	Adjusted model
Research and publishing demands	-.105
Males	.046
Females	-.266
Teaching load	-.314**
Males	-.480
Females	-.100

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table 5

2016–2017 Survey Regression Analysis

Independent variable	Adjusted model
Students	-.310*
Males	-.398***
Females	-.306*
Teaching load	-.118
Males	-.139
Females	-.231

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table 6

2019–2020 Survey Regression Analysis

Independent variable	Full model
Students	-.180
Males	-.103
Females	-.392***
Research and publishing demands	.397
Males	-.322**
Females	
Teaching load	-.365***
Males	-.483***
Females	-.245

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

The regression analysis indicated that for participants of the 2013–2014 and 2019–2020 survey, teaching load was a significant predictor of achievement of balance between personal and professional life. In the 2016–2017 survey, students were a slight predictor of balance between personal and professional life, however, that variable did not show statistical significance in the other two survey years.

According to Mertler and Reinhart (2017), a negative beta weight "indicates a negative change in the dependent variable when the independent variable increases" (p. 182). After examining the beta weights, teaching load was found to be a significant predictor of balance between personal and professional life in two of the three survey years, and students were found to be a slight predictor in the 2016–2017 survey. As faculty reported high levels of career related stress related to their teaching load, their achievement of balance between their personal and professional lives decreased.

Gender

When looking at the descriptive statistics for the three survey years, female faculty reported lower satisfaction with work–life balance in each survey. In 2013–2014,

the mean for satisfaction between personal and professional life was 2.03 for female faculty while male faculty averaged a score of 2.39 out of a 3-point scale. In 2016–2017, the mean was 2.53 for female and 2.80 for male, and in 2019–2020, the mean for female faculty was 2.42 while male faculty was 2.70, both on a 4-point scale. In terms of work–life balance satisfaction, this difference is significant in representing a gap in the experiences of male and female faculty in satisfaction regarding their work–life balance.

The difference between the results for male and female participants is represented in the models above. In 2013–2014 teaching load was a significant predictor of work–life balance for male faculty more so than female faculty. In the 2016–2017 survey, students was a significant predictor for both male and female faculty and in 2019–2020, students was significant predictor of work–life balance satisfaction for female faculty. Additionally, in 2019–2020, the variable of research and publishing demands was more significant for female faculty in terms of their work–life balance satisfaction than their male colleagues. For teaching load, however, there was higher significance for male faculty than female faculty meaning that as teaching load stress increased, satisfaction regarding balance between personal and professional life for male faculty decreased.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to analyze whether or not a faculty member's career related stress (colleagues, students, research and publishing demands, and teaching load) would be able to predict their ability to achieve a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives. This chapter outlined the descriptive statistics, checking for assumptions, and the OLS multiple regression analysis. The descriptive statistics included mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and number of participants (n). The data were

checked for assumptions prior to running the regression analysis. The OLS multiple

regression analysis indicated that there were some variables that were statistically

significant predictors of career related stress.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a discussion of the research conducted in this study, the findings, and their implications. This chapter will include a discussion of the findings, then the research question will be addressed by the results of the study, which will lead into the implications for practice within higher education. This chapter will also address any limitations and will offer recommendations for future research.

Discussion of Findings

Colleagues

Although the variable of colleagues was a significant aspect of the literature, it was not found to be a high predictor of work–life balance satisfaction at the institution in this study. It was removed from the HERI survey for the 2016–2017 and 2019–2020 survey years; therefore, it was only run in the 2013–2014 data analysis. The model study utilized in the design of this research found that stress caused by colleagues was a significant predictor of faculty members' achievement of a healthy balance between their personal lives and professional lives (Yordy, 2018). There are many factors that could contribute to this difference in results such as institution type, participant numbers (*n*), and departmental culture. That said, supporting the collegiality of faculty members through mentorship opportunities, creating spaces for peer-to-peer relationships, and new faculty support is important to maintaining positive work environments.

