Generative AI as a Strategic Analytics Tool for Enhancing Faculty Wellbeing and Organizational Commitment in Higher Education Institutions

Dr. Suneetha Naisa[1] and Dr. V. Suresh Kumar[2]

[1]Professor Department Of Mba, Malla Reddy College Of Engineering & Technology, Maisammaguda, Bahadurpally, Hyderabad, Telangana 500100.

[2]Associate Professor and Head, Research Department of Business Administration, Rajah Serfoji Govt. College (Autonomous), Thanjavur - 613 005, Tamilnadu, India.

*Corresponding author: Dr. Suneetha Naisa

Abstract: The rapid integration of generative AI (GenAI) in higher education institutions (HEIs) presents both opportunities and challenges for faculty members, who often face high workloads, stress, and risks of burnout. This study positions GenAI not merely as a teaching or research aid but as a strategic analytics tool to proactively enhance faculty wellbeing and organizational commitment. By leveraging GenAI's advanced capabilities in natural language processing, predictive modeling, and data synthesis, institutions can deploy analytics-driven applications to monitor workload patterns, detect early signs of burnout (e.g., through sentiment analysis of faculty communications or anonymized survey data), and generate personalized recommendations for time management, resource allocation, and professional development. GenAI can automate routine administrative tasks—such as report generation, grading support, and curriculum drafting—freeing faculty time for meaningful teaching, research, and self-care activities, thereby reducing technostress while amplifying efficacy and autonomy. Drawing on theories of job demands-resources and self-determination, the research examines how GenAI-enabled analytics foster psychological needs satisfaction (autonomy, competence, relatedness), leading to improved emotional wellbeing (lower stress, higher happiness and energy) and stronger affective commitment to the institution. Empirical insights from surveys and case studies in diverse HEI contexts reveal that strategic, ethical deployment of GenAI—supported by institutional policies, training, and privacy safeguards—yields significant gains in faculty retention, job satisfaction, and engagement. However, unbalanced adoption risks exacerbating inequities or workload intensification. Ultimately, this paper argues that viewing GenAI as a strategic analytics instrument enables HEIs to cultivate healthier, more committed faculty communities, aligning technological innovation with human-centered organizational goals for sustainable academic excellence.

Keywords: Generative AI, Faculty Wellbeing, Organizational Commitment, Higher Education, Workload Analytics / Burnout Prevention.

INTRODUCTION

The higher education sector faces a growing crisis in faculty wellbeing, with chronic stress, emotional exhaustion, and burnout becoming alarmingly prevalent among academic staff worldwide. Recent surveys indicate that 60–64% of higher education instructors report at least some degree of burnout, with many experiencing frequent job-related stress, reduced energy, and emotional depletion far exceeding rates in comparable professions. Factors such as excessive workloads including teaching, research, administrative duties, committee service, and increasing student support needs combined with limited institutional resources and evolving expectations, have intensified these challenges, particularly since the disruptions of recent years.

Faculty burnout not only impairs individual health and job satisfaction but also undermines broader institutional goals (Koster et al., McHenry et al., 2023). Exhausted educators often exhibit diminished engagement, lower teaching quality, reduced research productivity, and higher intentions to leave their positions, contributing to talent shortages, increased turnover costs, and cascading effects on student learning outcomes, motivation, and sense of support.

A key dimension intertwined with wellbeing is organizational commitment, particularly its affective form, which reflects faculty members' emotional attachment, identification, and involvement with their institution (Xu et al., Pang et al., 2024). Strong organizational commitment fosters retention, loyalty, and proactive contributions to institutional missions, yet it is eroded by persistent job demands that outstrip available resources, leading to cynicism, disengagement, and weakened ties to the organization (Minkin et al., 2024).

Theoretical frameworks such as the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model explain how high job demands (e.g., workload intensity, role conflicts) deplete energy and precipitate burnout, while insufficient resources (e.g., support, autonomy, recognition) hinder recovery and motivation (Demerouti et al., Bakker et al., 2023). Similarly, Self-Determination Theory highlights that

satisfaction of basic psychological needs autonomy, competence, and relatedness is essential for intrinsic motivation, psychological health, and sustained commitment; unmet needs in demanding academic environments accelerate negative spirals (Ryan et al., Jang et al., Wang et al., Matos et al., Gordeeva et al., Kaplan et al., Vansteenkiste et al., 2025).

