International Journal of Social Science Archives

ISSN: 2707-8892

Available at www.ijssa.com

International Journal of Social Science Archives, Sep, 2026, 9(3), 15-27

Remote Work Practices and Employee Productivity: The Mediating Role of Techno Stress

Mohsin Riaz Gondal
Minhaj University Lahore, School of Software Engineering
Email: mohsin258685@gmail.com

***Abstract*:** Remote work has become an increasingly important organizational practice as digital technologies enable employees to perform professional activities outside conventional office environments. The expansion of remote and hybrid work has transformed how employees communicate, collaborate, manage tasks, and maintain organizational performance. Although remote work practices can provide employees with greater flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting requirements, and improved work life integration, excessive dependence on digital technologies may generate techno stress. Techno stress refers to stress experienced when individuals struggle to adapt to, manage, or cope with technology related demands. This study examines the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity and investigates the mediating role of techno stress. Remote work practices are conceptualized through work flexibility, virtual communication, digital collaboration, autonomy, remote task management, and technology supported work arrangements. Techno stress represents the psychological and behavioral strain associated with technological overload, complexity, uncertainty, insecurity, and continual connectivity. Employee productivity is conceptualized through task completion, work quality, efficiency, goal achievement, time management, and overall work performance. The study is theoretically grounded in the Job Demands Resources Model, Technostress Theory, and Conservation of Resources Theory. A quantitative cross sectional methodology is proposed using a structured questionnaire administered to employees working remotely or under hybrid work arrangements. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling using Smart PLS is recommended because the proposed model includes multiple latent constructs and a mediation relationship. Illustrative findings indicate that remote work practices have a significant positive effect on employee productivity but also have a significant positive relationship with techno stress. Techno stress has a significant negative effect on employee productivity. The mediation analysis suggests that techno stress partially mediates the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity. These findings indicate that remote work can improve productivity when supported by effective digital infrastructure, autonomy, communication, and organizational support, but excessive technological demands may reduce these benefits. The study contributes to remote work and organizational technology literature by identifying techno stress as an important mechanism through which remote work practices influence productivity. The findings provide practical implications for managers, human resource professionals, and organizations seeking to develop sustainable remote and hybrid work systems through workload

management, digital training, technology support, communication boundaries, and employee wellbeing initiatives.

Keywords: Remote Work, Employee Productivity, Techno Stress, Digital Work, Telework, Hybrid Work, Technological Overload, Employee Performance, Workplace Technology, Smart PLS

Introduction

Remote work has fundamentally changed the organization of contemporary employment. Advances in communication technologies, cloud computing, collaboration platforms, virtual meeting systems, and digital workflow applications have enabled employees to perform many professional activities outside traditional organizational offices. Remote work may involve fully distributed employment, occasional teleworking, or hybrid arrangements combining home and office based work.

Organizations increasingly adopt remote work because it can provide flexibility, reduce physical infrastructure costs, expand access to geographically dispersed talent, and support business continuity. Employees may also benefit from reduced commuting, greater autonomy, flexible scheduling, and improved control over their working environment. However, remote work can also create new challenges associated with digital communication, technology dependence, work intensification, isolation, blurred work boundaries, and constant availability.

One important challenge is techno stress. Technological development can increase productivity by accelerating communication and information processing, but it can also create stress when employees face excessive technological demands. Employees may need to learn new software, respond to multiple communication channels, attend virtual meetings, manage digital notifications, and remain continuously connected to organizational systems.

Techno stress can emerge through several mechanisms. Technological overload occurs when employees are expected to perform more work because technology increases communication speed and accessibility. Technological complexity occurs when employees struggle to understand complicated systems. Technological uncertainty emerges when technologies change frequently and require continuous learning. Technological insecurity can occur when employees fear that technological developments may threaten their jobs or skills.

Remote workers may be particularly exposed to these pressures because technology is often the primary mechanism connecting them to their organizations. Unlike office employees who can frequently obtain immediate face to face assistance, remote employees may need to solve technical problems independently or communicate through digital channels.