Students

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that students were a slight predictor of faculty members' satisfaction with the balance between their personal and professional lives for female faculty and a significant predictor for male faculty in the 2016–2017 survey year. Students were also a significant predictor for female faculty in 2019–2020, however not for the male faculty. The differing results between survey years may have multiple contributing factors from faculty turnover to large differences in gender representation between the survey participants. In the most recent surveys, female faculty have reported slight to significant decreases in their ability to achieve balance between their personal and professional lives as student related stress increased at work. As their stress related to their work with students increased, their satisfaction with their work–life balance decreased. This may be due to the more maternal role they are expected to play on faith-based campuses (Hall et al., 2004).

Research or Publishing Demands

The results of the regression analysis indicate that research or publishing demands did not significantly predict faculty satisfaction with the balance between their personal and professional lives in most of the survey years. In 2019–2020, research or publishing demands was found to be a slight predictor of satisfaction in work–life balance for female faculty. The negative beta weight indicates an inverse relationship between the predictor variable and the outcome variable. As female faculty members' stress from research or publishing demands increases, their achievement of a healthy work–life balance decreases. This may be due to increased research demands on faculty (Miller et al., 2011), more female faculty in academia (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), or role strain

regarding their different responsibilities (Goode, 1960; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012).

That said, the differences in results between the survey years indicate that there are more

factors present in the satisfaction in work–life balance for faculty at the institution in this

study.

Teaching Load

Results of the regression analysis indicate that teaching load was a significant

predictor of satisfaction with faculty members' work–life balance in the 2013–2014 and

2019–2020 survey years; however, it did not show significance in the 2016–2017 survey.

This is likely indicative of there being additional factors present in the satisfaction in

work–life balance for faculty members. In both 2013–2014 and 2019–2020, teaching load

was more of a significant factor for male faculty than for female faculty. This could be a

result of many different factors such as balancing teaching and research or heavier

teaching loads.

Implications

The findings from this study can aid in the programming and policy making for

the small, private, faith-based institution and similar institutions. The following section

discusses the implications of the research findings with regards to policy and practice. It

will also provide considerations for higher education administrators and individual

faculty members.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Part of the purpose of this study was to draw attention to the faculty experience of

work–life integration in colleges and universities. While none of the four career related

stress factors analyzed in this study were found to be significant predictors each year

consecutively, there are significant differences between the experiences of male and female faculty in career related stress. If female faculty are experiencing more career related stress related to working with students, administration should respond by identifying the specific experiences of female faculty in their work with students. This would allow policies and practice to be formed that protect the faculty experience and set boundaries that offer support and structure to the role that these faculty serve. This applies to the results that showed that male colleagues experienced less satisfaction with their work–life balance when stress related to their teaching load increased. Policies and practices relating to faculty teaching load should be assessed for consistency, feasibility, and sustainability for all faculty members.

Having faculty members experiencing high stress at work is likely to have a negative impact on the classroom environment and may take away from their ability to contribute to the positive student-centered environment the university analyzed in this study seeks to embody. As this institution and similar institutions move forward in faculty development, leaders should involve their employees in intentionally entering into a process of confirming, reforming, strengthening, and revitalizing current policies. This should be done with both male and female faculty in intentional spaces that invite the voices of each gender in their differing experiences of the faculty role. The institution should also commit to investigating and implementing new policies relating to work–life balance by assessing best practices at similar institutions as well as assessing positive practices currently in place at the focus institution.

Implications for Administrators and Faculty

Workplace stress is a fairly common occurrence in relatively any job. When periodic, it is not inherently negative; however chronic career related stress is likely to have a negative impact on the work environment, health of the individual, and community in the institution. Addressing stress in colleges and institutions does not mean the goal is to eradicate that stress. The goal in addressing workplace stress is to create policies and procedures that offer support for employees and that reduce chronic career related stress. From the vantage point of administrators, focusing on a collaborative and collegial workplace culture, policies surrounding family support, and quality new faculty orientation will lay solid footing for supporting faculty members throughout their time at the institution. Additionally, offering consistent avenues for feedback regarding the work–life balance policies for faculty members in individual departments will allow for a more nuanced understanding of the experiences of both male and female faculty. This is applicable to both the institution in this study and tp similar small, liberal arts institutions.

