International Journal of Economic, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration (IJEBAS)

International Journal of Economics, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration (IJEBAS Journal) | ISSN(e): 2808-4713
Volumes 6 No. 1 (2026)

THE IMPACT OF TECHNOSTRESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT ON EMPLOYEE WELL BEING: EXAMINING BURNOUT AS A MEDIATOR

Nasra[1], Irsan Tricahyadinata[2], Saida Zainurossalamia ZA[3]
[1]Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
[3]Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia
Email: irsan.tricahyadinata@feb.unmul.ac.id, saida.zainurossalamia.za@feb.unmul.ac.id

Received	: 15 January 2026	Accepted	: 20 February 2026
Revised	: 31 January 2026	Published	: 28 February 2026

Abstract

This study analyzes the influence of technostress and organizational support on employee well-being, with burnout as a mediating mechanism in public sector digital bureaucracy. Digital transformation in local government performance systems creates technological demands that can drain employees' psychological resources. Based on the integration of JD-R theory and Perceived Organizational Support theory, this quantitative study used an SEM PLS approach on 57 employees. The results show that technostress directly increases burnout and decreases well-being, whereas organizational support effectively suppresses burnout but does not have a significant direct effect on well-being. Burnout decreases well-being but does not significantly mediate all tested relationships. These findings extend the theory by showing that in the context of a control-oriented digital bureaucracy, technological stress can directly decrease well-being without the accumulation of chronic fatigue. The theoretical and policy implications emphasize the importance of adaptive and resource-oriented digital design.

Keywords: Technostress, Organizational Support, Burnout , Employee Well-Being , Digital Bureaucracy

Introduction

The digital transformation of the public sector has transformed the work patterns of government organizations in various countries and generated significant psychological consequences. The digitalization of public services, integration of information systems, and demand for real-time responses have increased employee exposure to technology-based stress, or technostress, defined as psychological tension resulting from a mismatch between technological demands and an individual's capacity to manage them. International studies have shown that technostress is correlated with decreased psychological well-being, increased emotional exhaustion, and an impaired work-life balance (Califf et al., 2020; Molino et al., 2020). In the context of public organizations, which are heavily regulated and accountable, these pressures are often exacerbated by high service expectations and resource limitations. This development emphasizes that employee well-being is no longer an individual issue but rather a structural problem that requires a more comprehensive theoretical explanation based on the job demands-resources theory and conservation of resources theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Hobfoll et al., 2018).

In contemporary literature, employee well-being is understood as a positive psychological state reflecting the vitality, satisfaction, and meaningfulness of work. However, empirical findings on the impact of technostress on well-being are inconsistent. Some studies have reported a significant direct negative effect (Molino et al., 2020), while others have found that contextual support can mitigate this impact, rendering the effect indirect or partial (Spagnoli et al., 2021). This inconsistency indicates that the mediating mechanisms, particularly the role of burnout as a psychological mechanism bridging technological demands and declining well-being, have not been fully explained. Recent literature recognizes that burnout is a chronic response to accumulated work demands and serves as a transmission channel between structural stress and well-being (Sonnentag & Lühring, 2021; Salvagioni et al., 2022). However, models that simultaneously integrate technostress, organizational support, burnout, and employee well-being

in the local public sector context are still limited. Perceived organizational support is a contextual resource rooted in social exchange theory. This support creates the perception that the organization values employees' contributions and cares about their psychological well-being. Recent empirical evidence suggests that organizational support positively impacts employee well-being and reduces the risk of burnout (Kurtessis et al., 2017; Caesens et al., 2020). However, the literature has not fully examined how organizational support interacts with technology-based pressure to impact well-being through the mechanism of emotional exhaustion. This gap becomes significant when public organizations face rapid digitalization without adequate psychological preparedness.