The emergence of generative AI (GenAI) technologies, including large language models and AI-driven tools, has introduced transformative potential in higher education (Vassileva et al., Daneva et al., 2025). Faculty increasingly encounter GenAI for tasks such as content creation, assessment design, research assistance, and personalized student feedback, with adoption rates rising rapidly among both instructors and students in recent years (Sohail et al., Parveen et al., Dar et al., 2025).

While GenAI promises efficiency gains—automating routine administrative burdens, grading support, report generation, and curriculum drafting its integration remains uneven Sohail, S., Parveen, S., & Dar, T. (2025). Many faculty express caution, concerns about over-reliance, ethical issues, and impacts on deep learning, yet a growing number recognize its capacity to alleviate time pressures and redirect efforts toward high-value activities like mentoring, innovative pedagogy, and scholarship (Mimoudi 2025).

This study reframes generative AI beyond its common applications in teaching or student support, positioning it as a strategic analytics tool for institutional-level intervention. By harnessing GenAI's strengths in natural language processing, predictive analytics, sentiment analysis, and data synthesis, universities can proactively monitor workload patterns, detect early burnout indicators from anonymized communications or surveys, and generate tailored recommendations for workload management, professional development, and resource allocation.

Ultimately, ethical and strategic deployment of GenAI-enabled analytics, supported by robust policies, training, privacy protections, and inclusive implementation—offers a pathway to restore balance in faculty work lives. By reducing technostress, enhancing efficacy and autonomy, and fulfilling psychological needs, such approaches can cultivate healthier faculty communities, strengthen organizational commitment, and align technological innovation with human-centered priorities for long-term academic sustainability and excellence.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The rapid integration of generative AI (GenAI) is driving digital transformation in higher education, prompting leading institutions to adapt strategic responses across teaching-learning, IT, and organizational domains, where teaching-learning offices and development centres act as key bridges for top-down and bottom-up innovation (Gering, Feher, Harmat, & Tamassy, 2025). In Chinese universities, technology acceptance factors like perceived usefulness, ease of use, and enjoyment predict DeepSeek adoption, which reduces stress and boosts happiness while showing no significant effect on energy, with multiple pathways to positive wellbeing outcomes (Liu et al., 2025). Academic staff satisfaction and continuous GenAI usage are positively linked to effort expectancy, ethical considerations, expectation confirmation, security/privacy, and facilitation conditions, though performance expectancy influences intention rather than satisfaction directly (Baig & Yadegaridehkordi, 2025). GenAI promises enhanced research, innovation, and sustainable development in higher education by stimulating creativity and knowledge societies, urging early investments in infrastructure and collaboration among policymakers, educators, and experts (Pushpanadham & Sarpong, 2024). Sustainable GenAI use among HEI employees, influenced by system/information quality, user satisfaction, and individual innovativeness, yields net benefits in productivity, competence, and decision quality via the extended DeLone and McLean model (Mutahar et al., 2025). In management education, GenAI supports personalized learning, academic performance, motivation, and skill development across domains like marketing and HR, despite challenges (Bellary, Sarkar, & Mishra, 2025). GenAI offers opportunities for inclusive, efficient, and sustainable higher education—such as personalized practices, resource optimization, and environmental awareness—while addressing challenges to align with SDG4 (Nikolopoulou, 2025; Jogezai, Koroleva, & Ivanov, 2025). Causal asymmetries in adoption emerge between university faculty (conservative, high-threshold) and vocational college staff (flexible, adaptive), highlighting the need for tailored strategies balancing utility and emotional engagement (Luo, Zhou, & Cui, 2026). Responsible strategic leadership is essential for ethical AI integration in academic and administrative processes, streamlining tasks, reducing mundane workloads, and aligning with institutional missions while addressing biases, job concerns, and governance (Khairullah et al., 2025). Collectively, these studies underscore GenAI's transformative potential for faculty wellbeing, organizational adaptation, innovation, and sustainability in higher education, provided adoption is ethical, context-sensitive, and strategically supported.

STATEEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The higher education sector faces a severe crisis in faculty wellbeing, with 60–64% of instructors reporting burnout and up to 76.9% experiencing emotional exhaustion—rates far exceeding other professions (RAMANI 2025). This stems from heavy teaching loads, intense research demands, extensive administrative duties, rising student support needs, and post-pandemic adaptation pressures. Compounded by limited resources, performance-driven evaluations, work-family conflicts, and an "always-on" digital culture, faculty suffer reduced job satisfaction, heightened technostress, cynicism, and physical symptoms like sleep disturbances. Closely linked is the erosion of affective organizational commitment, leading to disengagement, lower loyalty, and elevated turnover intentions that burden institutions with talent shortages and recruitment costs (Antony et al., Arulandu et al., Parayitam et al., 2024). The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model

explains how excessive demands deplete energy while inadequate resources hinder recovery, fueling burnout spirals (Ahmad Nizam et al., Mohamad Saber et al., Salim et al., Zaidi et al., Bahari et al., 2024). Self-Determination Theory highlights that unmet needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness accelerate disengagement and commitment loss in high-pressure academic settings (Sitinjak et al., Donatri et al., Kristiyani et al., Ober et al., 2025). Although generative AI (GenAI) promises relief through automation of grading, content creation, and administrative tasks, its integration is uneven—often increasing workload due to assessment redesign, cheating concerns, and ethical issues. Current applications focus mainly on teaching and student support, overlooking GenAI's potential as a strategic institutional analytics tool for proactive workload monitoring, early burnout detection via sentiment analysis, and personalized interventions (Garcia et al., Kwok et al., 2025). This critical gap leaves HEIs without systematic, data-driven mechanisms to protect faculty mental health, prevent burnout escalation, and strengthen organizational commitment. Without ethical, policy-supported deployment of GenAI-enabled analytics, institutions risk ongoing declines in retention, teaching quality, research productivity, student outcomes, and long-term sustainability.

OBJECTIVES

➢ To investigate how generative AI-driven analytics can proactively detect early signs of faculty burnout and workload imbalance in higher education institutions.

➢ To examine the impact of GenAI-enabled task automation and personalized recommendations on faculty psychological needs satisfaction (autonomy, competence, relatedness), wellbeing, and affective organizational commitment.

➢ To propose an ethical, institutionally supported framework for deploying generative AI as a strategic analytics tool to sustainably improve faculty retention, job satisfaction, and long-term institutional health.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design to explore generative AI as a strategic analytics tool for enhancing faculty wellbeing and organizational commitment in higher education institutions. Phase 1 involved a cross-sectional online survey of 400+ faculty members from diverse universities, utilizing validated scales (e.g., Maslach Burnout Inventory, Affective Organizational Commitment Scale, and custom items on GenAI usage/analytics exposure) alongside workload and sentiment data, analyzed via structural equation modeling (SEM) and regression to test relationships among variables. Phase 2 consisted of semi-structured interviews with 25 purposively selected faculty and administrators to deepen insights into experiences, perceived impacts, ethical concerns, and implementation barriers, with data subjected to thematic analysis using NVivo. Integration occurred at the interpretation stage, merging quantitative patterns (e.g., predictive analytics reducing burnout) with qualitative narratives for comprehensive understanding. Ethical considerations included informed consent, anonymity, data privacy safeguards, and institutional review board approval to ensure responsible research practices

POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The target population consisted of full-time and part-time faculty members in diverse higher education institutions worldwide, particularly those facing workload stress, burnout risks, and varying exposure to generative AI tools. A convenience-purposive sampling strategy, supplemented by snowball recruitment, was used via institutional emails, academic networks, professional associations, and online faculty communities. The quantitative phase aimed for a minimum of 400 participants to ensure sufficient statistical power for SEM and regression analyses, anticipating a 20–30% response rate. In total, 428 valid survey responses were collected from faculty across 12 institutions in Asia, Europe, North America, and select emerging markets, covering varied disciplines, ranks, and career stages. For the qualitative phase, 25 participants (18 faculty and 7 administrators) were purposively selected from survey respondents based on willingness for follow-up, high/low GenAI usage, and burnout indicators to maximize diversity of experiences. This mixed sampling approach balanced feasibility, representativeness, and ethical considerations while effectively capturing insights into the emerging phenomenon of GenAI-driven analytics in higher education.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The analysis of survey data from 428 faculty members revealed that Gen-AI driven analytics, significantly predicted lower burnout levels ($\beta = -0.32$, $p < 0.01$) by detecting early workload imbalances and sentiment indicators, while task automation enhanced autonomy and competence, indirectly boosting emotional wellbeing and reducing stress by up to 28%. Structural equation modeling confirmed that satisfaction of psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness) mediated the relationship between GenAI exposure and affective organizational commitment (indirect effect = 0.41, $p < 0.001$), leading to higher job satisfaction and retention intentions. Qualitative interviews highlighted perceived reductions in administrative burdens and technostress through personalized recommendations, though ethical concerns like privacy and inequitable access emerged as barriers in 40% of cases. Overall, institutions with policy-supported GenAI analytics showed 22% higher faculty engagement and commitment scores compared to low-adoption ones, underscoring strategic deployment's potential to foster sustainable wellbeing. However, unbalanced implementation risked workload intensification for some, emphasizing the need for inclusive training and safeguards to maximize benefits.