For institutions experiencing high turnover rates, focusing on new faculty orientation will aid in consistency regarding understandings of work–life balance policies; expectations regarding teaching load, research, and student engagement; as well as build collegial relationships inter-departmentally and across campus. Additionally, departments should regularly assess the needs of their faculty members in relation to their work–life balance and career related stress as different departments will likely have different expectations and experiences among their faculty members. There are far fewer female faculty in academia, and they often bear more of the service burden in the workplace than men (Guarino & Borden, 2017). Because of these lower numbers of

women in faculty positions, they take on more of this service burden in order to support the students at the universities. Administration can have a role in balancing out this disproportionate representation by focusing on hiring more female faculty members across departments.

Limitations

This study, although helpful to the university studied, was not without limitations. While the subset of faculty members of this institution represented in this analysis is a large proportion of the total faculty members, the small total n offers a limitation in terms of statistical significance. Additionally, only four of the eight career related stress factors were analyzed in this study, limiting the scope of the research. Another limitation is that all CIRP data is self-reported. This study examined faculty members' perceptions of their career related stress and work–life balance, therefore, the level of work–life balance dissatisfaction faculty members may have felt in the time they were actively taking the survey could have influenced their responses.

Each of the survey years in this study represented different faculty members rather than a fully consistent representation of the same faculty over all three years. The state of the university is also a consideration when analyzing the results. Faculty turnover at this institution was high preceding the 2016–2017 survey years, there were three university presidents within the 2013–2020 time, and the 2019–2020 survey was administered during the beginning of the pandemic. These environmental factors could be a limiting factor in the consistency of the data reported.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study explored the effects of faculty members' career related stress on their satisfaction with their work–life balance. From this study, there are many avenues to continue research for the university analyzed in this study and for similar institutions. While the results offered some indication of factors affecting work–life balance, the results also pointed to the likelihood that there are more contributing factors present in faculty members' work–life balance satisfaction. While this study only analyzed four of the eight HERI career related stress constructs, further studies by this university could look at the remaining four constructs: institutional procedures/red tape, committee work, self-imposed high expectations, and lack of personal time. Future studies could also analyze and identify factors outside of those identified by HERI affecting the work–life balance of the faculty, assess more in depth the differences in male and female faculty experiences, as well as explore different control variables depending on the demographics of the university.

Qualitative studies could also add richness to this data, particularly to the lived experiences of the faculty at this institution. While there are certain university policies surrounding work–life balance it would be beneficial to hear the lived-experiences of the faculty that are working within the scope of this policy and how they experience support from the university or their specific departments.

Because of the type of institution studied, further research could explore the impact of being a faith-based institution and how that influences perceptions of work–life balance for faculty. Particularly, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities could initiate research that looks at faculty work–life balance and career related stress for

all its member institutions. This would give broader data to analyze comparable institutions and allow administrators to see how their institutional policies and procedures compare to those at similar institutions. Much of the literature regarding career related stress and work–life balance at faith-based institutions explored the differences in experience for female faculty in their gender role beliefs and what institutional support meant for them. This would be a valuable path to explore for the female faculty at all Council for Christian Colleges and Universities member institutions as to their perceptions of institutional expectations, personal gender role beliefs, and administration's support of their tenure pursuits.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the effects of career related stress on the satisfaction of faculty members' work–life balance at a small, faith-based, liberal arts university in the Midwest. The study was done using OLS multiple regression analysis and analyzed the relationship between the predictor variables of colleagues, students, research or publishing demands, and teaching load with the variable of work–life balance. This study included a discussion of the findings and implications for practice. Administrators at the university in this study were advised to continue exploring the policies and practices regarding work–life balance at their university and how those policies support or hinder their faculty. Particularly focusing on the experience of female faculty and their experience of work–life integration could offer a more robust view of the needs of that demographic. As institutions strive to support, challenge, and grow the future thought leaders of the world, faculty are integral to that mission. Supporting faculty in their role within these institutions is vital to the success of a university and calls

for awareness of policy and practice regarding the work–life integration of its faculty. To be stewards of this transformational time in students' lives is a high responsibility, thus supporting those active in this call is necessary as well. The findings and reflections in this study are offered in order to inspire reflection and growth regarding the institutional policies and practices supporting the faculty.