The context of the East Kutai Regency Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Office presents relevant theoretical boundary conditions for this study. This institution operates in a sensitive, case-based social service environment where digital administrative demands intersect with the emotional burden of work. This situation has the potential to exacerbate the accumulation of depleted resources, as described in the conservation of resources theory, while simultaneously testing the effectiveness of organizational support as a buffer against psychological exhaustion. Thus, this context serves not only as an empirical setting but also as an arena for testing the limits of theoretical generalizability in regional public organizations undergoing digital transformation. Based on this mapping, the following research question was formulated: How does technostress affect employee well-being through the mechanism of burnout in public organizations undergoing digital transformation? To what extent can organizational support suppress the process of psychological resource depletion and strengthen employee well-being? Does burnout play a central role in explaining the relationship between technological demands and employee well-being? These questions require theoretical answers regarding causal processes and not simply testing linear associations between variables.

This study offers contributions at three levels. At the theoretical level, this study integrates job demands-resources theory and social exchange theory into a single mediation model that explains the psychological process from technological stress to well-being through employee burnout. This integration expands the literature that has previously separated the analysis of technological demands and organizational support. At the methodological level, this study uses a variance-based structural equation modeling approach to simultaneously test mediation models, providing more precise estimates of direct and indirect relationships than previous studies. At the contextual level, this study enriches the public sector literature by presenting empirical evidence from a local social service organization that is rarely explored in the international discourse on technostress.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

This study begins with the transformation of digital bureaucracy, which has transformed technology from a mere administrative tool into an intensive instrument for controlling and measuring performance. In this context, employees' work experiences are no longer determined solely by conventional task loads but also by the demands of continuous technological adaptation. This study integrates the constructs of technostress, organizational support, burnout, and employee well-being to explain how digital demands and organizational resources shape the dynamics of work well-being. This focus has conceptual relevance because it positions the phenomenon of digitalization as a structural context that influences employees' internal psychological processes.

The main framework of this research is built from the integration of Job Demands and Resources Theory and Perceived Organizational Support Theory, and is expanded through the resource-based view and dynamic capability perspectives. Job Demands and Resources Theory explains that high work demands trigger burnout and health decline, whereas job resources serve as a buffer that maintains employees' psychological balance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Recent literature shows that digitalization creates new forms of digital job demands and can trigger strain if not balanced with adequate resources (Scholze and Hecker, 2024).

From the perspective of Perceived Organizational Support, organizational support fosters the belief that the organization values employees' contributions and cares about their well-being. The principle of reciprocity in social exchange theory explains that perceptions of support influence employees' responses to work pressures, including technology-based pressures (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Support is not only instrumental but also creates a sense of psychological safety that strengthens resilience to work demands. The resource-based perspective expands this argument by positioning employee well-being as a valuable and difficult-to-replicate strategic resource. A decline in well-being translates into the degradation of human capital, impacting the quality of public organization services (Barney, 1991). Dynamic capability emphasizes the need for organizations to reconfigure policies, training, and

support systems to adapt to evolving digital pressures (Teece et al., 1997). The integration of these four perspectives provides conceptual novelty because it explains well-being not merely as a psychological outcome but as a strategic element of public-organizational sustainability.

Technostress as a Digital Job Demand

Technostress is understood as the psychological pressure resulting from the demands of intensive and repetitive technology use. Recent empirical evidence shows that dimensions such as techno-overload and techno-invasion consistently correlate with increased job exhaustion and decreased well-being (Mansuroğlu & Smith, 2026). Within the framework of the JD-R theory, this pressure drains psychological energy and triggers a process of strain that accumulates in the form of burnout. Recent research in the education sector shows that technostress creators increase burnout and decrease job satisfaction, strengthening the argument that technological stress has systemic psychological consequences (Tu et al., 2025). In the context of digital bureaucracies, these stressors are often amplified by rigid and real-time performance monitoring systems.

Hypothesis 1: Technostress has a positive effect on burnout.

In addition to impacting burnout, technostress logically affects well-being by disrupting work autonomy and role balance. A recent systematic review confirmed that technostress is negatively associated with engagement, satisfaction, and psychological well-being in work contexts (Mansuroğlu & Smith, 2026). From a strategic resource perspective, decreased well-being reduces an organization's capacity to maintain service quality.

Hypothesis 2: Technostress negatively affects employee well-being.

Organizational Support as a Protective Resource

Employees' perceived organizational support serves as a job resource that reduces the risk of burnout and enhances well-being. Theoretically, this resource mitigates the negative impact of work demands through the buffering mechanism of the Job Demands-Resources Theory. Support strengthens feelings of appreciation and expands the capacity to adapt to digital changes. Empirical evidence from the past three years has shown that perceived organizational support is negatively correlated with burnout in the healthcare and public service sectors (Zhang et al., 2024; Ren et al., 2024). Support not only reduces burnout but also strengthens the psychological resources that support work resilience.