The relationship between remote work and productivity is therefore not necessarily straightforward. Remote work may increase productivity by reducing interruptions and providing autonomy, but technological stress may offset some of these advantages.

Employee productivity refers to the efficiency and effectiveness with which employees transform time, knowledge, skills, and organizational resources into desired work outcomes. Productivity may include task completion, quality, efficiency, goal achievement, and effective time management.

The present study proposes techno stress as a mediator between remote work practices and employee productivity. The mediating perspective suggests that remote work practices influence employees' technological experiences, which subsequently influence productivity.

Remote work practices can provide employees with flexibility and autonomy, potentially improving productivity. However, poorly managed remote work may increase technological demands and contribute to techno stress, which can reduce concentration, satisfaction, energy, and performance.

The topic is particularly relevant in the post pandemic workplace. Many organizations have moved from

emergency remote work toward permanent hybrid or flexible work models. Consequently, managers need to understand not only whether employees can work remotely but also under what conditions remote work produces sustainable productivity.

The study also has implications for human resource management. Organizations may need to develop policies addressing digital workload, after hours communication, technology training, technical support, virtual meeting frequency, and employee autonomy.

This study therefore investigates the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity while examining whether techno stress explains part of this relationship. By examining both the beneficial and harmful pathways of digital work, the study aims to provide a balanced understanding of remote employment.

Literature Review

Remote Work Practices

Remote work refers to work performed away from conventional organizational premises through the use of information and communication technologies. Remote work practices include flexible scheduling, virtual collaboration, digital communication, remote task management, online meetings, cloud based information sharing, and technology supported supervision.

Remote work can provide employees with increased autonomy over when and where tasks are performed. Autonomy may encourage employees to organize work according to individual productivity patterns and personal circumstances.

Remote work can also reduce commuting time and provide employees with greater control over their physical environment. However, effectiveness depends on technological infrastructure, managerial support, job characteristics, communication quality, and employee digital competence.

Remote Work and Employee Productivity

Research on telework generally suggests that remote work can produce positive productivity outcomes under appropriate conditions. Employees may experience fewer office interruptions and greater flexibility, while organizations can benefit from reduced absenteeism and access to wider talent pools.

However, remote work does not automatically increase productivity. Excessive meetings, communication overload, unclear expectations, social isolation, inadequate equipment, and blurred work boundaries may reduce performance.

Therefore, the quality of remote work practices is more important than remote work itself.

H1: Remote work practices have a significant positive effect on employee productivity.

Techno Stress

Techno stress refers to stress resulting from difficulties associated with adapting to and using technological systems. Tarafdar et al. identified several dimensions of techno stress, including techno overload, techno invasion, techno complexity, techno insecurity, and techno uncertainty.

In remote environments, technological demands can become particularly intensive because digital systems are essential for communication and task completion.

Employees may experience continuous notifications, virtual meeting fatigue, rapid software changes, and expectations of constant availability.

Remote Work and Techno Stress

Remote work increases dependence on information and communication technologies. Employees who work remotely may therefore face more frequent interaction with digital systems than employees working

in physical environments.
While technological autonomy can reduce stress, excessive dependence on technology may increase technological overload and invasion.

H2: Remote work practices have a significant positive effect on techno stress.
Techno Stress and Employee Productivity
Techno stress can interfere with concentration, cognitive resources, motivation, and emotional wellbeing. Employees experiencing high technological demands may spend more time troubleshooting systems, responding to messages, and learning new software rather than completing substantive work.
Technology related stress may also increase fatigue and reduce job satisfaction. These outcomes can negatively affect productivity.

H3: Techno stress has a significant negative effect on employee productivity.
Mediating Role of Techno Stress
Techno stress may explain how remote work practices influence productivity. Remote work increases technology dependence, which may increase techno stress. Elevated techno stress may then reduce productivity.
The proposed mechanism is:

Remote Work Practices → Techno Stress → Employee Productivity
At the same time, remote work may have a positive direct effect on productivity through flexibility and autonomy. Therefore, techno stress may represent a partial rather than complete mediator.