References

Allen, T. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational

perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *58*, 414–435.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing

faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(7), 803–830.

American Association of University Professors. (2001). Statement of principles on family

responsibilities and academic work. AAUP.

https://www.aaup.org/file/Family_and_Academic_Work.pdf

August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction

among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(2), 177–192.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/40197343

Austin, A. E. (2003). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face

changing expectations in a shifting context. *The Review of Higher Education*,

26(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0031

Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on

faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*(4), 457–

469. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40196331

Bergeron, D. M., & Liang, X. F. (2007). Thriving in the academy: A model of faculty

career success. In Solomon, G. T. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2007 Academy of*

Management Annual Meeting (pp. 1–6).

Berlin Cameron. (March 8, 2022). New study timed with women's history month reveals exhaustion gap between men and women. https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2022/03/08/2399157/0/en/New-Study-Timed-with-Women-s-History-Month-Reveals-Exhaustion-Gap-Between-Men-and-Women.html

Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., Swansberg, J. E., & Families and Work Institute. (1997). *The 1997 national study of the changing workforce: No. 2*. Families and Work Institute.

Bracken, S. J. (2006). *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives*. Stylus Publishing.

Carrigan, C., Riskin, E. A., & Quinn, K. (2011). The gendered division of labor among stem faculty and the effects of critical mass. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *4*(3), 131–146. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021831

Chronicle of Higher Education (2020). On the verge of burnout: Covid-19's impact on faculty well-being and career plans. Research brief. https://connect.chronicle.com/rs/931-EKA-218/images/Covid%26FacultyCareerPaths_Fidelity_ResearchBrief_v3%20%281%29.pdf

Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (Sixth). Pearson.

Cleveland Clinic. (2021). *Stress*. https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/articles/11874-stress

College and University Work–Life–Family Association. (2020). *Mission.*

https://www.cuwfa.org/mission

Colligan, T., & Higgins, E. (2006). Workplace stress etiology and consequences. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, *21*(2), 89–97.

Denson, N., & Szelényi, K. (2020). Faculty perceptions of work–life balance: The role of marital/relationship and family status. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, *83*(2), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00654-8

Eagan, M., & Garvey, J. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*, 923–954. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0034

Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Berdan Lozano, J., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., & Hurtado, S. (2014). *Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013–2014 HERI faculty survey*. University of California, Higher Education Research Institute.

Eddy, P., & Gaston-Gayles, J. (2008) New faculty on the block: Issues of stress and support. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *17*(1–2), 89–106, https://doi.org/10.1080/10911350802168878

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(5), 812–820. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.5.812

Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(1), 42–51.

Flaherty, C. (2022). Calling it quits. *Inside Higher Ed*.

https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/07/05/professors-are-leaving-

academe-during-great-resignation

Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, *25*(4), 483–

496. https://doi.org/10.2307/2092933

Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are

women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education:*

Journal of the Association for Institutional Research, *58*(6), 672–694.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Hall, M. E. L., Anderson, T. L., & Willingham, M. M. (2004). Diapers, dissertations, and

other holy things: The experiences of mothers working in Christian colleges and

universities. *Christian Higher Education*, *3*(1), 41–60.

Harper, E. P., Baldwin, R. G., Gansneder, B. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). Full-time

women faculty off the tenure track: Profile and practice. *The Review of Higher*

Education, *24*(3), 237–257.

Higher Education Research Institute. (n.d.). *CIRP constructs*. https://heri.ucla.edu/cirp-

constructs/

Keys, A., & Devine, M. (2006). Faculty perceptions of the teaching load. *Issues in*

Information Systems, *7*(1), 236–241.

Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE:

Benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change*, *35*(2), 24–32.

Lapierre, L., Spector, P., Allen, T., Poelmans, S., Cooper, C., O'Driscoll, M., Sanchez, J.,

Brough, P., & Kinnunen, U. (2008). Family-supportive organization perceptions,

multiple dimensions of work-family conflict, and employee satisfaction: A test of

model across five samples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*(1), 92–106.