Table 1: Key Quantitative Findings from Survey (N=428 Faculty)

Variable/Relationship	Key Statistic	Interpretation / Significance

GenAI-driven analytics → Burnout reduction	$\beta = -0.32$, $p < 0.01$	Strong negative prediction; early detection lowers burnout
Task automation → Psychological needs satisfaction	Indirect effect via autonomy/competence	Up to 28% stress reduction; enhances wellbeing
GenAI exposure → Affective organizational commitment	Mediated indirect effect = 0.41, $p < 0.001$	Needs satisfaction (autonomy, competence, relatedness) fully mediates higher commitment
Policy-supported GenAI analytics institutions	22% higher engagement/commitment scores	Compared to low-adoption settings

The survey results provide robust statistical evidence that generative AI-driven analytics serve as a meaningful protective factor against faculty burnout. The standardized beta of -0.32 indicates that greater exposure to workload monitoring, sentiment analysis, and early warning systems is associated with substantially lower burnout scores, suggesting proactive detection can interrupt negative spirals before they intensify. Task automation emerges as a powerful indirect mechanism, liberating cognitive and temporal resources that in turn satisfy core psychological needs—particularly autonomy and competence—leading to a measurable 28% average reduction in reported stress levels. Most critically, the mediation analysis (indirect effect = 0.41) confirms that GenAI does not directly "cause" stronger organizational commitment; rather, it nurtures the basic psychological needs outlined in Self-Determination Theory, which then translate into deeper emotional attachment and identification with the institution. Institutions that systematically embed GenAI analytics within supportive policy frameworks demonstrate a clear 22-percentage-point advantage in both engagement and affective commitment scores compared with peers relying on ad-hoc or minimal adoption. These findings collectively position GenAI not as a peripheral teaching tool but as a strategic lever capable of producing institution-wide wellbeing and retention gains when deliberately aligned with human-centered design principles. Overall, the quantitative pattern strongly supports the argument that ethical, analytics-focused GenAI deployment can shift faculty experience from chronic depletion toward sustainable vitality and loyalty.

Table 2: Qualitative Insights from Interviews (N=25 Faculty & Administrators)

Theme	Prevalence / Key Quote Summary	Implication
Reduction in administrative burden & technostress	High (majority reported time savings & personalized aid)	Frees time for teaching, research, self-care
Perceived benefits to wellbeing & commitment	Frequent mentions of increased efficacy, autonomy, energy	Aligns with JD-R & SDT; supports retention
Ethical & implementation concerns	~40% expressed privacy risks, inequity, access barriers	Highlights need for safeguards & inclusive policies
Risk of workload intensification	Noted in unbalanced adoption cases	Potential negative spiral if poorly managed

Qualitative narratives vividly illustrate how faculty and administrators actually experience GenAI-enabled support in daily academic life. The most recurrent theme—substantial relief from administrative overload and associated technostress—underscores that personalized time-saving recommendations and automated routine tasks genuinely restore bandwidth for high-value activities such as deep mentoring, innovative course design, and personal recovery. Participants frequently linked these practical gains to renewed feelings of efficacy, greater perceived control over their workload, and bursts of renewed energy, aligning closely with both JD-R resource pathways and SDT need satisfaction mechanisms. At the same time, nearly 40% of interviewees spontaneously raised serious ethical red flags, most commonly fears of surveillance, data privacy breaches, unequal access across disciplines or ranks, and the risk that poorly implemented tools could paradoxically intensify pressure on already vulnerable colleagues. Several administrators and senior faculty described scenarios in which rushed or top-down rollouts created resentment or compliance fatigue rather than genuine relief. A smaller but important subset of voices cautioned that, without careful calibration, GenAI recommendations could inadvertently normalize even higher performance expectations, turning time saved into additional output demands. Collectively, these lived accounts enrich the quantitative findings by revealing both the human promise and the implementation hazards, emphasizing that technology impact depends heavily on trust, transparency, inclusivity, and ongoing dialogue between users and institutional leadership.

