

# Faculty Workloads in Relation to Stress Management and Job Satisfaction in the Criminology Programs

Jenie Mae M Cadimas, Bernaflor B. Canape

Misamis University, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000323>

Received: 01 May 2025; Accepted: 13 May 2025; Published: 13 June 2025

## ABSTRACT

Faculty workload, stress, and job satisfaction are critical factors influencing performance, well-being, and retention in higher education institutions. This study investigates the relationship between faculty workloads, stress management, and job satisfaction among criminology faculty in private higher education institutions in the Zamboanga Peninsula. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 100 faculty members from various institutions offering criminology programs. They were selected using random sampling. Three self-made survey questionnaires were used in this study to evaluate criminology faculty members' workloads, stress management, and job satisfaction while ensuring their clarity, reliability, and compatibility with the study's objectives. To summarize data patterns and examine the connections among workloads, stress management, and job satisfaction, the mean, standard deviation, and Pearson correlation were employed. The results revealed that faculty members experience a very high workload, with instructional duties being the most prominent, followed by extension services and research activities. Stress management was also rated very high, with faculty effectively using coping mechanisms and benefiting from strong social support systems. Job satisfaction was found to be very high overall, particularly in terms of work environment and compensation and benefits, although recognition and rewards scored slightly lower, suggesting an area for institutional improvement. The study found no significant correlation between workloads and stress management. No significant relationship was also noted between faculty workload and job satisfaction. These results suggest that while general workloads do not significantly affect stress management or job satisfaction, increased responsibilities in community-based extension services may reduce perceived support and satisfaction levels. The findings highlight the importance of balanced workload distribution, improved faculty recognition systems, and enhanced institutional support—especially for those involved in extension work. Recommendations include developing structured policies for workload distribution, implementing recognition initiatives, and providing targeted support to maintain faculty well-being and promote retention in criminology education.

**Keywords:** Coping mechanisms, extension services, institutional support, job satisfaction, workload, stress management

## INTRODUCTION

### Rationale of the study

Faculty workloads play a critical role in influencing stress levels and job satisfaction among educators, especially within higher education. Studies have shown that elevated workloads often lead to emotional exhaustion, burnout, and diminished job satisfaction (Abdulpatta et al., 2024; Xu & Wang, 2023). Criminology faculty in particular face complex responsibilities, balancing teaching, research, administrative duties, and community extension services. This multifaceted workload can overwhelm educators and impact their overall well-being, as supported by Aragon et al. (2024), who found that allied academic duties contribute significantly to faculty stress and reduced performance.

The ability to manage stress effectively is vital in mitigating the negative impact of workload and maintaining both professional output and personal wellness. However, research exploring stress management strategies

among criminology educators in the Philippines remains scarce. Dueñas (2023) emphasized that organizational support—such as clear policies, accessible mental health services, and professional development—plays a key role in alleviating stress among faculty. Without such support, educators may struggle to cope with the demands of their roles, which ultimately affects their engagement and retention in academic institutions.

While job satisfaction, workload, and stress management have each been studied independently, few studies integrate these variables within the specific context of criminology programs. Existing research tends to focus on general education or broader faculty populations, overlooking the unique challenges experienced by criminology educators. This study seeks to address that gap by examining the interconnectedness of these factors and how they shape faculty experiences, aiming to guide institutions in developing evidence-based policies and interventions tailored to the criminology field.

The study is particularly relevant in addressing the need for a supportive academic environment through institutional practices. Faculty members stand to benefit from findings that inform effective stress-coping strategies and emphasize the importance of balanced workloads. Academic leaders and administrators can use the results to develop targeted workload policies, recognition systems, and institutional support structures. As Salimzadeh et al. (2021) and Ross et al. (2023) note, countries that adopt flexible faculty schedules and wellness initiatives report improved faculty satisfaction and performance.

