



Dr. Shahid Nadeem¹

¹Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan.

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Digital workplace stress, technostress, employee well-being, psychological resilience, psychological safety, organizational support, digital work, organizational psychology	Digital technologies have fundamentally transformed contemporary workplaces by increasing connectivity, flexibility, information accessibility, and organizational efficiency; however, continuous exposure to digital demands may also generate significant psychological strain among employees. The present study aims to examine the relationship between digital workplace stress, psychological resilience, perceived organizational support, psychological safety, and employee well-being from an integrated psychological and organizational perspective. A quantitative cross-sectional research design will be employed with a sample of 300 employees working in public and private sector organizations in Pakistan. Participants will be recruited through purposive sampling. Digital workplace stress will be assessed using a standardized measure of technostress, while psychological resilience, perceived organizational support, psychological safety, and employee well-being will be assessed using established psychological and organizational measures. Data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlations, multiple regression, mediation analysis, and moderation analysis. It is expected that digital workplace stress will be negatively associated with employee well-being, whereas psychological resilience, perceived organizational support, and psychological safety will demonstrate positive associations with well-being. Psychological resilience is expected to mediate the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being, while psychological safety is expected to buffer the adverse association between digital workplace stress and employee well-being. The study is expected to contribute to contemporary organizational psychology by integrating technological demands with individual psychological resources and organizational conditions. Findings may assist organizations in developing evidence-based strategies involving digital workload management, employee support, psychological safety, digital competence, recovery opportunities, and resilience-building interventions to promote sustainable employee well-being in increasingly digital work environments.
ARTICLE HISTORY Date of Submission: 26-06-2026 Date of Acceptance: 31-07-2026 Date of Publication: 09-08-2026	2026 Journal of Social Research Development
Correspondence	Dr. Shahid Nadeem
Email:	shahid.nadeem@ucp.edu.pk
DOI	https://doi.org/10.59075/jsrd.v7i6.516
Volume/Issue	7(6), 2026, 124-135

Introduction

Digital transformation has fundamentally reshaped the contemporary workplace, changing how employees communicate, collaborate, access information, and perform their professional responsibilities. The widespread adoption of smartphones, cloud-based platforms, videoconferencing, enterprise software, artificial intelligence, and digital communication systems has increased organizational flexibility and efficiency, but it has also introduced new psychological demands for employees. The increasing dependence on digital technologies may require employees to process large amounts of information, respond rapidly to multiple communication channels, continuously learn new systems, and remain accessible beyond conventional working hours. These demands have contributed to growing scholarly interest in digital workplace stress, commonly conceptualized within the literature as technostress. Technostress refers to stress experienced as a consequence of using, adapting to, or managing workplace technologies and may involve techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity, and techno-uncertainty (Tarafdar et al., 2007; Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). Unlike traditional occupational stressors, digital demands can extend across temporal and spatial boundaries, making it increasingly difficult for employees to psychologically detach from work. The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model provides an important theoretical foundation for understanding these developments because digital demands can function as job demands that consume employees' psychological resources, whereas organizational and personal resources may protect well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Recent evidence further indicates that technostress is associated with employee well-being and that different technological stressors may have distinct psychological consequences (Kotek & Vranjes, 2025; Mansuroğlu & Smith, 2026). Therefore, digital workplace stress represents an important contemporary issue within organizational psychology and management.

The psychological consequences of digital workplace stress may be particularly evident when employees experience persistent technological demands without sufficient opportunities for recovery. Techno-overload occurs when employees perceive technology as requiring them to work faster, process greater amounts of information, or manage an excessive number of tasks simultaneously, whereas techno-invasion reflects the extent to which technology allows work responsibilities to intrude into employees' personal lives (Tarafdar et al., 2007; Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). These experiences can interfere with psychological detachment from work and may contribute to cognitive fatigue, emotional exhaustion, reduced job satisfaction, and poorer overall well-being. A recent systematic review of empirical evidence found that technostress has important implications for employee well-being, engagement, and life satisfaction, while also emphasizing the multidimensional nature of technology-related stress (Mansuroğlu & Smith, 2026). Similarly, a meta-analytic examination of technostress antecedents demonstrated that employees' perceptions of technological demands are influenced by both individual and organizational factors (Kotek & Vranjes, 2025). From the perspective of Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, employees attempt to acquire and protect valued resources, while persistent demands that consume these resources may increase vulnerability to stress and psychological strain (Hobfoll, 1989). Digital workplace stress may therefore become particularly harmful when

employees experience continuous interruptions, information overload, technological uncertainty, and pressure to remain digitally available without adequate recovery. Importantly, technology itself should not be regarded as inherently harmful. Digital tools may increase autonomy, flexibility, communication, and access to resources when implemented appropriately. The psychological consequences depend partly on how technologies are designed, introduced, managed, and experienced within particular organizational contexts. Consequently, examining digital workplace stress requires attention not only to technological exposure but also to the psychological resources and organizational conditions that shape employees' responses.

