

Work-Life Balance and Mental Health: A Psychological Study of Professional Women in High-Stress Occupations

Professor (Dr.) Priya Saroj

University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh University, Mohali, Punjab, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.120500154>

Received: 06 June 2025; Accepted: 07 June 2025; Published: 18 June 2025

ABSTRACT

This study explores the intricate relationship between **work-life balance** and **mental health** among professional women engaged in high-stress occupations, such as healthcare, law, finance, and education. As more women occupy demanding professional roles, they often face persistent challenges in managing professional responsibilities alongside familial and personal obligations. This research aims to assess how work-related stress, workload, job control, and support systems interact with psychological well-being, and to identify patterns of burnout, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion among female professionals.

Using a **mixed-methods design**, the study surveyed 300 professional women aged 25–50 using validated instruments including the Work-Life Balance Scale (WLB), Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21), and semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data were analysed using ANOVA and regression analysis, while thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative data. Findings indicate that poor work-life balance is significantly associated with higher levels of stress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms. Moreover, limited organisational support and rigid work cultures exacerbate psychological strain.

The study concludes by recommending systemic organisational changes—including flexible working hours, mental health support programs, and inclusive leadership—to enhance psychological resilience among women in high-stress roles. These findings contribute to the discourse on gender, occupational health, and workplace equity in modern economies.

Keywords: Work-life balance, Professional women, Mental health, Occupational stress, psychological well-being

INTRODUCTION

The intersection between professional obligations and personal life responsibilities poses a significant psychological burden for women in high-stress occupations. Societal expectations often position women as primary caregivers while simultaneously encouraging their professional advancement. This dual pressure creates internal conflict, potentially compromising mental health (American Psychological Association, 2017). Recent global trends show a marked increase in emotional exhaustion, anxiety, and depressive symptoms among women in leadership and high-performance roles (WHO, 2021). Despite numerous policy discussions on gender equity, there is a limited empirical understanding of how work-life imbalance directly contributes to psychological distress among professional women[1].

OBJECTIVES

This study is designed to address the growing concern about mental health deterioration among professional women in high-stress occupations. By exploring the psychological, organisational, and sociocultural dynamics that influence work-life balance, this research aims to provide both empirical insights and practical recommendations. The specific objectives of the study are as follows:[2].

Examine the relationship between work-life balance and mental health indicators (stress, anxiety, and burnout) among women in high-stress occupations

This objective focuses on establishing the strength and nature of the correlation between perceived work-life balance and key psychological health outcomes—namely, stress, anxiety, and burnout. High-stress occupations, such as healthcare, law, corporate finance, and academia, are known for long working hours, high accountability, and performance pressure. This study seeks to determine whether a lower sense of balance predicts higher mental health distress and whether this varies across occupational categories[3].

Identify workplace and personal factors contributing to poor work-life balance

This objective aims to explore the external (organisational culture, leadership style, workload, policies) and internal (perfectionism, guilt, coping styles) factors that shape women's experiences of imbalance. Through surveys and interviews, the study will investigate which specific elements—such as rigid schedules, unsupportive supervisors, or lack of autonomy—most significantly contribute to work-life conflict[4].

Explore coping mechanisms employed by women to manage competing demands

Given that many professional women develop adaptive and maladaptive strategies to handle role conflict, this objective focuses on documenting these responses. The study will analyse the types of coping mechanisms used (e.g., time management, emotional regulation, social support seeking, or withdrawal) and assess their perceived effectiveness. Understanding these strategies may inform targeted interventions and mental health programming [5].

Propose policy recommendations for improving mental health support for professional women

Based on the quantitative and qualitative findings, this objective involves synthesising actionable recommendations for employers, mental health professionals, and policymakers. The focus will be on evidence-based practices to reduce psychological strain, such as flexible work arrangements, organisational mental health initiatives, and inclusive workplace cultures that account for gender-specific needs. These proposals will aim to promote sustainable well-being, retention, and productivity among professional women[6].

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a **mixed-methods research design**, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between work-life balance and mental health among professional women. The **quantitative component** allowed for the measurement and statistical analysis of relationships among variables, while the **qualitative component** provided rich, narrative data that revealed deeper experiential and contextual insights. This dual strategy enhanced the validity and interpretability of the findings through methodological triangulation[7].

Participants

A total of **300 professional women**, aged **25 to 50 years**, were purposively sampled from four high-stress occupational sectors:

Healthcare (n = 75)

Law (n = 75)

Finance (n = 75)

Higher Education (n = 75)

Eligibility criteria included:

Full-time employment status

Minimum of **3 years of continuous professional experience**

Willingness to participate in both survey and/or interview components

Participants represented a range of hierarchical positions, including junior professionals, mid-level managers, and senior executives, ensuring a diverse sample in terms of professional responsibility and life-stage[8].