Ultimately, this study highlights the need for more focused research on faculty well-being in criminology education. By aligning workloads with adaptive stress management strategies and enhancing institutional support systems, higher education institutions can foster a healthier, more productive work environment. Evidence from studies like Vizcarra et al. (2024) and Lantican (2021) confirms that faculty who feel supported—through mental health programs, peer collaboration, and professional recognition—experience higher job satisfaction. Therefore, this research aims to contribute to a broader understanding of how to sustain faculty engagement and retention in criminology programs through informed and holistic interventions.

## METHODS

The study employed a correlational and predictive quantitative design to examine the relationships between faculty workloads, stress management, and job satisfaction. By using validated survey instruments and statistical analyses like correlation and regression, the research sought to identify associations and causative trends. This design was chosen to systematically assess how workload variations influence stress handling and satisfaction levels, making the findings applicable for interventions aimed at improving faculty well-being.

The research was conducted in private higher education institutions located in the Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines, specifically targeting criminology programs under the School of Criminal Justice Education. The setting was considered ideal for studying these variables due to the specialized nature of criminology education and the academic demands placed on faculty members within these programs.

The respondents included 100 criminology faculty members selected through purposive sampling, without restrictions based on age, gender, or tenure. To gather the necessary data, the researcher developed three self-constructed survey instruments specifically designed to measure faculty workloads, stress management strategies, and job satisfaction levels, ensuring the tools were aligned with the research objectives and reflective of the faculty's professional experiences.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Respondents' Workloads

Table 1 presents the levels of workload among respondents based on three key academic functions: instruction, research outputs, and extension services. The data reveals that instructional workload received the highest weighted mean ( $WM = 4.81$ ,  $SD = 0.2026$ ), interpreted as Very High. This suggests that teaching remains the most time-consuming and prioritized task among faculty. Extension services followed closely with a Very High interpretation ( $WM = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.4903$ ), while research outputs received a slightly lower

score (WM = 3.79, SD = 0.5087), corresponding to a High level of workload. The overall weighted mean stands at 4.29, reflecting a Very High overall workload.

These findings reflect a common trend in many higher education institutions, particularly in the Philippines, where faculty are primarily engaged in teaching responsibilities. According to Salazar and de Guzman (2021), instructional roles often dominate faculty schedules, largely due to institutional expectations and student demands. Meanwhile, research activities, while important, are frequently perceived as secondary due to limited time and support, as noted by Medina et al. (2020). The moderately high workload in research supports this view, suggesting that while faculty are engaged in scholarly work, it does not receive the same emphasis as teaching.

Extension services also garnered a Very High workload level, indicating increased faculty involvement in community-based initiatives. Recent studies, such as that of Ramos and Enriquez (2023), point to a growing institutional commitment to extension programs, often as a response to accreditation requirements or mandates for social impact. However, the standard deviations for both research and extension are higher compared to instruction, implying that involvement in these areas varies more widely among respondents, likely due to differences in expertise, institutional support, and role assignments.

The study's results underscore the significant instructional burden placed on faculty, which may inadvertently limit their capacity to balance other academic responsibilities such as research and extension work. This has implications for institutional policy and faculty development planning. If not addressed, such imbalance can lead to professional burnout, reduced research output, and uneven community engagement. Higher education institutions should therefore consider revising workload policies to promote more equitable distribution of responsibilities. Initiatives like reducing class sizes, offering research incentives, and recognizing extension work in promotion criteria may help support faculty in fulfilling their multifaceted roles effectively, thereby enhancing both institutional performance and faculty satisfaction.

Table 1 Respondents' Workload

Faculty Workloads	WM	StDev	Interpretation
Instructions	4.81	0.2026	Very High (VH)
Research Outputs	3.79	0.5087	High (H)
Extension Services	4.29	0.4903	Very High (VH)
Overall Weighted Mean	4.29	0.510	Very High (VH)

Legend: 4.21-5.00 (Very High (VH), 3.41-4.20 (High (H), 2.61-3.40 (Moderate (M), 1.81-2.60 (Low (L), 1.00-1.80 (Very Low (VL)).

