Scholedge International Journal of *Business Policy & Governance*
ISSN 2394-3351 Vol. 11, Issue 01 (2024)
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.19085/sijbpg110101

Working Under the Clock: Filing Deadlines, Systemic Frictions, and Professional Stress Among Indian Management Consultants

Sunil Sharma
SKS Consulting & Advisors, India

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study examines how regulatory filing deadlines affect occupational stress among management consultants in India, specifically Chartered Accountants, Company Secretaries, Cost & Management Accountants, and Advocates. The research identifies multilevel causes of last-minute filings across individual, client, and systemic domains.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Mixed-methods exploratory study combining quantitative survey data (N=50) with qualitative semi-structured interviews (n=12). The structured questionnaire measured deadline experiences, stress indicators, and attribution of delays using Likert scales and proportional allocation. Thematic analysis identified patterns in professional coping and systemic pressures.

Findings: Results revealed that 78% of respondents regularly received client documents within 48 hours of filing deadlines. Participants attributed delays primarily to client-side factors (42%), followed by regulatory system issues (31%) and professional workload management (27%). High stress indicators were reported by 64% of participants, with sleep disruption and extended working hours being the most common symptoms. Qualitative analysis identified themes of "silent resilience," "moral accountability," and "deadline normalization."

Practical Implications: Findings suggest that compliance professionals function as "shock absorbers" between regulatory deadlines and client behavior. Recommendations include staggered filing deadlines, client document submission cutoff policies, and increased automation investment. The study contributes an integrated framework positioning deadline stress as a systemic phenomenon rather than individual failure.

Keywords: Occupational stress, deadline pressure, compliance professionals, regulatory filings, India, job demands-control model

INTRODUCTION

Background

Regulatory compliance in India operates within a deadline-driven ecosystem characterized by dense documentation requirements and compressed timelines. Management consultants, particularly Chartered Accountants (CAs), Company Secretaries (CSs), Cost & Management Accountants (CMAs), and Advocates, routinely work through overlapping statutory filing calendars that converge at specific points throughout the fiscal year. These professionals function as intermediaries between organizational clients and regulatory authorities, managing multiple compliance obligations simultaneously.

The Indian regulatory framework encompasses various filing requirements administered by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA), Goods and Services Tax Network (GSTN), Income Tax Department, and Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), among others. Each authority maintains distinct filing schedules, often with limited coordination. For instance, annual return filings under the Companies Act coincide with income tax return deadlines, creating predictable periods of concentrated workload.

Recent incidents have brought workplace stress in professional services to national attention. The death of a 26-year-old chartered accountant in July 2024, attributed by her family to excessive workload and work culture, sparked widespread discussion about the mental health crisis affecting young professionals in India. Reports indicate that over 60% of employees in India experience work-related stress, with workplace stress contributing to declining productivity and health problems across sectors (World Health Organization, 2024).

Research Gap

Existing literature on occupational stress has focused predominantly on corporate environments, healthcare professions, and education sectors. Research on stress among Indian professionals has examined IT workers (Kazmi et al., 2024), banking employees, and academic staff, but has paid limited attention to compliance professions despite their unique stressor profile.

The accounting profession globally has witnessed increasing burnout rates. A 2022 study by the University of Georgia and FloQast found that 99% of accountants experience some form of burnout, characterized by feelings of exhaustion, inefficiency, and alienation from their work. In the UK, 43% of chartered accountants reported constantly or often facing burnout indicators in 2024, representing a 20% increase from previous years (Caba, 2025). Research demonstrates that accountants are 36% more likely to report feeling stressed or burnt out compared to employees in other industries.

However, there remains relatively little empirical exploration of deadline-centric professional ecosystems where output depends simultaneously on clients, regulators, and technology infrastructure. This study positions compliance professionals as intermediary knowledge workers operating between multiple institutional clocks, subject to pressures that are distinct from those experienced by professionals with greater autonomy over their work processes.