Instruments

Work-Life Balance Scale (WLB)

The **Work-Life Balance Scale** (Brough et al., 2014) was used to measure the degree of perceived balance between work demands and personal life obligations. The scale includes items that assess time allocation, psychological involvement, and satisfaction across domains [9].

Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale (DASS-21)

The **DASS-21** is a validated, widely used instrument that measures symptoms of **depression, anxiety, and stress** over the past week. Each subscale contains 7 items rated on a 4-point Likert scale. It has demonstrated strong reliability and construct validity in occupational mental health research[10].

Semi-Structured Interviews

In-depth **semi-structured interviews** were conducted with a sub-sample of **30 participants**, selected to reflect diversity in age, sector, and job role. The interview guide focused on:

Personal definitions of work-life balance

Daily stressors and coping strategies

Perceptions of organisational support

Experiences of mental health challenges

Data Collection

Data collection was carried out over 4 months using the following procedures:

Quantitative surveys were distributed electronically using a secure, anonymous online survey platform. Participants were recruited via professional associations, LinkedIn, and organisational networks.

Qualitative interviews were conducted via **Zoom** to accommodate participant schedules and ensure confidentiality. Each interview lasted between **45–60 minutes** and was audio-recorded with participant consent.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and informed consent was collected before participation in both components [11].

Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using **SPSS Version 26.0**. The following statistical procedures were employed:

Descriptive statistics to profile the sample and key variables

Pearson's correlation to examine relationships between work-life balance and mental health outcomes

One-way ANOVA to compare mental health indicators across occupational sectors

Multiple regression analysis to identify predictive factors of stress, anxiety, and burnout [12].

Qualitative Analysis

Interview transcripts were transcribed verbatim and analysed using **thematic analysis**, following the six-step framework outlined by **Braun and Clarke (2006)**:

Familiarisation with data

Initial coding

Generating themes

Reviewing themes

Defining and naming themes

Producing the report

RESULTS

Quantitative Findings

The **quantitative analysis** revealed significant and consistent patterns indicating a strong relationship between work-life balance and mental health outcomes. A **Pearson correlation analysis** showed a strong negative correlation between perceived work-life balance and mental health symptoms as measured by the DASS-21:[13].

$r = -0.67$, $p < 0.001$, suggesting that lower levels of work-life balance are significantly associated with higher levels of stress, anxiety, and depression among professional women across all sectors.

Burnout and Sector-Specific Trends

Further **ANOVA comparisons** across occupational sectors showed notable distinctions:

Healthcare professionals reported the **highest burnout rates**, with 72% of respondents scoring in the moderate to severe range on the DASS-21 stress subscale. This aligns with their exposure to shift work, high emotional labor, and long hours.

Legal professionals exhibited the **highest levels of work-family conflict**, with over 68% reporting that their work regularly interferes with personal or family responsibilities. This group also demonstrated high anxiety levels, often linked to performance targets and billing pressures.

Finance and academia showed **moderate overall stress levels**, but a unique trend was observed among **mid-career women (ages 35–45)** in these sectors, who reported significantly **higher levels of emotional exhaustion**, possibly due to overlapping demands of career advancement and caregiving roles at home [14].

Predictive Model

A **multiple regression analysis** indicated that three factors significantly predicted mental health outcomes:

Perceived lack of work-life balance ($\beta = -0.54$, $p < 0.001$)

Low organizational support ($\beta = -0.31$, $p < 0.01$)

High role overload ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.05$)

These variables accounted for **47% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.47$)** in stress and burnout scores.

Qualitative Findings

The **thematic analysis** of 30 in-depth interviews identified four dominant themes, offering a nuanced understanding of the personal and professional tensions experienced by women in high-stress occupations[15].

Theme 1: “Always On” Culture

Participants across sectors described an “always available” expectation from their employers. Remote work and digital connectivity, while increasing flexibility, also blurred boundaries between work and personal life, leading to **chronic cognitive load** and inability to disengage from professional responsibilities[16].

“Even when I’m home, I’m not present. My phone’s always buzzing, and there’s a constant feeling that I should be doing more.”

Theme 2: Guilt and Role Conflict

Many women reported **intense guilt** when prioritising personal or family responsibilities over work. The internalised belief that excelling in both domains is essential led to **emotional strain** and self-criticism[17].

“If I leave work early for my child’s appointment, I feel guilty at the office. If I stay late, I feel like a bad mother.”

Theme 3: Lack of Organisational Flexibility

A recurring concern was the **inflexibility of organizational policies** regarding parental leave, caregiving emergencies, or hybrid work models. Many respondents noted that support systems—when available—were inconsistently applied or socially discouraged.