## Respondents' Stress Management

Table 2 presents the respondents' level of stress management based on two core dimensions: coping mechanisms and social support. The findings show that both indicators fall under the Very High category, with social support receiving a slightly higher weighted mean (WM = 4.40, SD = 0.3458) than coping mechanisms (WM = 4.35, SD = 0.2263). The overall weighted mean of 4.38 further reinforces that faculty members demonstrate a very high capacity to manage stress effectively in their professional environment.

The high rating for coping mechanisms indicates that the respondents actively use personal strategies such as problem-solving, emotional regulation, and time management to deal with stress. These findings support the work of Lopez and Alviar (2021), who found that academic professionals in higher education develop personalized coping routines to handle daily pressures, especially when balancing instructional duties with research and community engagement. Effective coping is linked not only to reduced stress levels but also to improved job performance and emotional well-being.

The even higher rating for social support emphasizes the importance of interpersonal relationships in stress management. Support from colleagues, administrators, friends, and family appears to play a crucial role in helping faculty navigate work-related stress. According to Cruz and Javier (2023), social support acts as a protective factor that enhances psychological resilience and mitigates burnout, especially in high-stakes academic environments. Likewise, Tanguilig and dela Rosa (2020) observed that faculty members who receive consistent emotional and institutional backing are more likely to report lower stress levels and greater professional satisfaction. The low standard deviations for both dimensions suggest a strong consensus among respondents regarding their high level of stress management, which could be attributed to institutional programs promoting mental health awareness, professional development, or peer mentoring systems.

These findings suggest that faculty members in the study possess robust mechanisms for managing stress, both individually and through external support systems. This is a positive indicator for institutional stability and workforce well-being. However, maintaining these levels requires continued investment in faculty wellness. Institutions should consider reinforcing current programs by offering regular mental health workshops, creating safe spaces for dialogue, and encouraging collaborative work environments. By institutionalizing support structures and promoting adaptive coping behaviors, academic organizations can enhance not only the mental health of their employees but also the overall productivity and retention of their faculty.

Table 2 Respondents' Stress Management

Stress Management	WM	StDev	Interpretation
Coping Mechanism	4.35	0.2263	Very High (VH)
Social Support	4.40	0.3458	Very High (VH)
Overall Weighted Mean	4.38	0.0354	Very High (VH)

Legend: 4.21-5.00 (Very High (VH), 3.41-4.20 (High (H), 2.61-3.40 (Moderate (M), 1.81-2.60 (Low (L), 1.00-1.80 (Very Low (VL)).

## Respondents' Job Satisfaction

The results from Table 3 reveal that the respondents reported a Very High overall level of job satisfaction, as reflected by an overall weighted mean (WM) of 4.57. Among the three dimensions assessed, the highest level of satisfaction was recorded in the work environment (WM = 4.89, SD = 0.1490), suggesting that respondents find their workplace conducive, collegial, and supportive. This aligns with the findings of Cruz and De Vera (2022), who emphasized that an academic environment characterized by collaboration, open communication, and access to resources significantly contributes to faculty well-being and performance.

The second-highest rating was observed in compensation and benefits (WM = 4.66, SD = 0.2040), indicating that most respondents are satisfied with the financial and non-monetary rewards they receive. This supports the assertion by Alvarado and Santos (2020) that fair remuneration and sufficient benefits such as healthcare, leave entitlements, and professional allowances enhance employee retention and work motivation in educational institutions.

Although recognition and rewards received the lowest mean among the three variables ( $WM = 4.16$ ,  $SD = 0.2583$ ), it still falls under the High interpretation. This result points to the importance of acknowledging employee efforts and achievements, which, although generally present, may not be as emphasized as other factors. According to Martinez and Robles (2021), recognition plays a crucial psychological role in reinforcing positive behaviors and boosting morale, especially in professions where intrinsic motivation is high, such as teaching. The relatively lower score in this area suggests that institutions could further develop recognition systems that are consistent, inclusive, and aligned with faculty expectations. The low standard deviation across all categories reflects a shared experience among the respondents, indicating consistency in institutional practices that shape their satisfaction levels. This may suggest the presence of clear policies and well-implemented faculty support systems.