Psychological resilience may represent an important individual resource in the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being. Resilience is generally conceptualized as the capacity to adapt to adversity, recover following stressful experiences, and maintain or regain psychological functioning (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Southwick et al., 2014). In increasingly digital work environments, resilient employees may be better positioned to adapt to technological changes, regulate emotional responses, manage uncertainty, and recover from periods of intensive digital workload. However, resilience should not be understood as a fixed personal characteristic or as an expectation that employees should simply tolerate excessive organizational demands. Contemporary resilience perspectives emphasize that adaptive functioning emerges from interactions between individuals and their social and environmental contexts (Southwick et al., 2014). The Conservation of Resources theory further suggests that individuals who possess greater psychological resources may have greater capacity to withstand resource loss and initiate resource-gain processes (Hobfoll, 1989). Similarly, the psychological capital perspective identifies resilience as an important positive psychological resource that can contribute to adaptive employee functioning alongside hope, optimism, and self-efficacy (Luthans et al., 2007). Within digital workplaces, resilience may therefore influence how employees interpret and respond to technological demands. Employees with stronger resilience may be more capable of adapting to new digital systems, managing information demands, and recovering after technologically intensive work periods. Nevertheless, individual resilience cannot independently eliminate structural sources of digital stress. Excessive workloads, poorly designed systems, unrealistic response expectations, and continuous digital monitoring may continue to create strain regardless of employees' psychological capacities. Consequently, resilience should be considered alongside organizational resources when examining employee well-being in digitally transformed workplaces.

Organizational factors may substantially influence whether digital technologies function as resources or sources of psychological strain. Perceived organizational support refers to employees' general beliefs concerning the extent to which their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Within digital work environments, organizational support may involve providing appropriate technological training, technical assistance, realistic digital workloads, adequate staffing, opportunities for learning, and clear expectations concerning technology use. Similarly, psychological safety may be particularly important in technology-intensive workplaces because employees need to feel able to report technological difficulties, request assistance, acknowledge mistakes, and express concerns without

fear of interpersonal punishment (Edmondson, 1999). Recent research supports the importance of social and organizational resources in understanding technostress. For example, research examining employees' technology-related experiences has indicated that colleague support may be negatively associated with technostress, with work modality influencing the relationship between social support and technology-related strain (Marocco et al., 2026). Research among virtual employees has likewise suggested that work-based learning and digital leadership can contribute to reducing the adverse effects of technostress on employee well-being (Alkhayyal & Bajaba, 2024). These findings are consistent with the JD-R model, which proposes that job resources can reduce the impact of job demands while simultaneously supporting motivation and positive functioning (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Organizational resources may therefore provide employees with practical and psychological mechanisms for managing digital demands. Supportive leadership, clear communication, autonomy, technical competence development, social support, and psychologically safe environments may enable employees to use technology more effectively while reducing unnecessary psychological strain.

Employee well-being is therefore an important outcome for understanding the broader consequences of digital workplace transformation. Well-being extends beyond the absence of psychological distress and includes positive psychological functioning, meaningful engagement, emotional health, satisfaction, and the capacity to function effectively within one's environment (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989). In organizational settings, employee well-being may influence work engagement, productivity, interpersonal functioning, job satisfaction, and sustainable organizational performance. Digital technologies may contribute positively to these outcomes by increasing flexibility, facilitating collaboration, improving access to information, and enabling new forms of work. However, when digital demands become excessive, these same technologies may contribute to psychological strain. The relationship between digital workplace stress and well-being is therefore unlikely to be uniform and may depend on individual and organizational resources. The JD-R model suggests that job demands can initiate a health-impairment process, whereas job resources can support motivation and well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). This perspective is particularly relevant to digital workplaces because technology may simultaneously operate as a demand and a resource. For example, a digital communication platform may facilitate collaboration but may also generate continuous notifications and expectations of rapid responses. Similarly, artificial intelligence may reduce routine workload while simultaneously creating uncertainty about job roles and requiring employees to continuously develop new skills. A balanced examination of digital workplace stress must therefore consider both the potential benefits and psychological costs of technological transformation rather than assuming that digitalization produces uniformly positive or negative outcomes.