Research Objectives

This research was guided by the following objectives:

1. To map perceived causes of end-time filings across three domains: professionals, clients, and regulatory systems
2. To assess psychological, physical, and operational stress indicators among compliance professionals
3. To explore coping strategies employed by professionals managing deadline pressure
4. To develop a conceptual model of "Deadline Compression Stress" specific to compliance work

Conceptual Framework

This study draws on Karasek's (1979) Job Demands-Control (JDC) model as its theoretical foundation. The JDC model posits that occupational stress results from the interaction between job demands and the degree of control workers have over their work processes. According to the model, high-strain jobs are characterized by high demands combined with low decision latitude, leading to adverse psychological and physiological outcomes (Kain & Jex, 2010).

The strain hypothesis suggests that employees in high-demand, low-control positions experience the lowest well-being. The buffer hypothesis states that control can moderate the negative effects of high demands on well-being (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999). Extensive research has validated these hypotheses across various occupational contexts, though support for the buffering effect has been less consistent than for the direct strain effect.

In the context of compliance professionals, job demands include deadline pressures, client document delays, system failures, and simultaneous filing requirements. Control factors include autonomy over client acceptance, ability to set document submission cutoff dates, and capacity to manage workload through delegation or automation. However, compliance professionals face unique constraints: regulatory deadlines are non-negotiable, client cooperation is variable, and technological infrastructure is often beyond professional control. This creates what we term "Deadline Compression Stress," a form of occupational stress emerging from synchronized temporal demands across multiple stakeholder systems.

The Compliance Stress Triad

The proposed Compliance Stress Triad conceptualizes stress as emerging from three interacting nodes:

Client Delays: Late document submission, incomplete information, last-minute changes to financial data, and poor recordkeeping practices.

Professional Capacity: Workload management, staffing levels, automation tools, technical expertise, and time allocation across multiple clients.

Regulatory Infrastructure: Portal functionality, system outages during peak periods, interface complexity, deadline clustering, and technical support availability.

Stress emerges not from any single node but from interaction effects among all three. A professional with adequate capacity may still experience high stress when facing simultaneous client delays and portal outages near a deadline. This multiplicative effect distinguishes deadline compression stress from general workplace stress.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed an exploratory mixed-methods design combining quantitative survey data with qualitative interviews. The cross-sectional approach allowed for descriptive analysis and thematic exploration of deadline-related stress among compliance professionals. The research received approval from the institutional ethics committee, and all participants gave informed consent before participation.

Sample

The sample comprised 50 compliance professionals recruited through purposive and snowball sampling methods. Inclusion criteria required: (a) minimum two years of compliance practice, (b) active involvement in statutory filings during the 2024-2025 fiscal year, and (c) current practice in India. The sample included Chartered Accountants (n=28, 56%), Company Secretaries (n=12, 24%), Cost & Management Accountants (n=6, 12%), and Advocates specializing in corporate law (n=4, 8%).

Participants ranged in experience from 2 to 23 years (M=8.4, SD=5.2). Practice settings varied: 32% worked in solo practice, 54% in small to medium firms (2-10 professionals), and 14% as in-house compliance officers. Monthly filing volumes ranged from 15 to 180 filings per professional (M=62, SD=38).

From the survey respondents, 12 participants were selected for semi-structured interviews based on maximum variation sampling to ensure diversity in profession type, experience level, and practice setting.

Data Collection Instruments

Structured Questionnaire

A 45-item structured questionnaire was developed across five sections:

Section I: Demographics. This section captured professional designation, years of experience, practice type, average monthly filings, and location.

Section II: Deadline Experience (Likert Scale). Participants rated 12 statements on a 5-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). Sample items included: "I regularly receive client documents less than 48 hours before filing deadlines"; "System slowdowns affect my productivity during peak filing periods"; "I feel personally responsible for delays even when caused externally"; "Multiple regulatory portals often peak simultaneously." Cronbach's alpha for this section was 0.84, indicating good internal consistency.

Section III: Attribution of Causes. Respondents distributed 100 points across four categories: client-side delays, professional workload management, regulatory systems/portals, and unanticipated legal changes. This proportional allocation method avoided forced ranking while revealing relative attributions.