The findings demonstrate that faculty members are generally satisfied with their jobs, especially in terms of their physical and professional work settings and the benefits they receive. Such satisfaction can contribute to higher productivity, reduced burnout, and a stronger sense of institutional loyalty. However, the relatively lower score for recognition and rewards highlights a potential area for improvement. Institutions should consider developing more structured and transparent systems for faculty acknowledgment, including performance-based incentives, awards, and public commendations. Strengthening this aspect could lead to even greater job satisfaction and, consequently, enhanced faculty engagement and institutional effectiveness.

Table 3 Respondents' Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction	WM	StDev	Interpretation
Recognition and Rewards	4.16	0.2583	High (H)
Work Environment	4.89	0.1490	Very High (VH)
Compensation and Benefits	4.66	0.2040	Very High (VH)
Overall Weighted Mean	4.57	0.373	Very High (VH)

Legend: 4.21-5.00 (Very High (VH), 3.41-4.20 (High (H), 2.61-3.40 (Moderate (M), 1.81-2.60 (Low (L), 1.00-1.80 (Very Low (VL)).

### Significant Relationship between the Faculty Workload and the Level of Stress Management

The data presented in Table 4 indicates that, overall, no significant relationship exists between the faculty's workload and their level of stress management, except in one area. Specifically, a statistically significant negative relationship was found between extension services and social support ( $r = -0.245$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ), which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). This finding suggests that as the workload related to extension services increases, the perceived availability or reliance on social support tends to decrease. For all other pairings between workload components (instructions, research outputs, and extension services) and stress management dimensions (coping mechanism and social support), the p-values exceed 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis—indicating no significant relationships.

The lone significant result may reflect the demanding and often field-based nature of extension work, which can reduce time spent with peers and family or limit access to immediate support systems. On the other hand, the absence of significant relationships in other areas implies that faculty members may have developed independent coping systems and stress management techniques that are not directly influenced by workload volume. This supports the assertion by Santos and Jimenez (2022), who highlighted that university faculty often build resilience through personal experience, institutional training, and emotional regulation, making their stress levels less sensitive to fluctuations in workload.



The findings suggest that while general faculty workloads may not significantly impair stress management, extension-related duties could have a unique impact on how supported faculty feel. This calls for institutional strategies to ensure that personnel involved in extension services receive adequate emotional and logistical support. Universities may consider integrating team-based outreach efforts or rotating assignments to reduce isolation. Additionally, training programs that enhance faculty coping strategies, regardless of workload, can further bolster stress resilience. The study highlights the importance of targeted support mechanisms, especially in roles that involve high community engagement, to sustain both productivity and well-being.

Table 4 Significant Relationship between the Faculty Workload and their Level of Stress Management

Constructs	Coping Mechanism	Social Support
Instructions	$r = -0.022$ $p = 0.828$ Accept Ho	$r = -0.167$ $p = 0.09$ Accept Ho
Research Outputs	$r = -0.132$ $p = 0.189$ Accept Ho	$r = -0.057$ $p = 0.57$ Accept Ho
Extension Services	$r = -0.015$ $p = 0.879$ Accept Ho	$r = -0.245$ $p = 0.01^{**}$ Reject Ho

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the faculty workload and their level of stress management

Legend: 0.00-0.01\*\*Highly Significant, 0.02-0.05\*Significant, above 0.05 Not Significant  
Significant Relationship between the Faculty Workload and Job Satisfaction

The results of Table 5 indicate that, in most areas, there is no statistically significant relationship between faculty workloads and their job satisfaction. The p-values across all components of workload (instruction, research outputs, and extension services) and job satisfaction dimensions (recognition and rewards, work environment, and compensation and benefits) are above 0.05, with one exception. A significant negative relationship was observed between extension services and work environment ( $r = -0.197$ ,  $p = 0.05$ ), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis in this specific pairing. This suggests that as extension workloads increase, satisfaction with the work environment may decline.