Hypothesis 3: Organizational support has a negative effect on burnout.

Organizational support also has direct implications for well-being by creating an equitable, supportive, and adaptable work environment to digital demands. The literature on digitalization and work design shows that digital and organizational resources enhance motivation and positive work experiences (Scholze & Hecker, 2024).

Hypothesis 4: Organizational support positively affects employee well-being.

Burnout as a Causal Mechanism

Burnout represents the psychological consequences of resource depletion resulting from chronic work demands. In the Job Demands-Resources Theory, burnout is a strain outcome that occurs when demands exceed adaptive capacity. Empirical evidence suggests that emotional exhaustion and cynicism are negatively associated with well-being and the quality of the work experience (Aleksić et al., 2023).

Hypothesis 5: Burnout negatively affects employee well-being.

The Mediation Role of Burnout

The causal effect of technostress on well-being is thought to operate through this burnout. Technological stress first drains energy and causes exhaustion, which then decreases positive affect and job satisfaction. Recent literature emphasizes the importance of mediating variables in explaining the heterogeneity of technostress's impact on well-being (Mansuroğlu & Smith, 2026).

Hypothesis 6: Burnout mediates the effect of technostress on employee well-being.

A similar mediation pattern applies to the relationship between organizational support and employee well-being. Organizational support reduces burnout, and this reduction enhances well-being. Empirical evidence suggests that the indirect pathway through burnout explains most of the influence of support on psychological outcomes (Ren et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024).

Hypothesis 7: Burnout mediates the influence of organizational support on employee well-being.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design and Theoretical Justification

This study used a quantitative explanatory approach with a cross-sectional survey design to examine the causal relationships between technostress, organizational support, burnout, and employee well-being. This design was chosen because it allows for testing a theory-based structural model that positions technostress as a job demand and organizational support as a job resource within the JD-R Theory framework, and positions burnout as a psychological mechanism that bridges the influence on work well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2023; Schaufeli, 2023). The choice of an explanatory design was based on the need to simultaneously test the mediating mechanisms within a single integrated model. The literature over the past five years confirms that the relationship between digital demands and well-being is not direct but rather operates through emotional exhaustion and psychological resource depletion (Kaltenegger et al., 2024; Gaspar et al., 2024). Thus, a quantitative design based on a structural model provides a theoretical contribution by testing the integration of JDR theory and Perceived Organizational Support theory in the context of public sector digital bureaucracy. The methodological contribution of this study lies in testing a mediation model in local government organizations, which have rarely been the focus of SEM-based empirical studies. This broadens the generalizability of a theory previously tested primarily in the healthcare and private sectors (Ren et al. 2024).

Population, Sampling Techniques, and Sample Size

The study population included all employees of the Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Agency of East Kutai Regency who actively used the e-Performance system. This population selection is theoretically relevant because the organization represents a digital bureaucratic context characterized by high emotional demand and accountability pressure. The sampling technique used was saturated sampling, given the relatively small population size and the fact that all members met the inclusion criteria. This strategy ensured no sampling bias and increased the inferential strength of the model (Hair et al., 2022). The final number of 57 respondents met the minimum criteria for Partial Least Squares-based SEM analysis, which is ten times the number of indicators for the construct with the most indicators or ten times the number of paths to the endogenous construct (Hair et al., 2022; Sarstedt et al., 2022). The justification for using this sample is not only technical but also theoretical, as the research aims to comprehensively capture an organization's internal dynamics. Using the entire population, the resulting model has high contextual validity in explaining technostress in regional bureaucracies.