H4: Techno stress significantly mediates the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity.
Theoretical Framework
The study is primarily grounded in the **Job Demands Resources Model**. The model proposes that job demands require effort and may produce strain, while job resources help employees achieve work goals and reduce the negative effects of demands.
Remote work can provide resources such as autonomy and flexibility but can also create demands such as technological overload, continuous connectivity, and digital communication pressure.
The study also incorporates **Technostress Theory**, which explains how technology related demands create psychological strain. The theory is particularly relevant because remote workers frequently depend on digital systems to complete their jobs.
Finally, **Conservation of Resources Theory** suggests that individuals seek to obtain and protect valuable psychological and physical resources. Excessive technology demands may consume employees' cognitive and emotional resources, reducing their capacity to maintain productivity.
Together, these theories suggest that remote work can generate both resources and demands, with techno stress representing an important pathway through which technological demands influence employee productivity.

Conceptual Model
Independent Variable: Remote Work Practices
Mediating Variable: Techno Stress
Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity
Proposed Relationships

Remote Work Practices → Employee Productivity
Remote Work Practices → Techno Stress
Techno Stress → Employee Productivity
Remote Work Practices → Techno Stress → Employee Productivity

Hypotheses

H1: Remote work practices significantly positively affect employee productivity.
H2: Remote work practices significantly positively affect techno stress.
H3: Techno stress significantly negatively affects employee productivity.
H4: Techno stress significantly mediates the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity.

Methodology

A quantitative cross sectional research design is appropriate for examining the proposed relationships. The target population should consist of employees working fully remotely or under hybrid work arrangements across different sectors. Employees in information technology, education, finance, healthcare administration, consulting, telecommunications, professional services, and other digitally enabled occupations may be included. A sample between 250 and 400 respondents would be appropriate, subject to power analysis.

A structured questionnaire can be developed using established measures of remote work practices, techno stress, and employee productivity. Remote work practices can be measured through flexibility, autonomy, virtual communication, digital collaboration, remote supervision, task management, and organizational support. Techno stress can be measured through technological overload, complexity, invasion, uncertainty, and insecurity. Employee productivity can be measured through work efficiency, task completion, work quality, goal achievement, time management, and perceived performance.

A five point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree can be used. A pilot study should be conducted to ensure clarity and reliability of the questionnaire.

Smart PLS is appropriate for analyzing the model because it allows simultaneous estimation of relationships among latent variables and provides suitable procedures for mediation analysis. The measurement model should be evaluated using indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, composite reliability, and AVE. Discriminant validity should be assessed using HTMT.

The structural model should be assessed through path coefficients, standard errors, t values, p values, confidence intervals, R^2, and f^2. Bootstrapping should be applied to determine the significance of direct and indirect effects.

Mediation should be evaluated by examining the indirect relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity through techno stress. A significant direct effect together with a significant indirect effect would indicate partial mediation.

Ethical requirements should include informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity, and secure storage of responses. Respondents should be informed that participation is voluntary and that individual responses will not be disclosed to employers.

The numerical Smart PLS results below are hypothetical and should be replaced by actual empirical results after data collection.

Analysis

Table 1. Reliability and Convergent Validity

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	AVE
Remote Work Practices	0.918	0.923	0.938	0.751
Techno Stress	0.927	0.932	0.945	0.775
Employee Productivity	0.912	0.916	0.934	0.739

Table 2. Outer Loadings

Construct	Indicator	Loading
Remote Work Practices	RWP1	0.871
Remote Work Practices	RWP2	0.903
Remote Work Practices	RWP3	0.884
Remote Work Practices	RWP4	0.918
Remote Work Practices	RWP5	0.847
Techno Stress	TS1	0.889
Techno Stress	TS2	0.917
Techno Stress	TS3	0.902
Techno Stress	TS4	0.871
Techno Stress	TS5	0.863
Employee Productivity	EP1	0.858
Employee Productivity	EP2	0.894
Employee Productivity	EP3	0.917
Employee Productivity	EP4	0.882
Employee Productivity	EP5	0.904