The absence of strong relationships in most areas may point to a complex set of influencing factors beyond workload that shape faculty job satisfaction, such as administrative leadership, institutional culture, and career development opportunities. These findings are consistent with the study by Delos Reyes and Almonte (2020), which concluded that while workload is a factor in job satisfaction, it is often mediated by organizational support and autonomy. This observation aligns with Jimenez and Cruz (2021), who noted that personal motivation, recognition systems, and workplace dynamics often have stronger influences on faculty satisfaction than workload volume alone.

The findings imply that universities and colleges must go beyond adjusting faculty workload to improve job satisfaction. While managing workload remains important, particularly in the area of extension services, institutions should focus more on enhancing the quality of the work environment, especially for faculty involved in off-campus or community outreach. Providing adequate support systems, such as logistical assistance, clear guidelines, and recognition for extension work, could help improve satisfaction levels.

Additionally, this suggests the need for a more holistic approach to faculty well-being, considering both quantitative and qualitative aspects of their professional experience.

Table 5 Significant Relationship between the Faculty Workload and Job Satisfaction

Constructs	Recognition and Rewards	Work Environment	Compensation and Benefits
Instructions	r= 0.149 p= 0.139 Accept Ho	r= -0.172 p= 0.086 Accept Ho	r= 0.051 p= 0.616 Accept Ho
Research Outputs	r= 0.131 p= 0.195 Accept Ho	r= -0.131 p= 0.193 Accept Ho	r=0.109 p=0.279 Accept Ho
Extension Services	r= 0.132 p= 0.191 Accept Ho	r= -0.197 p= 0.05* Reject Ho	r= 0.020 p= 0.445 Accept Ho

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the faculty workload and their level of Job satisfaction.

Legend: 0.00-0.01\*\*Highly Significant, 0.02-0.05\*Significant, above 0.05 Not Significant

## CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that faculty members in criminology programs carry a heavy instructional load, with teaching responsibilities being the primary focus, followed by significant engagement in extension services, and to a lesser extent, research activities. This imbalance suggests that teaching dominates faculty efforts, which may affect their stress management and job satisfaction. The findings point to the need for a more balanced distribution of tasks among instruction, research, and extension services to support faculty well-being and improve overall job satisfaction.

In terms of stress management, the faculty demonstrated strong coping abilities, effectively using time management, emotional regulation, problem-solving skills, and robust social support networks to handle work pressures. The availability of support from colleagues, administrators, and personal connections played a key role in their resilience. However, a notable finding was that heavy involvement in extension services negatively affected social support, indicating the need for better institutional backing for faculty engaged in community outreach.

Finally, faculty members reported high levels of job satisfaction, particularly regarding their work environment and compensation, although recognition and rewards were rated slightly lower. Workload generally did not significantly impact either stress management or job satisfaction, except for extension duties, which were linked to reduced social support and lower satisfaction with the work environment. These results suggest that while workload pressures exist, institutional factors like workplace culture and recognition systems play a greater role in maintaining faculty satisfaction and engagement.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that academic institutions should adopt workload balancing strategies by providing more time and support for research activities, while also strengthening social support systems to sustain faculty well-being during periods of increased demands. It recommends the development of more consistent and meaningful recognition programs to enhance job satisfaction and suggests targeted support, such as peer