Measurement Instruments and Adaptation Process

The measurement instrument uses a standardized scale that has been validated. The technostress construct was measured using the Technostress Creators scale developed by Tarafdar et al. and updated in a recent study (Kaltenegger et al., 2024). The organizational support construct was measured using the short version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, revalidated in the study by Ren et al. (2024). The burnout construct was measured using the Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey, conceptually updated by Schaufeli (2023). Employee well-being is measured using a multidimensional scale based on a modern work well-being approach (Gaspar et al., 2024). The adaptation process was conducted through a back-translation procedure and content validity testing by three human resource management experts. This procedure followed the cross-cultural instrument adaptation guidelines recommended by Beaton et al. and reinforced by Hair et al. (2022). The theoretical contribution of this instrument selection is the integration of classical psychological indicators with the context of modern digital demands, resulting in measurements that are more contextual and relevant to technology-based bureaucracies.

Validity and Reliability Test

The measurement model was evaluated using a reflective measurement model approach. Convergent validity was tested using an outer loading value exceeding 0.70 and an Average Variance Extracted value exceeding 0.50 (Hair et al., 2022). Construct reliability was assessed using Composite Reliability and Cronbach's alpha with a threshold of 0.70. Discriminant validity was tested using the Fornell-Larcker and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio criteria, with an HTMT value of less than 0.90 (Sarstedt et al., 2022). This test ensured that each construct had clear conceptual distinctions and that there were no overlapping indicators. This approach not only ensures statistical precision but also

strengthens the theoretical validity of the model because each construct is tested for conceptual and empirical consistency simultaneously.

Structural Model Evaluation

Structural model evaluation was conducted through path coefficient estimation, t-values from bootstrapping 5000 subsamples and bias-corrected confidence intervals. The coefficient of determination (R-squared) was used to assess the predictive power of the endogenous construct, and the effect size (f-squared) was used to measure the relative contribution of each path (Hair et al., 2022). Mediation analysis was conducted using the indirect effects bootstrapping approach recommended by Preacher and Hayes and supported by the recent SEM literature (Sarstedt et al., 2022). The model was also tested using Q-squared values to measure its predictive relevance. The methodological contribution of this section is the simultaneous examination of direct and indirect pathways in the context of digital bureaucracy, thereby enriching the empirical evidence on the psychological mechanisms that bridge technological demands and employee wellbeing.

Data Analysis Procedures and Software

The analysis was conducted using the latest version of SmartPLS because the Partial Least Squares method is more suitable for relatively small sample sizes and complex predictive models (Hair et al., 2022). This approach also excels in non-normal data distribution and mediation models. The analysis process included measurement model evaluation, structural model evaluation, hypothesis testing, and mediation analysis. This strategy ensures that testing is conducted systematically and meets the publication standards of reputable, international journals.

Research Ethics and Bias Control

This study adhered to the principles of informed consent, respondent anonymity, and data confidentiality, in accordance with contemporary social research ethical standards (American Psychological Association, 2023). All respondents were given an explanation of the purpose of the study and their right to withdraw at any time. To control for common method bias, this study used Harman’s single factor test and variance inflation factor procedures, as recommended by Kock (2023). Furthermore, the questionnaire was constructed by separating the independent and dependent constructs to minimize simultaneous perception bias. With strict ethical procedures and bias controls, this study ensured scientific integrity while increasing the credibility of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents' demographic profile

Table 1 displays the composition of the respondents based on gender, age, highest level of education, length of service, and work unit. Demographic patterns show a predominance of female respondents, a larger age distribution in the over-45 age group, and a majority with a bachelor's degree. This composition is relevant to the DP3A context because the nature of the service demands intense emotional and administrative work, making the respondent profile a basis for interpreting variations in perceptions of technological pressure and organizational support.

Table 1. Demographic profile of respondents (N = 57)

Category	Classification	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Man	14	24.6
	Woman	43	75.4
Age	< 25 years	3	5.3
	25–35 years	18	31.6
	36–45 years	14	24.6
	> 45 years	22	38.6
last education	High school or vocational school	6	10.5
	D3	10	17.5
	S1	33	57.9
	S2 or S3	8	14.0
Length of work	< 5 years	7	12.3
	5–10 years	16	28.1
	11–15 years	18	31.6
	> 15 years	16	28.1
Work unit or position	General Administration	20	35.1
	Women's Protection	14	24.6
	Child Protection	15	26.3
	Planning or Monitoring	8	14.0

Evaluation of measurement models

A measurement model evaluation was conducted to ensure the quality of the indicators and constructs before interpreting the causal relationships. The standards used refer to common SEM PLS criteria, namely ideal outer loading above 0.70, adequate construct reliability if composite reliability is above 0.70, adequate convergent validity if the AVE is above 0.50, and discriminant validity evaluated using Fornell-Larcker, with the square root of the AVE greater than the correlation between constructs (Hair et al., 2022; Sarstedt et al., 2022; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Outer loading indicator

All indicators showed high outer loadings, ranging from 0.879–0.948. This indicates that each indicator strongly reflects its construct, so no indicators need to be eliminated.