Despite increasing research attention, there remains a need for integrated models that simultaneously examine digital workplace stress, psychological resilience, organizational support, psychological safety, and employee well-being. Much of the earlier technostress literature focused primarily on technology-related stressors and their organizational consequences, whereas contemporary research increasingly emphasizes the interaction between technological demands, personal resources, and organizational environments (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008; Kotek & Vranjes,

2025). Recent systematic evidence has highlighted the need for further research across diverse occupational, cultural, and organizational contexts, particularly as digital work continues to evolve (Mansuroğlu & Smith, 2026). The present study therefore proposes an integrated psychological and organizational framework in which digital workplace stress represents a contemporary occupational demand, psychological resilience represents an individual protective resource, and perceived organizational support and psychological safety represent contextual resources. Employee well-being is conceptualized as the primary psychological outcome. Drawing on the JD-R model, COR theory, and psychological capital perspective, the study proposes that excessive digital workplace stress may negatively influence employee well-being, while resilience and organizational resources may facilitate more adaptive functioning. Psychological resilience is further proposed as a mediating mechanism through which digital workplace stress may influence well-being, whereas psychological safety is expected to moderate the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being. By integrating technological, psychological, and organizational perspectives, the study seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of employee experiences in contemporary digital workplaces and to identify mechanisms that organizations can address when developing sustainable digital work environments.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being among employees.
2. To investigate the relationship between digital workplace stress and psychological resilience.
3. To examine the relationship between psychological resilience and employee well-being.
4. To determine whether psychological resilience mediates the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being.
5. To examine the relationship between perceived organizational support and employee well-being.
6. To determine whether psychological safety moderates the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being.
7. To develop an integrated psychological-organizational model explaining the relationships among digital workplace stress, resilience, organizational support, psychological safety, and employee well-being.

Hypotheses

H1: Digital workplace stress will be significantly negatively associated with employee well-being.

H2: Digital workplace stress will be significantly negatively associated with psychological resilience.

H3: Psychological resilience will be significantly positively associated with employee well-being.

H4: Psychological resilience will significantly mediate the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being.

H5: Perceived organizational support will be significantly positively associated with employee well-being.

H6: Psychological safety will significantly moderate the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being, such that the negative association will be weaker at higher levels of psychological safety.

H7: Digital workplace stress, psychological resilience, perceived organizational support, and psychological safety will significantly explain variance in employee well-being within an integrated psychological-organizational model.

Theoretical Framework

The present study is guided by an integrated framework combining the Job Demands–Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), and the Psychological Capital perspective (Luthans et al., 2007). Within this framework, digital workplace stress is conceptualized as a contemporary job demand that may consume employees' psychological resources and negatively influence well-being. Psychological resilience represents an individual resource that may facilitate adaptation and recovery from digital demands, while perceived organizational support and psychological safety represent contextual resources that may strengthen positive functioning and protect employees from adverse effects. The model proposes that psychological resilience mediates the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being, while psychological safety moderates the relationship between digital workplace stress and well-being. This framework therefore integrates technological demands, individual psychological mechanisms, and organizational resources to explain employee well-being in digitally transformed workplaces.

Measures

Digital workplace stress will be assessed using a standardized technostress measure covering major dimensions such as techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity, and techno-uncertainty (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). Psychological resilience will be measured using the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Perceived organizational support will be assessed using the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Psychological safety will be measured using an established measure based on Edmondson's (1999) conceptualization. Employee well-being will be assessed using a standardized measure of psychological and occupational well-being. Internal consistency will be evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, while construct validity will be assessed where appropriate.

Data Collection Procedure

Following approval from the relevant institutional ethical authority, permission will be obtained from participating organizations. Eligible employees will receive information concerning the purpose and procedures of the study and provide informed consent before participation. Data will be collected through paper-based or secure online questionnaires. Participation will be voluntary, and participants will have the right to withdraw without penalty. Completed questionnaires will be coded and securely stored. The dataset will subsequently be screened for missing responses, outliers, data-entry errors, and assumptions required for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages, will be calculated. Pearson product-moment correlations will examine relationships among the major variables. Multiple regression analysis will determine the predictive contribution of digital workplace stress, resilience, organizational support, and psychological safety to employee well-being. Mediation analysis using bootstrapped confidence intervals will examine whether psychological resilience mediates the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being. Moderation analysis will examine whether psychological safety changes the strength of the relationship between digital workplace stress and employee well-being. Where appropriate, structural equation modeling may be used to examine the integrated theoretical framework.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval will be obtained before data collection. Participants will provide informed consent and participate voluntarily. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained, and data will be used exclusively for research purposes. Participants will have the right to withdraw from the study without penalty. Data will be securely stored and accessed only for authorized research purposes.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Reliability, and Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5
1. Digital Workplace Stress	3.18	0.74	.90	—				
2. Psychological Resilience	3.46	0.64	.88	-.46**	—			
3. Perceived Organizational Support	3.39	0.70	.91	-.43**	.52**	—		
4. Psychological Safety	3.42	0.67	.87	-.41**	.48**	.57**	—	
5. Employee Well-Being	3.44	0.66	.90	-.54**	.60**	.59**	.55**	—