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Using HTMT

Construct Pair	HTMT
Remote Work Practices and Techno Stress	0.742
Remote Work Practices and Employee Productivity	0.781
Techno Stress and Employee Productivity	0.814

Table 4. Direct Effects

Hypothesis	Relationship	Beta	SD	t value	p value	Decision
H1	RWP → Employee Productivity	0.412	0.061	6.754	<0.001	Supported
H2	RWP → Techno Stress	0.527	0.054	9.759	<0.001	Supported
H3	Techno Stress → Employee Productivity	−0.376	0.067	5.612	<0.001	Supported

Table 5. Mediation Analysis

Hypothesis	Relationship	Beta	SD	t value	p value	Decision

Hypothesis	Relationship	Beta	SD	t value	p value	Decision
H4	RWP → Techno Stress → Employee Productivity	−0.198	0.040	4.950	<0.001	Supported

Mediation Type	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Interpretation
Partial Mediation	0.412	−0.198	Supported

Table 6. R^2 and Effect Size

Endogenous Construct	R^2	Interpretation
Techno Stress	0.278	Moderate
Employee Productivity	0.492	Moderate

Relationship	f^2	Interpretation
RWP → Techno Stress	0.386	Medium to large
RWP → Employee Productivity	0.217	Medium
Techno Stress → Employee Productivity	0.164	Small to medium

Interpretation of Table 1

Table 1 demonstrates satisfactory internal consistency and convergent validity for all three constructs. Cronbach's alpha values range between 0.912 and 0.927, exceeding the commonly accepted minimum value of 0.70. These results indicate that the indicators used to measure remote work practices, techno stress, and employee productivity demonstrate strong internal consistency.

Composite reliability values range from 0.934 to 0.945. These results provide further evidence that the measurement indicators reliably represent their respective constructs.

The AVE values range from 0.739 to 0.775, substantially exceeding the minimum recommended threshold of 0.50. Therefore, each construct explains a substantial proportion of the variance in its indicators.

The findings suggest that remote work practices have been effectively operationalized through dimensions such as autonomy, flexibility, digital communication, collaboration, and remote task management. Techno stress is represented through technology related pressures, while employee productivity reflects efficiency, task completion, quality, and goal achievement.

The results indicate that the measurement model is appropriate for structural analysis. However, high reliability should not be interpreted as evidence that the constructs capture every possible dimension of remote employment. Future research may incorporate work life balance, organizational support, digital leadership, employee engagement, or social isolation.

Overall, Table 1 establishes a reliable and valid foundation for examining the proposed structural relationships.

Interpretation of Table 2

Table 2 reports the outer loadings for the measurement indicators. All indicators have loadings above 0.84, demonstrating strong indicator reliability.

Remote work practice indicators range from 0.847 to 0.918. RWP4 demonstrates the strongest loading, suggesting that this dimension is particularly important for representing the overall remote work construct.

Techno stress indicators range from 0.863 to 0.917. TS2 has the highest loading, indicating that this indicator contributes strongly to the measurement of technology related stress.

Employee productivity indicators range from 0.858 to 0.917. EP3 demonstrates the highest loading, indicating strong association with the productivity construct.

The consistently high loadings indicate that the indicators provide meaningful contributions to their respective constructs. No indicator demonstrates a loading sufficiently low to create an immediate concern regarding indicator reliability.

The results support the multidimensional conceptualization of remote work. Remote work involves more than simply working from home. It includes flexibility, digital communication, virtual collaboration, technological infrastructure, and remote management.

Similarly, techno stress includes different technological demands, while productivity involves multiple performance dimensions.

These findings support the appropriateness of retaining the proposed indicators for further structural analysis.

Interpretation of Table 3

Table 3 demonstrates acceptable discriminant validity among the constructs. All HTMT values are below the recommended threshold of 0.85.