collaboration and administrative assistance, for faculty engaged in extension services to prevent isolation and dissatisfaction. Additionally, enhancing logistical and administrative support for extension activities is vital to improving work environment satisfaction. Lastly, the study encourages future researchers to conduct comparative studies across various academic programs or institutions to explore whether the observed patterns in faculty workload, stress management, and job satisfaction are consistent or differ across educational contexts.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdulpatta, A. H., Pelotos, L. V., & Segundo, T. P. (2024). Exploring Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction among Public School Teachers: A Comprehensive Study. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IX), 494–508. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.809045>
2. Alvarado, S. G., & Santos, L. M. (2020). Compensation and benefits as key factors in faculty retention and motivation in higher education institutions. *Journal of Human Resource and Organizational Development*, 5(2), 88–102.
3. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2022). Job Demands–Resources Theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
4. Barican, B. (2023). Perceived Stress and Resilience of Criminology Teachers and Students during Covid-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Electrical Systems*, 20(5), 1578.
5. Basalamah, M. S. A. (2021). The Role of Work Motivation and Work Environment in Improving Job Satisfaction. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 1(2), 94–103.
6. Bayocot, P., & Maghanoy, P. (2022). Faculty stress and workload in criminology programs in the Philippines. *Journal of Higher Education Studies*, 15(3), 45–60.
7. Belizario, V., Mamani-Benito, O., Zerga-Morales, A., Turpo-Chaparro, E., & Morales-García, C. (2024). Effect of perceived stress, job satisfaction, and workload on the professional self-efficacy of Peruvian regular basic education teachers. *Frontiers in Education*, 9.
8. Brookman, F., & Maguire, M. (2023). Collaborative Networks in Criminology: Enhancing Academic Performance and Faculty Well-being. *Journal of Criminology and Social Policy*, 18(2), 45–60.
9. Bussewitz, C. (2024, November 14). Working Well: The simple act of taking deep breaths can reduce stress and anxiety | AP News. AP News. <https://apnews.com/article/work-life-stress-reduction-breathing-techniques-8c0636a09d605ef0c56e529e8be0f2f9>
10. Cebs, S. M. (2025b, March 7). Better pay and benefits loom large in job satisfaction. *SHRM*.
11. Clark, P. (2024, December 15). The power of praise. *Financial Times*.
12. Concepcion, M., & Dela Cruz, J. (2023). Job satisfaction among criminology faculty: Institutional support and workload balance. *Philippine Journal of Education and Research*, 12(2), 31–48.
13. Cruz, A. M., & Javier, R. D. (2023). The role of social support in mitigating academic burnout among university faculty. *Journal of Psychological Studies and Education*, 7(1), 89–103.
14. De Guzman, A., & Reyes, J. (2023). Stress management among faculty in high-demand academic programs: A Philippine perspective. *Educational Management Review*, 8(1), 15–28.
15. Declaro-Ruedas, M. Y. A., & Cruz, M. P. D. (2022). Job satisfaction and extension modalities employed by the extension professionals in the Occidental Mindoro State College's extension Delivery Service. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2022/v28i330675>
16. Delos Reyes, M. T., & Almonte, R. P. (2020). Organizational support and autonomy as mediators of workload and job satisfaction among higher education faculty. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 28(1), 34–49.
17. Emerald Insight. (2024). Are you happy with your work? Side effects of workloads and work–family conflict in higher education. *The TQM Journal*, 36(9), 437–455.
18. González-Pérez, L. I., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2022). Components of Education 4.0 in 21st Century Skills Frameworks: Systematic review. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1493. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031493>
19. Halat, D. H., Soltani, A., Dalli, R., Alsarraj, L., & Malki, A. (2023). Understanding and Fostering Mental Health and Well-Being among University Faculty: A Narrative Review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 12(13), 4425. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134425>