Table 2. Outer loading indicators

Construct	Indicator	Code	Outer loading
Employee well-being	Job Satisfaction	Y1	0.879
	Work Life Balance	Y2	0.926
	Work Engagement	Y3	0.897
	Work-Related Happiness	Y4	0.909
Burnout	Emotional Exhaustion	M1	0.910
	Depersonalization or Cynicism	M2	0.900
	Reduced Personal Accomplishment	M3	0.927
Organizational support	Fairness	X21	0.919
	Recognition of Contribution	X22	0.890
	Care for Well-Being	X23	0.914
	Training and Development Support	X24	0.925
Technostress	Techno Overload	X11	0.948
	Techno Invasion	X12	0.917
	Techno Complexity	X13	0.889
	Techno Insecurity	X14	0.934
	Techno Uncertainty	X15	0.914

Reliability and convergent validity

The Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.899 to 0.956. The composite reliability rho c ranged from 0.937 to 0.965. The AVE ranged from 0.815 to 0.848. All values exceeded the minimum threshold, indicating high internal consistency and strong convergent validity (Hair et al., 2022; Sarstedt et al., 2022).

Table 3. Reliability and AVE

Construct	Cronbach's alpha	rho a	rho c	AVE
Burnout (M)	0.899	0.901	0.937	0.833
Technostress (X1)	0.956	0.986	0.965	0.848
Organizational support (X2)	0.934	0.997	0.952	0.831
Employee well-being (Y)	0.925	0.939	0.946	0.815

Discriminant validity

Discriminant validity is met because the diagonal value in the Fornell-Larcker matrix, namely the square root of the AVE, is greater than the correlation between constructs in the same row and column. This finding indicates that each construct has clear conceptual boundaries and does not overlap (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2022).

Table 4. Fornell Larcker

	M	X1	X2	Y
M	0.912			
X1	0.309	0.921		
X2	-0.322	-0.125	0.912	
Y	-0.393	-0.357	0.241	0.903

Structural model evaluation

Structural model evaluation was conducted to assess the explanatory power, predictive relevance, and contribution of each path. The indicators used include R-squared, f-square, Q-square, and bootstrapping path coefficients (Hair et al., 2022; Sarstedt et al., 2022).

Coefficient of determination R square

The model explains 17.7 percent of the variation in burnout and 22.9 percent of the variation in employee well-being. In the context of organizational behavior in the public sector, with its complex psychological determinants, these values demonstrate realistic moderate explanatory power, while also indicating that other factors beyond the model contribute to well-being.

Table 5. R square

Endogenous constructs	R square	R square adjusted
Burnout (M)	0.177	0.147
Employee well-being (Y)	0.229	0.185

Effect size f square

The effect size indicates the relative contribution of each predictor to the endogenous constructs. The largest f-square values appear in the paths of organizational support to burnout and technostress to burnout, while organizational support to employee well-being shows a very small effect, consistent with the results of path significance.

Table 6. f square

Track	f square
Burnout → Employee well being	0.081
Technostress → Burnout	0.089
Technostress → Employee well being	0.077
Organizational support → Burnout	0.099
Organizational support → Employee well being	0.017

Predictive relevance of Q square

The Q-square values for burnout and employee well-being were 0.133 and 0.153, respectively, both of which were positive. This indicates that the model has predictive relevance for the endogenous construct, meaning that it not only explains the sample data but also has reasonable predictive ability in similar populations (Hair et al., 2022).

Table 7. Q square

Construct	SSO	SSE	Q square
Burnout (M)	171,000	148,303	0.133
Employee well-being (Y)	228,000	193,092	0.153

Interpretation of the hypothesis

The hypothesis interpretation is presented based on the path coefficients, t-values, and p-values. Paths are declared significant at the 5 percent level.