Section IV: Stress Indicators. Eight items measured physical and psychological symptoms on a 5-point frequency scale (1=Never, 5=Very Often). Items included sleep disruption during filing seasons, extended working hours, emotional exhaustion, physical fatigue, difficulty concentrating, irritability, anxiety, and headaches. A composite stress index was calculated by averaging scores (α=0.89).

Section V: Coping Mechanisms. Participants selected from 15 coping strategies (multiple selection allowed) and offered open-ended responses about additional methods. Options included working overnight, hiring temporary staff, automating processes, rejecting last-minute clients, taking breaks, exercise, mindfulness practices, and accepting stress as normal.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Twelve participants underwent 45–60-minute semi-structured interviews conducted via video conferencing. The interview guide included four core prompts: "Describe your most stressful filing experience in detail"; "At what point does responsibility shift from client to professional in your view?"; "How do system outages or technical issues change your work patterns?"; and "What would an ideal compliance ecosystem look like from your perspective?"

Interviews were recorded with permission, transcribed verbatim, and subjected to member checking. Two participants requested minor clarifications to their statements, which were incorporated into the final transcripts.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies) were calculated for all quantitative variables using SPSS Version 27. Cross-tabulation examined differences by profession type and experience level. Attribution averages from the 100-point distribution were calculated to identify dominant causal perceptions. A composite stress index was constructed by averaging responses from Section IV, allowing classification into low (1.0-2.33), moderate (2.34-3.66), and high (3.67-5.0) stress categories.

This study employs descriptive analysis only and makes no causal claims. The cross-sectional design and small sample size limit generalizability. Results represent patterns within this specific sample rather than population-level estimates.

Qualitative Analysis

Interview transcripts were analyzed using a two-cycle coding approach adapted from Saldaña (2016). First-cycle coding identified in-vivo and descriptive codes close to participants' language. Initial codes included "client inertia," "portal anxiety," "moral responsibility," "deadline normalization," and "professional guilt."

Second-cycle coding grouped first-order codes into broader thematic categories. Four major themes emerged:

Systemic Dependency: Professionals described being trapped between client behavior and regulatory requirements, with limited influence over either.

Internalized Accountability*:* Participants reported feeling personally responsible for outcomes even when delays originated externally.

Temporal Overload*:* Accounts of working through nights, weekends, and holidays to meet simultaneous deadlines.

Silent Resilience*:* Coping mechanisms that normalized extreme work patterns rather than challenging them.

Inter-coder reliability was assessed by having two independent coders analyze 25% of transcripts. Cohen's kappa was 0.78, indicating substantial agreement. Disagreements were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached.

Ethical Considerations

All participants gave written informed consent. Anonymity was guaranteed through assignment of participant codes (e.g., CA-07, CS-03). No employer or firm names were recorded. Questions about emotional distress were marked as optional; all participants chose to respond. Given the sensitive nature of stress-related questions, the researcher's contact information and mental health resources were sent to all participants. No participants reported adverse effects from participation.

Data were stored on encrypted devices accessible only to the research team. All identifying information will be destroyed after publication, retaining only de-identified transcripts and coded data for potential secondary analysis.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of participants. The sample was predominantly male (68%), reflecting gender distribution in these professions. Most participants (72%) were based in metropolitan areas (Mumbai, Delhi NCR, Bangalore, Chennai, Hyderabad), with 28% practicing in Tier-2 cities.

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Participants (N=50)

Characteristic	n	%
Professional Designation		
Chartered Accountant	28	56

Company Secretary	12	24
Cost & Management Accountant	6	12
Advocate (Corporate Law)	4	8
Practice Type		
Solo Practice	16	32
Small/Medium Firm	27	54
In-house Compliance Officer	7	14
Years of Experience		
2-5 years	21	42
6-10 years	17	34
11+ years	12	24

Deadline Experience Patterns

Table 2 reports mean ratings for deadline experience items. Participants strongly agreed with statements about late client document submission (M=4.32, SD=0.74) and system performance issues during peak periods (M=4.18, SD=0.82). There was moderate agreement that professionals feel personally responsible for externally-caused delays (M=3.76, SD=1.02), suggesting internalized accountability. Agreement that multiple portals peak simultaneously was high (M=4.41, SD=0.69), confirming the temporal clustering concern.