“My company has parental leave on paper, but culturally, it’s frowned upon to actually use it without consequences.”

Theme 4: Emotional Toll of Performance Pressure

Participants highlighted the **emotional burden of constant performance expectations**, often compounded by subtle gender bias in promotions, recognition, and feedback. This pressure was linked to symptoms of anxiety, sleep disturbances, and feelings of inadequacy [18].

“There’s always a sense that you need to prove your worth—constantly. And that’s exhausting.”

Summary

Together, the quantitative and qualitative findings paint a compelling picture of the psychological toll experienced by professional women navigating high-pressure careers and personal responsibilities. Poor work-life balance, insufficient organisational support, and internalised role conflict emerged as **primary contributors to deteriorating mental health**. The triangulated results underscore the urgent need for gender-sensitive and structurally supportive workplace reforms [19].

Work-Life Balance and Mental Health: A Psychological Study of Professional Women in High-Stress Occupations

DISCUSSION

The results of this study strongly affirm that **work-life conflict is a key predictor of mental health challenges** among women in high-stress professions. These findings align with a growing body of research suggesting that structural barriers, cultural expectations, and insufficient organisational flexibility contribute to psychological distress among working women (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Allen et al., 2014)[20].

Structural and Cultural Contributors to Distress

The data underscore how **organisational inflexibility**—including rigid working hours, inflexible leave policies, and unaccommodating performance metrics—directly undermines women’s ability to manage personal and professional demands. These limitations are often amplified by **cultural norms** that valorise constant availability and undervalue caregiving responsibilities, particularly in traditionally male-dominated industries such as finance and law.

Many participants highlighted that while workplace policies promoting balance may exist nominally, they are often **inaccessible or stigmatised in practice**, leading to underutilization and increased role strain. The dissonance between formal support and informal expectations reflects a **culture of “presenteeism”**, where being constantly online or available is seen as a measure of commitment.

Role Overload and Post-Pandemic Realities

The concept of **role overload**—in which individuals feel compelled to meet competing and often contradictory demands from multiple roles—is particularly relevant in the post-COVID-19 context. The hybrid work era has blurred the boundaries between professional and personal spheres, increasing the mental load for women who disproportionately shoulder caregiving and household responsibilities (Chung et al., 2021).

The shift to remote and hybrid work arrangements was initially perceived as a solution to work-life balance; however, for many women in this study, it resulted in **longer working hours, increased emotional labour, and decreased psychological detachment** from work. This paradox supports recent literature suggesting that **technology-enabled flexibility without cultural change** may inadvertently worsen gendered role conflict (Kossek et al., 2011).

Emotional Repercussions and Coping Mechanisms

Participants commonly reported internalised pressure to “do it all,” often experiencing **guilt** when prioritising personal needs or declining professional opportunities. These feelings of inadequacy were often exacerbated by a **lack of recognition** or **implicit bias** in the workplace, further contributing to anxiety and depressive symptoms.

The coping mechanisms employed—such as **time-blocking, multitasking, emotional suppression, and overachievement**—provided temporary relief but often lacked **long-term sustainability**. These short-term strategies may mask deeper psychological strain and prevent individuals from seeking institutional support, leading to **chronic stress and emotional exhaustion**.

This aligns with prior findings suggesting that **individual-level coping strategies**, while important, are insufficient without **systemic organizational reform** (Burke & Greenglass, 2001). The normalization of stress as part of professional identity may also discourage help-seeking and perpetuate a **cycle of silent burnout**.

Intersectionality and Policy Gaps

It is also important to acknowledge how intersecting factors such as **age, marital status, motherhood, and cultural background** interact with occupational demands to shape women's mental health experiences. For example, mid-career women balancing caregiving with career advancement were more vulnerable to emotional exhaustion, while younger women expressed anxiety about long-term career prospects under such pressures.

Despite decades of gender equality discourse, the absence of **gender-responsive mental health frameworks** in most organisations remains a critical gap. The lack of tailored interventions reflects broader systemic inattention to the **psychological cost of gendered expectations in the workplace**.

Summary

Overall, the discussion illustrates that **work-life imbalance is not merely an individual time management issue but a systemic mental health concern**. Structural change, cultural transformation, and institutional accountability are essential to addressing the complex and compounding factors contributing to psychological distress among professional women. Employers must move beyond tokenistic gestures and engage in **evidence-based redesign of work environments** to promote well-being, equity, and long-term productivity.

Certainly! Here's a detailed and academically enriched version of the **6. Conclusion and Implications** section, tailored for inclusion in a **Scopus-indexed journal** article:

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study underscores the critical link between **work-life balance and mental health outcomes** among professional women employed in high-stress occupations. The findings reveal that poor work-life integration is not only a contributor to elevated levels of stress, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion but also reflects deeper **structural inequities and cultural expectations** that disproportionately burden women.