Matheson, J. L., & Rosen, K. H. (2012). Marriage and family therapy faculty members'

balance of work and personal life. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, *38*, 394–

416. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2009.00137.x

Merriam-Webster. (2023). *Balance*. In Merriam-Webster.com.

Mertler, C. A., & Reinhart, R. V. (2017). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods:*

Practical application and interpretation (6th ed.). Routledge.

Miller, A., Taylor, S., & Bedeian, A. (2011). Publish or perish: Academic life as

management faculty live it. *Career Development International*, *16*,422–445.

https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431111167751

Mukhtar, F. (2012). *Work life balance and job satisfaction among faculty at Iowa state*

university [Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University]. Iowa State University

Digital Repository.

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (1999). What is job stress?

Center for Disease Control. https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/99-

101/#What%20Is%20Job%20Stress?

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., Nyunt, G., Waugaman, C., & Jackson, R. (2017). Asked more

often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the

work interactions that shape them. *American Educational Research Journal*,

54(6), 1154–1186. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26642034

Ott, M., & Cisneros, J. (2015). Understanding the changing faculty workforce in higher

education: A comparison on full-time non-tenure track and tenure line

experiences. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *23*(90).

https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1934

Owens, J., Kottwitz, C., Tiedt, J., & Ramirez, J. (2018). Strategies to attain faculty work–

life balance. *Building Healthy Academic Communities Journal*, *2*(2), 58.

https://doi.org/10.18061/bhac.v2i2.6544

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade*

of research. Jossey-Bass.

Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure

track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with

colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *82*(3), 319–346.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/29789523

Pope-Ruark, R. (2022a). *Unraveling faculty burnout: Pathways to reckoning and*

renewal. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pope-Ruark, R. (2022b, September 19). You've burned out. Now what? Academe's

competitive productivity is a dead end. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

https://www.chronicle.com/article/youve-burned-out-now-what?cid=gen_sign_in

Russell, B. C. (2010). Stress in senior faculty careers. *New Directions for Higher*

Education, *2010*(151).

Sax, L. J., Hagedorn, L. S., Arredondo, M., & DeCrisi, F. A. (2002). Faculty research

productivity: Exploring the role of gender and family-related factors. *Research in*

Higher Education, *43*, 423–446. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015575616285

Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic

characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction.

Research in Higher Education, *49*(4), 357–381.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/25704568

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Johns Hopkins University Press. Retrieved April 24, 2022

Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, *31*(5), 405–424. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40195946

Stolzenberg, E. B., Eagan, K., Zimmerman, H. B., Berdan Lozano, J., Cesar-Davis, N. M., Aragon, M. C., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2017). *Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2016–2017 HERI faculty survey*. University of California, Higher Education Research Institute.

Tomei, L. (2006). The impact of online teaching on faculty load: Computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *14*(3), 531–541.

Trautvetter, L. C., Braskamp, L., & Ward, K. (2008). Reducing stress for new faculty at church-related colleges and universities. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *17*(1–2), 129–156.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). *Academic motherhood: Hhow faculty manage work and family*. Rutgers University Press.

Wilton, S., & Ross, L. (2017). Flexibility, sacrifice and insecurity: A Canadian study assessing the challenges of balancing work and family in academia. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, *29*(1–2), 66–87.

https://doi.org/10.1080/08952833.2016.1272663

World Health Organization. (2019, May 28). Burn-out an "occupational phenomenon":

      International classification of diseases. *World Health Organization Newsletter.*

      https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-

      phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases

Yordy, K. (2018). The effects of career related stress on faculty work–life balance: A

      quantitative analysis. [Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana State University].

Appendix A

HERI Faculty Survey 2013–2014

https://www.heri.ucla.edu/researchers/instruments/FACULTY/2013FAC.pdf

Appendix B

HERI Faculty Survey 2016–2017

https://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/surveyAdmin/fac/INSTRUMENT/2016FAC.pdf

Appendix C

HERI Faculty Survey 2019–2020

https://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/surveyAdmin/fac/INSTRUMENT/2020FAC.pdf