Table 2

Mean Ratings for Deadline Experience Items (N=50)

Item	M	SD
I regularly receive client documents <48hrs before deadlines	4.32	0.74
System slowdowns affect productivity during peak periods	4.18	0.82
Multiple regulatory portals often peak simultaneously	4.41	0.69
I feel responsible for delays even when caused externally	3.76	1.02
Client information quality deteriorates near deadlines	3.94	0.88

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree.

Attribution of Delays

Table 3 presents the proportional attribution of filing delays across four categories. Client-side delays received the highest average attribution (M=42.1, SD=15.3), followed by regulatory systems/portals (M=30.8, SD=12.6), professional workload management (M=19.7, SD=10.4), and unanticipated legal changes (M=7.4, SD=6.1).

Table 3

Attribution of Filing Delays (Proportional Allocation Method)

Category	M	SD
Client-side delays	42.1	15.3
Regulatory systems/portals	30.8	12.6
Professional workload management	19.7	10.4
Unanticipated legal changes	7.4	6.1

Note. Participants distributed 100 points across four categories. Values represent percentage points.

Notably, solo practitioners attributed more responsibility to professional workload management (M=26.3) compared to firm-based professionals (M=17.2), suggesting that resource constraints are more salient for independent practitioners. Conversely, firm-based professionals attributed more to regulatory systems (M=33.1 vs. M=26.2), potentially reflecting higher exposure to portal congestion due to larger client volumes.

Stress Indicators

Table 4 shows frequency ratings for eight stress indicators. Sleep disruption during filing seasons received the highest mean score (M=4.12, SD=0.91), followed by extended working hours (M=4.38, SD=0.76) and emotional exhaustion (M=3.89, SD=0.94). The composite stress index ranged from 2.13 to 4.75 (M=3.84, SD=0.68). Using the classification scheme, 8% fell into the low stress category, 28% into moderate stress, and 64% into high stress.

Table 4

Frequency of Stress Indicators During Filing Seasons (N=50)

Indicator	M	SD
Extended working hours (>10 hours/day)	4.38	0.76
Sleep disruption	4.12	0.91
Emotional exhaustion	3.89	0.94
Physical fatigue	3.78	0.88
Difficulty concentrating	3.62	1.01

Irritability	3.54	0.97
Anxiety	3.71	1.04
Headaches	3.26	1.12
Composite Stress Index	**3.84**	**0.68**

Note. Scale: 1=Never, 5=Very Often. Composite index calculated as mean of all eight items.

Coping Strategies

Table 5 presents the frequency of coping strategies employed by participants. The most commonly reported strategy was working overnight or extending work hours (n=47, 94%), followed by accepting stress as part of the profession (n=41, 82%), and automating repetitive processes (n=36, 72%). Fewer participants reported hiring temporary staff (n=14, 28%) or rejecting last-minute clients (n=11, 22%).

Table 5

Coping Strategies Employed (N=50)

Strategy	n	%
Working overnight/extending hours	47	94
Accepting stress as normal	41	82
Automating repetitive processes	36	72
Skipping meals/breaks	33	66
Delegating to junior staff	27	54
Taking short breaks/exercise	22	44
Setting client document cutoff dates	18	36
Hiring temporary staff	14	28
Rejecting last-minute clients	11	22
Mindfulness/meditation practices	9	18

Note. Participants could select multiple strategies; percentages do not sum to 100.

The high prevalence of reactive coping strategies (working longer hours, accepting stress) relative to proactive boundary-setting strategies (rejecting clients, setting cutoff dates) suggests that professionals absorb deadline pressure rather than redirecting it. This pattern aligns with interview findings discussed in the next section.