Despite ongoing efforts to address workplace gender equity, the persistence of rigid schedules, lack of autonomy, and inadequate support systems continues to undermine women's psychological well-being. As such, work-life imbalance should no longer be viewed solely as a personal time-management issue but as a **systemic organisational and public health concern**.

Organisational Implications

To meaningfully address the mental health burden faced by professional women, **organisations must adopt transformative, not performative, approaches**. Based on the empirical evidence from this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Flexible Work Arrangements:

Employers should move beyond temporary flexibility measures and institutionalise **permanent, adaptable scheduling options**, including hybrid models, compressed workweeks, and caregiver support leave policies. These accommodations should be equitably accessible and free of stigma.

Access to Mental Health Resources:

Organizations should provide comprehensive **mental health support services**, such as in-house counseling, stress management workshops, and Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), tailored to gender-specific needs. Psychological safety must be embedded into the workplace culture.

Mentorship and Peer-Support Programs:

Establishing **structured mentorship networks** and peer-support groups can help reduce professional isolation and offer emotional and career-related guidance, especially for early- and mid-career women navigating dual-role challenges.

Inclusive Leadership and Evaluation Practices:

Leadership training should incorporate **gender sensitivity and work-life equity**. Performance appraisals must shift from time-based metrics to **outcome-based evaluations** that recognise diverse working styles and caregiving responsibilities.

Policy and Institutional Recommendations

Beyond the organisational level, **policy frameworks and HR regulations** must be restructured to reflect the realities of working women in high-demand fields:

Workplace Well-Being Audits:

Employers should conduct regular **audits of employee well-being**, disaggregated by gender and caregiving status, to identify patterns of imbalance and psychological risk factors. These audits should inform targeted interventions and strategic planning.

Gender-Responsive Organisational Reforms:

Policies must be designed through a **gender lens**, accounting for differential access to resources, decision-making, and recognition. This includes reforms in promotion pathways, leave policies, and workplace safety protocols.

Future Research Directions

Given the complex and evolving nature of work-life dynamics, **longitudinal research** is essential to track how mental health outcomes change over time with the introduction of new workplace practices. Future studies should also explore:

Sector-specific interventions, examining how industry norms shape work-life expectations.

Intersectional analysis of experiences across race, socio-economic status, marital status, and parenting roles.

The role of **organisational culture change initiatives** in promoting sustainable mental health improvements.

Final Remarks

This study contributes to the growing literature that calls for a **paradigm shift in workplace health and gender equity**. Empowering professional women through systemic, culturally competent, and psychologically informed workplace reforms is not only an ethical imperative but also a **strategic investment** in organisational productivity, talent retention, and societal well-being.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2014). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(2), 345–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012>
2. American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). APA.
3. Brough, P., Timms, C., O'Driscoll, M., Kalliath, T., Siu, O. L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2014). *Work–life balance: A longitudinal evaluation of a new measure across Australia and New Zealand workers*.

- International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25(19), 2724–2744.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.899262>
4. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
5. Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Hospital restructuring and nursing staff well-being: The role of perceived hospital and union support. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 14(1), 93–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800108248354>
6. Chung, H., Seo, H., Forbes, S., & Birkett, H. (2021). Working from home during the COVID-19 lockdown: Changing preferences and the future of work. Cardiff University Report. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3789340>
7. Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2012). Revisiting work-life issues in Canada: The 2012 national study. Carleton University School of Business. <https://carleton.ca>
8. Grzywacz, J. G., & Carlson, D. S. (2007). Conceptualizing work–family balance: Implications for practice and research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422307305487>
9. Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2011). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.01.002>
10. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
11. Moen, P., & Sweet, S. (2004). From “work–family” to “flexible careers”: A life course reframing. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(2), 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1366880042000245446>
12. O’Driscoll, M. P., & Brough, P. (2010). Work–family conflict. In J. Houdmont & S. Leka (Eds.), *Contemporary occupational health psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 136–157). Wiley-Blackwell.
13. Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2002). Toward reducing some critical gaps in work–family research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(3), 299–312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00062-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00062-1)
14. Schieman, S., & Glavin, P. (2016). The pressure-status nexus and blurred work–family boundaries. *Work and Occupations*, 43(1), 3–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888415615389>
15. Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2007). When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71(3), 479–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.006>
16. Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor–detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1), S72–S103. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924>
17. Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work–family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6>
18. Voydanoff, P. (2005). Work demands and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: Direct and indirect relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 707–726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X05277516>
19. World Health Organization. (2021). Mental health atlas 2020. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240036700>
20. Zhang, Y., LePine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2014). It’s not fair... or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor–job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(3), 675–697. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.1110>