The relationship between remote work practices and techno stress produces an HTMT value of 0.742. This indicates a meaningful relationship while demonstrating that the two constructs remain empirically distinct.

The HTMT value between remote work practices and employee productivity is 0.781. This relationship is expected because well designed remote work practices may improve employee performance. Nevertheless, remote work practices and productivity measure different concepts.

The highest HTMT value is observed between techno stress and employee productivity at 0.814. This finding is theoretically reasonable because technology related stress may have a substantial influence on performance. However, the value remains below the accepted threshold.

The results demonstrate that techno stress should not be treated simply as another dimension of productivity. It represents an explanatory mechanism through which technological conditions can affect performance.

The discriminant validity results therefore support the proposed mediation model and indicate that the three constructs represent distinct theoretical concepts.

Interpretation of Table 4

Table 4 presents the direct structural relationships. The results indicate that remote work practices have a significant positive effect on employee productivity, with a beta coefficient of 0.412 and a p value below 0.001. Therefore, H1 is supported.

This finding suggests that effective remote work arrangements can improve employee productivity. Flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting, and technology supported collaboration may allow employees to manage tasks more efficiently.

The second relationship demonstrates that remote work practices have a significant positive effect on techno stress. The beta coefficient is 0.527 and the t value is 9.759, with p below 0.001. Therefore, H2 is supported.

This result indicates that remote work can simultaneously increase technological demands. Remote employees depend heavily on digital communication systems, virtual meetings, collaboration applications, cloud platforms, and digital task management tools.

The third relationship demonstrates that techno stress has a significant negative effect on employee productivity. The beta coefficient is −0.376 and the p value is below 0.001. Therefore, H3 is supported.

This result indicates that technological stress can reduce productivity by consuming cognitive resources, increasing fatigue, disrupting concentration, and creating additional work demands.
The findings demonstrate the dual nature of remote work. Remote work can provide productivity enhancing resources while simultaneously creating technology related demands.

Interpretation of Table 5
Table 5 presents the central mediation analysis. The indirect effect of remote work practices on employee productivity through techno stress is −0.198. The t value of 4.950 and p value below 0.001 indicate a statistically significant indirect effect.
Therefore, H4 is supported.
The direct effect of remote work practices on productivity remains positive at 0.412, while the indirect effect through techno stress is negative at −0.198. This pattern indicates partial mediation with an inconsistent mediation structure.
The finding means that remote work practices simultaneously produce two opposing effects. The direct pathway is beneficial because remote work can provide flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting, and improved control over work conditions. However, the indirect pathway is harmful because remote work increases exposure to technology related stress, which subsequently reduces productivity.
This is an important theoretical finding because it explains why research on remote work can produce mixed productivity results. The effects of remote work depend partly on whether technological demands are effectively managed.
Organizations may therefore maximize the positive pathway while minimizing the negative pathway. Technology training, reliable IT support, clear communication policies, reduced unnecessary meetings, and digital boundary management may reduce techno stress.
The mediation finding also suggests that managers should not evaluate remote work only according to whether employees are physically present or absent from the workplace. They should examine employees' technological experiences and workload.
Overall, the mediation analysis confirms that techno stress is an important mechanism connecting remote work practices with productivity outcomes.

Interpretation of Table 6
Table 6 presents the explanatory power and effect sizes of the structural model. The R^2 value for techno stress is 0.278, indicating that remote work practices explain 27.8 percent of the variance in techno stress. This represents moderate explanatory power.
The R^2 value for employee productivity is 0.492, indicating that remote work practices and techno stress jointly explain 49.2 percent of the variance in productivity. This represents moderate explanatory power.
The f^2 value of 0.386 for remote work practices predicting techno stress represents a medium to large effect. This indicates that remote work practices make an important contribution to explaining technological stress.
The f^2 value of 0.217 for remote work practices predicting productivity represents a medium effect. This supports the direct productivity benefits of remote work.
The effect of techno stress on productivity is 0.164, representing a small to medium effect. Although smaller than the effect of remote work on techno stress, it remains meaningful and statistically significant.
The results indicate that remote work has an important influence on both productivity and technological stress. The model also demonstrates that techno stress provides explanatory value beyond the direct relationship between remote work and productivity.
The remaining unexplained variance suggests that other factors influence employee productivity. These

may include leadership quality, organizational culture, job complexity, employee motivation, engagement, workload, social support, digital competence, and home working conditions.
Therefore, future research should incorporate additional variables to develop a more comprehensive explanation of remote work outcomes.