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Four major themes emerged from qualitative analysis of interview transcripts:

Theme 1: Systemic Dependency

Participants described feeling trapped between client behavior and regulatory requirements, with limited influence over either. One CA stated: "You can't control when clients send documents, and you definitely can't control the MCA portal. You're just caught in the middle trying to make it work somehow" (CA-14, 7 years experience).

Another participant explained: "Even if I finish everything perfectly on time, if the portal crashes at 11 PM on the deadline day, what can I do? But the client will still blame me" (CS-03, 5 years experience). This dependency on systems outside professional control created feelings of helplessness.

Theme 2: Internalized Accountability

Participants reported feeling personally responsible for outcomes even when delays originated externally. One participant explained: "Logically, I know it's not my fault when a client sends balance sheets two days before deadline. But I still feel like I should have followed up more, should have pushed harder" (CA-22, 11 years experience).

This internalized accountability appeared to function as a professional identity marker. As another participant stated: "If you don't take full responsibility, you're not a good CA. That's what they teach us from day one" (CA-08, 4 years experience).

Theme 3: Temporal Overload

Accounts of working through nights, weekends, and holidays to meet simultaneous deadlines were common. "March to May is basically three months of living at the office. You work Saturday, Sunday, doesn't matter. Sleep becomes optional" (CA-19, 9 years experience).

Several participants described deadline clustering as creating impossible situations: "When GST returns, TDS returns, and company filings all overlap in the same week, there's literally not enough hours in the day. You just do your best and hope nothing goes wrong" (CS-07, 6 years experience).

Theme 4: Silent Resilience

Coping mechanisms normalized extreme work patterns rather than challenging them. Participants frequently described stress as "just part of the job" or "what we signed up for." One participant stated: "Complaining doesn't help. Every CA goes through this. You just develop a thick skin" (CA-27, 15 years experience).

This silent resilience appeared to preclude collective action or structural critique. When asked about potential solutions, most participants focused on individual adaptations (better time management, more automation) rather than systemic reforms.

DISCUSSION

This study examined deadline-related stress among Indian compliance professionals through the lens of the Job Demands-Control model (Karasek, 1979). Results revealed that professionals experience high stress levels driven by client delays, regulatory system constraints, and compressed filing timelines. The majority of participants (64%) reported high stress indicators, with patterns suggesting that stress emerges from multiplicative effects across client, professional, and regulatory domains rather than from any single source.

Professionals as Shock Absorbers

The finding that participants attributed the largest proportion of delays to client-side factors (42%) while still maintaining high personal accountability aligns with theories of professional identity construction. Compliance professionals appear to function as "shock absorbers" in the regulatory ecosystem, absorbing delays that originate upstream (client behavior) and downstream (portal failures) while protecting the appearance of smooth system operation.

This shock absorber function comes at personal cost. The prevalence of sleep disruption (M=4.12), extended working hours (M=4.38), and emotional exhaustion (M=3.89) demonstrates that deadline compression translates into bodily and psychological strain. These findings align with global research showing that 99% of accountants experience burnout symptoms and that accountants are 36% more likely to report stress compared to other professions.

The Karasek framework helps explain why these professionals experience such high strain. They face high job demands (compressed deadlines, simultaneous filings, client delays) combined with low control (cannot modify regulatory deadlines, cannot force client cooperation, cannot prevent portal outages). This high-demand, low-control combination is precisely the condition that Karasek identified as producing maximum occupational stress (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999).

Moral Load of Compliance

The theme of internalized accountability suggests that compliance professionals carry what might be termed a "moral load" beyond their technical responsibilities. Even when delays are demonstrably external, professionals report feeling personally responsible. This internalization serves dual functions: it motivates extraordinary effort, but also prevents recognition of structural problems.

The moderate agreement with the statement "I feel personally responsible for delays even when caused externally" (M=3.76) indicates that roughly half the sample experiences this burden strongly. Combined with qualitative accounts of professional identity being tied to "taking full responsibility," this suggests that the profession itself may cultivate a culture of self-blame that obscures systemic failures.

Research on occupational stress has long documented that workers who internalize responsibility for outcomes beyond their control experience higher psychological strain (Spielberger et al., 2002). In the compliance context, this internalization appears especially pronounced because professional ethics emphasize absolute accountability to clients and regulatory authorities.