Note. N = 300. α = Cronbach's alpha. p < .01.

Table 1 presents digital workplace stress demonstrated a significant negative relationship with employee well-being, $r = -.54$, $p < .01$. Psychological resilience, perceived organizational support,

and psychological safety were positively associated with employee well-being. The reliability coefficients ranged from .87 to .91, indicating good internal consistency.

Table 2: Multiple Regression Predicting Employee Well-Being

Predictor	B	SEB	β	t	p
Digital Workplace Stress	-0.29	0.05	-.32	-5.80	< .001
Psychological Resilience	0.34	0.06	.33	5.67	< .001
Perceived Organizational Support	0.22	0.06	.24	3.67	< .001
Psychological Safety	0.18	0.06	.18	3.00	.003

Model: $R = .72$, $R^2 = .52$, Adjusted $R^2 = .51$, $F(4, 295) = 79.83$, $p < .001$.

Table 2 presents the regression model was statistically significant and explained approximately 52% of the variance in employee well-being. Digital workplace stress negatively predicted employee well-being, whereas resilience, organizational support, and psychological safety positively predicted well-being.

Table 3: Mediating Effect of Psychological Resilience

Effect	B	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Total effect	-0.51	0.06	-0.63	-0.39
Direct effect	-0.34	0.06	-0.46	-0.22
Indirect effect through resilience	-0.17	0.04	-0.26	-0.10

Note. LLCI = lower limit of 95% confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap = 5,000 samples.

Table 3 presents the indirect effect of digital workplace stress on employee well-being through psychological resilience was statistically significant because the bootstrap confidence interval did not contain zero. The direct effect remained significant after resilience was included, indicating partial mediation.

Table 4: Moderating Effect of Psychological Safety

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Digital Workplace Stress	-0.42	0.06	-.44	-7.00	< .001
Psychological Safety	0.30	0.06	.31	5.00	< .001
Digital Workplace Stress $\times$ Psychological Safety	0.13	0.04	.16	3.25	.001

Table 4 presents the interaction between digital workplace stress and psychological safety was statistically significant. This indicates that psychological safety altered the association between digital workplace stress and employee well-being. The negative association between digital workplace stress and well-being was weaker among employees reporting higher psychological safety.

Table 5: Integrated Model Predicting Employee Well-Being

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	p
Integrated Model	.72	.52	.51	79.83	<.001

Table 5 presents the integrated model accounted for approximately 52% of the variance in employee well-being. The findings indicate that digital workplace stress, psychological resilience, perceived organizational support, and psychological safety collectively contribute to explaining employee well-being.

Discussion

The present study examined digital workplace stress from an integrated psychological and organizational perspective, focusing on its relationship with employee well-being and the potential roles of psychological resilience, perceived organizational support, and psychological safety. The illustrative findings indicate that digital workplace stress is negatively associated with employee well-being. This finding is consistent with contemporary research showing that technostress can adversely affect employee well-being, engagement, and life satisfaction, particularly when employees experience techno-overload and techno-invasion. The finding can also be interpreted through the JD-R model, in which technology-related demands function as job demands that consume employees' cognitive and emotional resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Digital technologies can facilitate productivity, but excessive notifications, information processing, technological complexity, and expectations of continuous connectivity may increase psychological demands. The results therefore support the conceptualization of digital workplace stress as an occupational stressor rather than merely a technological inconvenience. The negative association is also consistent with research involving virtual employees, in which technostress was found to have a significant negative impact on employee well-being.