Table 3: Overall Impact Comparison & Recommendations

Outcome Area	Low/Uneven GenAI Adoption	Strategic, Policy-Supported GenAI Analytics	Net Effect / Recommendation
Faculty Burnout & Stress Levels	High / Persistent	Significantly reduced (up to 28%)	Proactive analytics yields clear prevention gains
Job Satisfaction &	Lower	Higher (via needs fulfillment)	Automation + recommendations

Emotional Wellbeing			boost efficacy
Affective Organizational Commitment & Retention	Weaker / Higher turnover risk	22% higher engagement & loyalty	Ethical frameworks essential for sustainability
Risks & Barriers	Inequities, technostress intensification	Privacy concerns mitigated by training/policies	Inclusive deployment & safeguards maximize benefits

These results synthesizes the mixed-methods evidence into a stark before-and-after contrast that highlights the conditional nature of GenAI's value in higher education. In settings characterized by low or haphazard adoption, faculty continue to report persistently high burnout, diminished satisfaction, eroded commitment, and elevated turnover risk—outcomes consistent with long-standing literature on academic labour intensification. By contrast, campuses that pursue deliberate, policy-backed, ethically governed GenAI analytics show meaningful improvements across every major outcome domain: noticeably lower stress, higher job satisfaction rooted in restored autonomy and competence, and a 22% uplift in affective commitment and retention proxies. This differential strongly suggests that the technology itself is neither inherently beneficial nor harmful; rather, outcomes hinge on intentional design choices—proactive versus reactive use, attention to equity, investment in training, and robust privacy safeguards. The table also surfaces an important cautionary note: when implementation remains unbalanced or coercive, some subgroups experience workload creep or technostress amplification, potentially widening existing inequities. Therefore, the overarching recommendation is clear—higher education leaders should treat GenAI analytics as a strategic human resource intervention rather than a cost-saving IT add-on. Sustainable gains appear most likely when institutions couple technical capability with inclusive governance, continuous faculty voice, transparent data practices, and explicit alignment with wellbeing and retention goals, thereby transforming a potentially disruptive innovation into a genuine enabler of long-term academic health and institutional vitality.

SUGGESTIONS

To maximize the benefits of GenAI as a strategic analytics tool for faculty wellbeing, higher education institutions should prioritize ethical frameworks that include transparent data governance, faculty co-design of analytics dashboards, mandatory privacy training, and equitable access across disciplines and ranks to prevent surveillance fears and digital divides. Leaders must integrate GenAI recommendations with workload audits and flexible resource allocation policies, ensuring automation genuinely reduces administrative burden rather than creating new performance pressures, while regularly evaluating impact through anonymous pulse surveys and iterative policy adjustments. Finally, invest in ongoing professional development that builds faculty AI literacy and self-efficacy, fostering a culture of trust and shared ownership so that technology enhances psychological need satisfaction, sustains long-term commitment, and supports a healthier, more resilient academic workforce.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that generative AI, when reframed and strategically deployed as an institutional analytics tool rather than solely a teaching aid, holds substantial promise for mitigating faculty burnout, fulfilling psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and strengthening affective organizational commitment in higher education. Mixed-methods evidence from surveys and interviews reveals that proactive workload monitoring, early burnout detection, task automation, and personalized recommendations—supported by ethical policies, privacy safeguards, inclusive training, and equitable access—can yield significant improvements in wellbeing, job satisfaction, engagement, and retention while reducing technostress and administrative burdens. Ultimately, by aligning GenAI innovation with human-centered priorities, higher education institutions can foster resilient, committed faculty communities that sustain long-term academic excellence, turning a potentially disruptive technology into a powerful enabler of healthier, more sustainable workplaces.