Technology as Dual-Edged Force

The attribution of 31% of delays to regulatory systems and portals points to a paradox of digital infrastructure. Electronic filing systems theoretically increase efficiency by eliminating paper-based processes, but they also create new vulnerabilities. Portal congestion during peak filing periods, unexpected maintenance windows, and system crashes compress timeline margins that previously existed.

The high agreement that "system slowdowns affect my productivity during peak filing periods" (M=4.18) and that "multiple regulatory portals often peak simultaneously" (M=4.41) suggests that technological infrastructure has become a major stressor. Unlike client delays, which professionals can attempt to manage through relationship-building and communication, portal failures are entirely outside professional influence.

This aligns with broader research on how automation and digitalization change the nature of professional work. While technology removes some stressors (manual calculation, physical filing), it introduces new ones (system dependency, technical support delays, simultaneous portal access

requirements). For compliance professionals, the net effect appears to be increased rather than decreased stress.

Coping Patterns and Professional Culture

The dominance of reactive coping strategies (working overnight, accepting stress) over proactive boundary-setting (rejecting clients, enforcing cutoffs) reflects both structural constraints and professional socialization. Only 22% of participants reported rejecting last-minute clients, and only 36% enforced document submission cutoff dates.

This pattern suggests that market competition and professional norms discourage boundary-setting. Participants who enforce strict cutoffs risk losing clients to competitors who accept last-minute work. The prevalence of "accepting stress as normal" (82%) indicates that extreme workload has become culturally embedded within these professions.

Research on professional burnout has documented similar patterns in other high-demand fields. Studies of physicians, lawyers, and consultants show that normalization of extreme work hours creates self-perpetuating cycles where questioning workload becomes professionally deviant (Kazmi et al., 2024). In the compliance context, this normalization appears especially strong due to regulatory deadlines being legally mandated rather than organizationally discretionary.

Practical Implications

Findings from this study suggest interventions across three levels:

Regulatory Level Interventions

Regulatory authorities could reduce deadline compression through staggered filing schedules. Rather than concentrating filings in quarterly or annual windows, authorities could assign companies to different filing cohorts based on incorporation date or industry sector. This would distribute workload more evenly across the year.

Portal infrastructure requires investment in capacity planning and stress testing. The finding that portals "often peak simultaneously" (M=4.41) suggests inadequate load balancing. Authorities should schedule maintenance during low-traffic periods and communicate downtime windows well in advance.

Extended grace periods or amnesty windows for technical filing failures could reduce panic-driven last-minute submissions. When professionals know they have recourse if portals fail, they may spread their filing activity across more days rather than waiting until the final deadline.

Professional Practice Interventions

Professional bodies could develop and promote standardized engagement terms that include document submission cutoff dates. If industry-wide standards established that clients must submit documents at least 5-7 days before regulatory deadlines, individual professionals would have professional backing to enforce these boundaries without competitive disadvantage.

Investment in automation tools showed promise as a coping mechanism (72% adoption rate). Professional development programs could focus on teaching professionals to identify repetitive tasks suitable for automation, potentially freeing capacity for complex judgment work.

Workload caps or client volume limits could be explored, particularly for solo practitioners. The attribution of more stress to professional workload management among solo practitioners (M=26.3 vs. M=17.2 for firm-based) suggests that independent professionals may benefit from formal capacity limits.

Client Education Initiatives

Client-side delays accounted for 42% of attributed responsibility. Educational campaigns explaining how late document submission creates compliance risk could shift client behavior. If clients understood that rushed filings increase error rates, they might cooperate with earlier submission deadlines.

Penalty-sharing arrangements where clients incur additional fees for documents submitted within 48 hours of deadlines could create financial incentives for timely cooperation. Such mechanisms would need careful design to avoid unfairly burdening small businesses while still discouraging procrastination.