Table 8. Results of path and mediation tests

Track	Coefficient	t	p	Decision
Burnout → Employee well being	-0.275	2,231	0.026	Significant
Technostress → Burnout	0.273	2,257	0.024	Significant
Technostress → Employee well being	-0.257	1,970	0.049	Significant
Organizational support → Burnout	-0.288	2,628	0.009	Significant
Organizational support → Employee well being	0.121	0.979	0.328	Not significant
Technostress → Burnout → Employee well being	-0.075	1,557	0.120	Mediation is not significant
Organizational support → Burnout → Employee well being	0.079	1,511	0.131	Mediation is not significant

The path coefficient between technostress and burnout was positive and significant. This implies that increased technology-based stress is followed by increased burnout. This pattern is consistent with the Job Demands-Resources logic, where digital demands drain energy and trigger psychological strain (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Scholze & Hecker 2024). The path coefficient of organizational support for burnout was negative and significant. This means that the stronger the organizational support, the lower the burnout. This finding aligns with the concept of Perceived Organizational Support, which states that support strengthens feelings of appreciation and provides resources that buffer the effects of job demands (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Ren et al., 2024).

The path coefficient of technostress on employee well-being was negative and significant. This implies that technological stress reduces work well-being. This finding supports the proposition that intensive digital demands tend to reduce satisfaction, role balance, and positive workplace affect (Scholze & Hecker, 2024). The path coefficient of organizational support for employee well-being was positive but insignificant. This result suggests that organizational support in this context operates more strongly by reducing burnout than by directly increasing well-being. The most theoretically consistent explanation is the role of support as a protective resource that primarily acts on strain, while the formation of well-being requires a combination of other resources such as job autonomy, role clarity, and a more adaptive digital work design (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Scholze & Hecker, 2024).

The path coefficient of burnout on employee well-being was negative and significant. This implies that burnout reduces work well-being. This finding confirms that burnout is a mechanism of work experience degradation that directly impacts the evaluative and affective dimensions of well-being (Schaufeli 2023). The indirect effect of technostress on employee well-being through burnout was not significant. This means that the pathway of decreased well-being due to technostress in this context is more dominant through direct effects than through burnout as a mediator. Substantively, technological stress appears to influence well-being through other, more immediate channels, such as impaired work-life balance or perceived technological invasiveness, before accumulating into a state of burnout. The indirect effect of organizational support on employee well-being through burnout was also insignificant in this study. This suggests that while organizational support effectively reduces burnout, this reduction is not strong enough to indirectly produce measurable improvements in well-being. This pattern indicates the need to expand the model by adding mechanisms more closely related to well-being, such as work engagement or psychological capital, as

frequently demonstrated in research findings over the past three years in the context of public services and healthcare (Ren et al., 2024).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirm that bureaucratic digitalization can produce measurable psychological consequences when technological demands are energy-draining work demands. The relationship pattern found places *technostress* as the primary trigger of the burnout process, while organizational support plays a protective role, particularly in reducing *burnout*, with direct consequences for decreased *employee well-being*. This framework of findings aligns with the research model in this thesis that examines the influence of *technostress* and organizational support on well-being, with *burnout* as a mediating variable in the context of the DP3A of East Kutai Regency. The positive effect *of technostress* on *burnout* reinforces the core proposition of *Job Demands Resources Theory, which states* that increasing work demands activate a process of health decline through psychological energy depletion, ultimately manifesting as emotional exhaustion and work cynicism (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Recent literature on digital job demands indicates that the intensity of technology use, availability demands, and digital work intensification are forms of demands that systematically drive burnout, even in organizations that are not in the technology sector (Scholze & Hecker, 2023, 2024). Thus, the results of this study are not only consistent with the direction of the relationship but also strengthen the argument that digital demands have characteristics equivalent to classic job demands and can be a powerful source *of burnout in the public sector.*