The findings further suggest that psychological resilience may represent an important mechanism linking digital workplace stress with employee well-being. Employees with greater resilience may possess stronger capacities to adapt to technological change, regulate stress responses, recover after demanding digital work experiences, and maintain psychological functioning. The mediation finding is consistent with COR theory, which proposes that psychological resources can protect individuals against resource depletion associated with persistent stress (Hobfoll, 1989). It is also consistent with psychological capital theory, which conceptualizes resilience as a positive psychological resource that can contribute to adaptive functioning (Luthans et al., 2007). However, resilience should not be interpreted as a justification for increasing technological demands indefinitely. Contemporary evidence indicates that the relationship between technostress and well-being is influenced by multiple individual and contextual factors, and recent research has emphasized the importance of examining personal resources alongside digital demands. Thus, resilience-building interventions may be useful, but they should operate alongside organizational strategies that address excessive digital workload, inadequate technological training, and unrealistic expectations concerning employee availability.

The findings concerning perceived organizational support and psychological safety highlight the importance of organizational context in managing digital workplace stress. Organizational support was positively associated with employee well-being, suggesting that employees may experience better psychological functioning when organizations demonstrate concern for their welfare and provide adequate resources. Psychological safety also demonstrated a positive relationship with well-being and moderated the association between digital workplace stress and well-being. This finding is consistent with the broader JD-R perspective, which identifies social and organizational resources as potentially protective factors against job demands. Recent research provides further support for this perspective: a 2026 study of 316 employees found that colleague support was negatively associated with technostress, while work modality influenced the relationship between support and technostress. Similarly, research on virtual employees has identified digital leadership capability and work-based learning as resources that can buffer the adverse consequences of technostress. These findings suggest that organizations should not approach digital stress solely as an employee-level problem. Digital leadership, technical training, supportive communication, realistic expectations, and psychologically safe environments may all contribute to healthier digital work experiences.

Overall, the findings support an integrated psychological-organizational perspective on digital workplace stress. Digitalization creates both opportunities and demands, and its consequences may depend on how technological demands interact with employees' psychological resources and organizational environments. Recent research similarly indicates that digital work can produce both strain and resource-related processes rather than uniformly negative outcomes. Therefore, organizations should consider interventions at multiple levels, including digital workload management, employee training, opportunities for recovery, autonomy over technology use, supportive leadership, and resilience-building programs. The present framework also has implications for future research because longitudinal and intervention studies are needed to establish temporal relationships and determine whether organizational resources can reduce technology-related psychological strain over time. Cross-cultural research is particularly important because recent evidence has identified limited representation of different cultural and occupational contexts within the technostress literature. Because the proposed study uses a cross-sectional design, causal conclusions should not be drawn from the observed associations. Nevertheless, the framework provides a basis for understanding digital workplace stress as a multidimensional psychological and organizational phenomenon and highlights the importance of creating digitally productive environments that also protect sustainable employee well-being.

References

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Brod, C. (1984). *Technostress: The human cost of the computer revolution*. Addison-Wesley.

- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands–Resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Kotek, M., & Vranjes, I. (2025). When do employees perceive technology as stressful? A meta-analysis of work-related technostress antecedents. *Information & Management*, 62(8), 104203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104203>
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.
- Mansuroğlu, E., & Smith, A. P. (2026). Technostress and employee well-being: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 21, 100941. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2026.100941>
- Marocco, S., Galanti, T., Grossi, E., Santoriello, M., Cortini, M., & Presaghi, F. (2026). Human–technology interaction at work: The moderating role of work modality in the relationship between colleague support and technostress. *Frontiers in Organizational Psychology*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/forgp.2026.1835512>
- Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0165>
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5(1), 25338. <https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338>
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(1), 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109>
- Alkhayyal, S., & Bajaba, S. (2024). Countering technostress in virtual work environments: The role of work-based learning and digital leadership in enhancing employee well-being. *Acta Psychologica*, 248, 104377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104377>
- Zhou, J., Zhang, W., Fan, G., & Yue, X. (2026). Cross-cultural impact of information anxiety on employee mental health in digital workplaces: A comparative study between Chinese and Western contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17, 1775912. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1775912>

- Nielsen, K., Nielsen, M. B., Ogbonnaya, C., Käsälä, M., Saari, E., & Isaksson, K. (2017). Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Work & Stress*, 31(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1304463>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2008). It takes two to tango: Workaholism is working excessively and working compulsively. In R. J. Burke & K. M. Cooper (Eds.), *The long work hours culture: Causes, consequences and choices* (pp. 203–226). Emerald.
- La Torre, G., De Leonardis, V., & Chiappetta, M. (2019). Technostress: How does it affect the productivity and life of an individual? Results of a systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(19), 3516. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16193516>