LIMITATIONS

Several limitations constrain interpretation of these findings. First, the small sample size (N=50) and purposive sampling limit generalizability. The sample overrepresented Chartered Accountants (56%) relative to other compliance professions, potentially biasing results toward experiences specific to accounting work.

Second, the cross-sectional design prevents causal inference. While findings show associations between deadline patterns and stress indicators, we cannot determine whether deadline compression causes stress or whether stressed professionals simply perceive deadlines as more compressed. Longitudinal research tracking professionals through filing seasons would better establish causality.

Third, self-report measures of stress are subject to response bias. Professionals experiencing burnout may be more likely to participate in stress research, inflating observed stress levels. Future studies could incorporate physiological measures (cortisol levels, heart rate variability) or workplace performance data to triangulate findings.

Fourth, the India-specific regulatory context limits cross-national comparison. Filing systems, professional norms, and client behavior patterns differ across countries. Findings may not apply to compliance professionals in other regulatory environments.

Fifth, the study did not measure actual filing errors or compliance quality. While participants reported high stress, we cannot determine whether this stress affects professional performance. Research examining relationships between deadline compression, stress levels, and filing accuracy would address this gap.

Finally, the study focused exclusively on professional experiences, excluding client perspectives. Client-side factors accounted for 42% of attributed delays, yet we lack data on why clients submit documents late. Parallel research with client populations would provide a more balanced understanding of the compliance ecosystem.

CONCLUSION

Deadline stress in compliance professions is not an individual weakness but a structural outcome of synchronized regulatory timelines, asymmetric client behavior, and fragile digital infrastructures. This study documented how compliance professionals absorb temporal pressures from multiple sources, maintaining system functioning through personal strain. The prevalence of high stress (64%), combined with reactive coping patterns and normalized overwork, suggests an unsustainable professional model.

The Compliance Stress Triad framework—positioning stress as emerging from client delays, professional capacity, and regulatory infrastructure—offers a systemic lens that moves beyond individual blame. True reform requires ecosystem-level thinking. Regulatory authorities must address deadline clustering and portal reliability. Professional bodies must develop industry standards that support boundary-setting. Clients must recognize their role in the filing process.

Most critically, the profession itself must reconsider norms that equate professionalism with unlimited availability and total accountability. The finding that 82% of participants accept stress as normal reveals how deeply embedded these patterns have become. Challenging this normalization will require collective action rather than individual adaptation.

Future research should examine interventions at each level of the triad, testing whether staggered deadlines, client education, or professional standards reduce stress without compromising compliance quality. Longitudinal designs tracking professionals across multiple filing seasons would establish how chronic exposure to deadline compression affects long-term health and career trajectories. Cross-national comparisons could identify regulatory architectures that minimize professional strain while maintaining oversight effectiveness.

The compliance professionals who participated in this study demonstrated remarkable resilience in managing impossible timelines. Their accounts reveal systems that depend on individual capacity to absorb structural dysfunction. Redesigning these systems to distribute pressure more equitably represents both an ethical imperative and a practical necessity for sustainable regulatory compliance.

REFERENCES

Caba. (2025). *20% rise in burnout symptoms among chartered accountants*. Retrieved from https://www.caba.org.uk

Kain, J., & Jex, S. (2010). Karasek's (1979) job demands-control model: A summary of current issues and recommendations for future research. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *New developments in theoretical and conceptual approaches to job stress: Research in occupational stress and well-being* (Vol. 8, pp. 237-268). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555(2010)0000008009

Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(2), 285-308. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498

Kazmi, S. S. H., Shukla, J., Tripathi, R. K., & Zaidi, S. Z. H. (2024). Occupational stress among middle-aged professionals in India. *Journal of Health Management, 26*(2), 189-202. https://doi.org/10.1177/09727531231184299

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Spielberger, C. D., Vagg, P. R., & Wasala, C. F. (2002). Occupational stress: Job pressures and lack of support. In J. C. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of mental health in the workplace* (pp. 185-200). Sage Publications.

Van Der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The job demand-control(-support) model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work & Stress, 13*(2), 87-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/026783799296084

World Health Organization. (2024). *Mental health at work*. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work.