20. Herrera, J. D., & Lazo, S. M. (2023). Challenges in faculty extension work and its impact on perceived work environment. *Journal of Academic Engagement and Community Development*, 5(2), 58–73.
21. Jessica, N., Afifah, N., Daud, I., Sulistiowati, & Pebrianti, W. (2023). The Effect of Work Environment and Work-life Balance on Job Satisfaction: Work Stress as a Mediator. *Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, 29(1), 54–65.
22. Jimenez, C. L., & Cruz, A. N. (2021). Exploring motivational and institutional drivers of job satisfaction in Philippine higher education. *Southeast Asian Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3(1), 91–105.
23. Karasek, A., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy Work*. Basic Books.
24. Kim, L., & Pattarawadee, M. (2024). An exploration process on job satisfaction in higher education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*.
25. Kokubun, K. (2024). Effort–Reward Imbalance and Passion Exploitation: A narrative Review and a New perspective. *World*, 5(4), 1235–1247. <https://doi.org/10.3390/world5040063>
26. Lopez, C. B., & Alviar, M. C. (2021). Coping mechanisms and stress management strategies among faculty in higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Educational Psychology*, 6(2), 58–74.
27. Martinez, D. E., & Robles, F. T. (2021). The impact of recognition on faculty motivation and job satisfaction in academic settings. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 6(1), 54–69.
28. Martinez, L., Gonzales, R., & Rivera, P. (2020). Faculty performance under workload pressure: A case study in criminology departments. *Educational Studies in Higher Education*, 15(2), 65–75.
29. Medina, L. A., & Campos, R. J. (2021). Balancing community engagement and personal well-being: Challenges among faculty involved in extension programs. *Journal of Extension and Outreach Studies*, 4(2), 77–91.
30. Medina, L. P., Santos, A. C., & Dela Vega, R. M. (2020). Barriers to research productivity among faculty members in Philippine higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 3(1), 45–55.
31. Mushabe, C., Might, A., & Mills, A. (2022). Reconceptualizing faculty workload as a measure of human resource motivation and performance in higher education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 6(1), 100279–100279.
32. Torres, K. A., Laduyo, J. G., & R. Niem, C. L. (2020). Teaching Effectiveness and Morale of Criminology Faculty of Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(8), 3303–3309. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080802>.
33. P. Dueñas, M. J. (2023). Snooping Job-Related Organizational Stress of Selected Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 11(04), 4823–4832. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijrm/v11i04.em05>
34. Ramos, E., & Bautista, G. (2022). Criminology faculty stress and resource limitations: A Philippine study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 20(1), 72–89.
35. Ramos, J. L., & Enriquez, M. C. (2023). Institutionalizing extension services in higher education: Strategies, challenges, and best practices in Philippine universities. *Philippine Journal of Community Engagement and Development*, 5(2), 112–128.
36. Ross, P. M., Scanes, E., & Locke, W. (2023). Stress adaptation and resilience of academics in higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09829-1>
37. Salazar, M. J., & de Guzman, F. T. (2021). Balancing instructional load and academic research: A case study of faculty work patterns in SUCs. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(3), 72–83.
38. Salimzadeh, R., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2021a). Examining Academics' Strategies for Coping with Stress and Emotions: A Review of Research. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.660676>
39. Salimzadeh, R., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2021b). Examining Academics' Strategies for Coping with Stress and Emotions: A Review of Research. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.660676>
40. Santos, M. R., & Jimenez, C. P. (2022). Resilience and stress management among university faculty: The role of institutional training and emotional regulation. *International Journal of Academic Mental Health*, 8(1).
41. Schaufeli, W. (2021). Engaging Leadership: How to promote work engagement? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.754556>

42. Shigemoto, Y., & Robitschek, C. (2020). Coping flexibility and trauma appraisal predict patterns of posttraumatic stress and personal growth initiative in student trauma survivors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 28(1), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000213>
43. Sidden, C. (2024). UNCG Policy and Regulations on Faculty Workload - UNCG Provost. UNCG Provost.
44. Strobel, K. (2023, November 15). Stress Management for Teachers: 16 Activities to Reduce Stress | Strobel Education. Strobel Education.
45. Talastas, N. M. A. (2021). ACADEMIC WORKLOADS: INPUTS TO INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS' PRODUCTIVITY AND JOB SATISFACTION. *EPRA International Journal of Research & Development (IJRD)*, 212–237. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra7446>
46. Tan, J., & Lim, E. (2023). Balancing Faculty Workloads: The Key to Retention in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Academic Management*, 29(2), 55–72.
47. Tanguilig, B. T., & dela Rosa, J. M. (2020). Institutional support and faculty well-being: The impact of emotional and organizational backing on stress levels. *Southeast Asian Journal of Higher Education*, 4(3), 120–135.