REFERENCES

1. Koster, M., & McHenry, K. (2023). Areas of work-life that contribute to burnout among higher education health science faculty and perception of institutional support. *International journal of qualitative studies on health and well-being*, *18*(1), 2235129.
2. Xu, Z., & Pang, N. S. K. (2024). Promoting teachers' organizational commitment: The effects of authentic leadership, teachers' well-being and social–emotional competence. *Behavioral Sciences*, *14*(10), 862.
3. Minkin, L. (2024). Distrust, management and the long road to Iraq. In *The Blair Supremacy* (pp. 503-556). Manchester University Press.
4. Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2023). Job demands-resources theory in times of crises: New propositions. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *13*(3), 209-236.
5. Ryan, R. M., Jang, H., Wang, J. C., Matos, L., Gordeeva, T., Kaplan, H., ... & Vansteenkiste, M. (2025). Variations in need supports in education as a function of cultural and economic factors: Perspectives from self-determination theory. *Educational Psychology Review*, *37*(4), 118.
6. Vassileva, B., & Daneva, T. (2025). The role of GenAI in transforming educational process in HEIs. *Business & Management Compass*, *69*(1), 43-57.
7. Sohail, S., Parveen, S., & Dar, T. (2025). Investigating the Role of Generative Ai in Transforming Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Practices. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, *8*(4), 159-174.
8. Mimoudi, A. (2025). Generative AI to bridge the educational divide: Personalized learning and challenges. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 102140.

9. Gering, Z., Feher, K., Harmat, V., & Tamassy, R. (2025). Strategic organisational responses to generative AI-driven digital transformation in leading higher education institutions. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *33*(12), 132-152.

10. Liu, G., Lan, G., Nneli, N. C., Song, F., Xiao, Q., & Zheng, M. (2025, November). Balancing generative AI integration and faculty well-being: evidence from Chinese higher education. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 10, p. 1688902). Frontiers Media SA

11. Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2025). Factors influencing academic staff satisfaction and continuous usage of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1), 5.

12. Pushpanadham, K., & Sarpong, R. A. (2024). Research and innovation in higher education: promises of generative artificial intelligence for sustainable development. *Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A handbook for educational leaders*, *32*(5–6), 154.

13. Mutahar, A. M., Al-Sharafi, M. A., Shyyab, Y., & Zouria, A. (2025). Antecedents of sustainable generative AI use among HEIs employees: examining net benefits through the lens of IS success and innovativeness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 1-18

14. Bellary, S., Sarkar, S., & Mishra, A. N. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence for management education: applications, benefits, challenges and future research directions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *39*(5), 1217-1239.

15. Jogezai, N. A., Koroleva, D., & Ivanov, I. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: challenges, opportunities and future course of actions to achieve sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 1-25.

16. Luo, Y., Zhou, G., & Cui, Y. (2026). Understanding generative artificial intelligence adoption in higher education faculty: evidence from Chinese Universities and technical and vocational colleges. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-41.

17. Nikolopoulou, K. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence and sustainable higher education: Mapping the potential. *Journal of Digital Educational Technology*, *5*(1), ep2506.

18. Khairullah, S. A., Harris, S., Hadi, H. J., Sandhu, R. A., Ahmad, N., & Alshara, M. A. (2025, February). Implementing artificial intelligence in academic and administrative processes through responsible strategic leadership in the higher education institutions. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 10, p. 1548104). Frontiers Media SA.

19. RAMANI, D. (2025). MANAGING PROFESSIONAL STRESS: AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PERSPECTIVES OF COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *32*.

20. Antony, D. A. J., Arulandu, S., & Parayitam, S. (2024). Disentangling the relationships between talent management, organizational commitment and turnover intention: Evidence from higher educational institutions in India. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, *43*(2), 176-201.

21. Ahmad Nizam, S. N. E. S., Mohamad Saber, J., Salim, A., Zaidi, N. A., & Bahari, K. A. (2024). Examining the impact of job demand resource theory variables on burnout among hotel employees in Kuala Lumpur. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Culinary Arts*, *16*(1), 489-513.

22. Sitinjak, C., Donatrin, Y., Kristiyani, V., & Ober, J. (2025). Psychological Challenges Faced by Young Workers in the Digital Era: A Systematic Literature Review in the Indonesian Context. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, *12*(2), 1-20.

23. Garcia, R. F., & Kwok, L. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in human resource management: a critical reflection on impacts, resilience and roles. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *37*(9), 3136-3158.