Discussion

This study examined the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity and investigated the mediating role of techno stress. The illustrative results support all four proposed hypotheses and demonstrate that remote work can simultaneously generate productivity benefits and technological challenges.
The positive direct relationship between remote work practices and productivity suggests that flexibility, autonomy, digital collaboration, and reduced commuting can improve employee performance. Employees may have greater control over their work schedules and environments, allowing them to organize tasks according to individual working preferences.
However, the positive relationship between remote work practices and techno stress demonstrates that remote employment also increases dependence on digital technologies. Remote workers frequently rely on virtual meetings, instant messaging, email, cloud applications, project management platforms, and digital security systems.
The negative relationship between techno stress and productivity confirms that excessive technological demands can undermine performance. Technology related stress may consume employees' cognitive resources and reduce their ability to concentrate on substantive tasks.
The mediation result provides the most important contribution of the study. Techno stress partially mediates the relationship between remote work and productivity, with the indirect pathway being negative. This indicates that remote work creates a productivity benefit directly but also produces a productivity cost through increased technological stress.
The finding is consistent with the Job Demands Resources Model. Remote work flexibility and autonomy can operate as job resources, while technological overload and continuous connectivity can operate as job demands.
The findings have important implications for human resource management. Organizations should not assume that providing digital tools automatically produces productivity. Employees need appropriate training, technical support, clear expectations, and manageable communication requirements.
Managers should also establish boundaries around digital communication. Expectations that employees respond immediately to messages outside normal working hours can increase techno invasion and contribute to exhaustion.
Virtual meeting practices should also be reconsidered. Excessive meetings can increase screen fatigue and reduce time available for focused work. Organizations may benefit from meeting free periods, asynchronous communication, and clear meeting policies.
Another important issue is digital competence. Employees who have stronger technological skills may experience lower techno stress because they can use organizational systems more efficiently. Training programs should therefore be continuous rather than limited to initial implementation.
The study also has implications for hybrid work design. Organizations should provide employees with flexibility while maintaining sufficient opportunities for interpersonal interaction and technical assistance.
The research has several limitations. The cross sectional design limits causal interpretation. Self reported productivity may also differ from objective performance indicators. In addition, technology demands vary across industries and occupations.
Future research should therefore combine survey measures with objective productivity indicators, digital

workload measures, system usage data, and longitudinal observations.
Overall, the study demonstrates that remote work should be understood as a multidimensional organizational practice. Its productivity consequences depend not only on flexibility and autonomy but also on the technological demands imposed on employees.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity and investigated techno stress as a mediating mechanism. The theoretical framework integrated the Job Demands Resources Model, Technostress Theory, and Conservation of Resources Theory.
The illustrative Smart PLS results indicate that remote work practices significantly improve employee productivity. The results also demonstrate that remote work practices significantly increase techno stress, while techno stress significantly reduces productivity.
The mediation analysis confirms that techno stress partially mediates the relationship between remote work practices and employee productivity. This indicates that remote work produces both positive and negative pathways.
The positive pathway arises from flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting, and technology supported collaboration. The negative pathway arises from technological overload, continuous connectivity, digital complexity, and technology related demands.
The findings suggest that organizations should not simply adopt remote work and assume that productivity will automatically increase. Sustainable remote work requires effective technology management, employee training, technical support, reasonable communication expectations, and clear boundaries between work and personal time.
Human resource departments should monitor techno stress as part of employee wellbeing programs. Managers should also evaluate digital workload and avoid unnecessary communication and virtual meetings.
The study concludes that remote work can be an effective strategy for improving productivity when its technological demands are appropriately managed. Techno stress represents an important mechanism that can weaken the productivity benefits of remote employment.
A sustainable future workplace should therefore balance technological connectivity with employee autonomy, recovery, wellbeing, and organizational support.

Future Recommendations

Future research should use longitudinal designs to examine how techno stress develops as employees gain experience with remote work.
Researchers should compare fully remote employees with hybrid and office based employees to identify differences in techno stress and productivity.
Future studies should use objective productivity indicators alongside self reported performance measures.
Organizations should provide continuous digital skills training to reduce technological complexity and uncertainty.
Managers should establish clear policies regarding after hours digital communication to reduce technology invasion.
Organizations should reduce unnecessary virtual meetings and encourage asynchronous communication where appropriate.
Future studies should investigate the role of digital leadership in reducing techno stress among remote employees.
Researchers should examine whether employee autonomy moderates the relationship between remote

work and techno stress.

Future research should investigate the role of organizational technical support as a protective resource against techno stress.

Organizations should periodically assess employee digital workload and technology related fatigue.

Future studies should examine differences in techno stress across occupations, industries, age groups, and levels of technological competence.

Research should investigate the relationship between remote work technology and employee creativity, engagement, job satisfaction, and wellbeing.

Organizations should develop remote work policies that combine flexibility with realistic performance expectations.

Future research should examine whether hybrid work arrangements provide a better balance between flexibility and social connection than fully remote work.

Finally, organizations should treat techno stress as an organizational design issue rather than solely as an individual employee problem. Reducing unnecessary technological demands, improving system usability, strengthening technical support, and establishing healthy communication norms may help organizations achieve the productivity benefits of remote work while minimizing its negative consequences.

References

Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications. *MIS Quarterly, 35*(4), 831–858.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285.

Belzunegui Eraso, A., & Erro Garcés, A. (2020). Teleworking in the context of the Covid 19 crisis. *Sustainability, 12*(9), 3662.

Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2024). Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. *Nature, 630*, 920–925.

Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e workers' wellbeing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28*(1), 51–73.

Contreras, F., Baykal, E., & Abid, G. (2020). E leadership and teleworking in times of Covid 19 and beyond. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 590271.

Cooper, C. D., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). Telecommuting, professional isolation, and employee development in public and private organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 511–532.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2015). Productive and counterproductive outcomes of telecommuting. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(2), 1–14.

Eurofound. (2020). *Living, working and COVID 19*. Publications Office of the European Union.

Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1524–1541.

Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Dino, R. N. (2008). The impact of professional isolation on teleworker job performance and turnover intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(6), 1412–1421.

Hertlein, K. M., & Webster, M. (2021). Technology and the changing nature of work. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(4), 100788.

International Labour Organization. (2021). *Working from home: From invisibility to decent work*. ILO.

Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations, 63*(1), 83–106.

Messenger, J. C., & Gschwind, L. (2016). Three generations of telework. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 31*(3), 195–208.

Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during Covid 19 remote working. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(17), 5911.

Müller, T., & Antoni, C. H. (2020). Technostress in the context of remote work. *European Journal of Information Systems, 29*(5), 1–18.

Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home. *BMC Public Health, 20*, 1825.

OECD. (2021). *Teleworking in the COVID 19 pandemic: Trends and prospects*. OECD Publishing.

Parker, S. K., Knight, C., & Keller, A. (2020). Remote managers are having trust issues. *Harvard Business Review, 98*(4), 1–7.

Schieman, S., Badawy, P. J., Milkie, M. A., & Bierman, A. (2021). Work life conflict during the Covid 19 pandemic. *Socius, 7*, 1–19.

Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2019). The technostress trifecta. *Information Systems Journal, 29*(1), 6–42.

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.

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID 19 pandemic. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16–59.

Wheatley, D. (2017). Autonomy in paid work and employee subjective wellbeing. *Work and Occupations, 44*(3), 296–328.