These findings are also consistent with contemporary empirical evidence showing that *technostress creators* increase *burnout* and impair work outcomes in various professions experiencing digital intensification, including education and social services (Tu et al., 2025). Recent literature synthesis emphasizes that dimensions such as *techno-overload* and *techno-invasion* are often the primary drivers of negative effects because they combine additional administrative burdens with the disruption of work-life boundaries (Kumar, 2024). In the context of regional bureaucracies, these pressures tend to be amplified by real-time performance monitoring systems, making the experience *of technostress* more stable and recurring than merely a phase of technology adaptation. The direct negative impact *of technostress* on *employee well-being* suggests that the impact of digitalization does not wait for long-term fatigue to diminish well-being. These findings extend *JD R's reading* of the digital realm by emphasizing that some of the impacts *of technostress* are immediate, occurring through daily work experiences, such as decreased job satisfaction, disrupted role balance, and weakened positive affect at work (Scholze & Hecker, 2024; Kumar, 2024). The research findings not only confirm the theory but also clarify the temporal mechanism by which technological stress can directly diminish well-being, even before it becomes chronic *burnout.*

The negative relationship between organizational support and *burnout* supports *the Perceived Organizational Support theory*, which emphasizes the function of support as a signal that the organization values contributions and cares about well-being. This perspective is rooted in the principle of reciprocity in *social exchange*, such that perceived support strengthens psychological safety and reduces stress responses to job demands (Eisenberger et al., 1986). This finding is consistent with recent empirical evidence that organizational support is associated with reduced *burnout* through increased psychological resources and work engagement among service workers (Ren et al., 2024) and is correlated with lower levels of *burnout in demanding and intensive work environments (Zhang et al., 2024).* However, organizational support did not have a significant direct effect on *employee well-being* in this study's model. This pattern challenges the simplistic assumptions in the literature that often position support as a universal predictor of well-being and encourages a more contingent explanation. One of the most theoretically consistent interpretations is that organizational support in this context operates as a protective resource that primarily buffers strain processes rather than as a motivational resource that directly builds positive work experiences.

The digital *JDR literature* confirms that digital job resources that enhance well-being typically take the form of digital autonomy, process efficiency, and supportive work designs that minimize administrative friction, not just general perceived support (Scholze & Hecker, 2023, 2024). In other words, general organizational support can successfully reduce burnout, but it is insufficient to increase well-being if the design of specific digital job resources is inadequate. The negative impact *of burnout* on *employee well-being* reinforces the conceptualization of *burnout* as a mechanism for the degradation of the quality of work experience, where emotional exhaustion and cynicism disrupt the contribution of positive affect and work engagement. This finding is consistent with the occupational health model, which positions *burnout* as a marker of strain processes and a predictor of decreased well-being, particularly in jobs

with high emotional and administrative demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Empirical findings across contexts also suggest a similar pathway, including jobs experiencing digital stress and disruption, where technological intrusion reduces the quality of work experience and meaning of work (Aleksić et al., 2023). *The* mediation of *technostress* and *employee well-being* by burnout can be interpreted as an indication that the effects *of technostress* on well-being operate through alternative, more proximal pathways, such as work boundary disruption, role conflict, or loss of autonomy. Literature synthesis emphasizes that mediation in *technostress studies* often depends on the type of outcome and the nature of the dominant digital demands; thus, the relationship does not necessarily extend through *burnout* (Kumar, 2024). Contemporary evidence also suggests that some impacts of digitalization are immediate and direct on work experiences, while *burnout* tends to emerge as an accumulative consequence; therefore, mediation may be weakened in contexts featuring administrative and repetitive daily pressures (Scholze & Hecker, 2024).

The mediating role of burnout in the relationship between organizational support and *employee well-being* suggests that reducing burnout does not automatically improve well-being if the factors contributing to well-being are not adequately present. Recent literature suggests that organizational support often enhances positive outcomes when coupled with motivational mechanisms such as *work engagement*, *psychological capital*, or increased job control, suggesting that the indirect pathway is stronger when motivational mediators are included (Ren et al., 2024). In models that exclude these motivational mediators, organizational support may appear effective in reducing strain but less effective in fostering the positive experiences that are central to employee well-being.

This study makes three primary theoretical contributions. First, it validates that *technostress* acts as a significant digital job demand in local public organizations, extending the generalizability *of JDR* from the predominantly private and healthcare sectors to emotionally demanding social service bureaucracies. This finding reinforces the literature emphasizing the dark side of digitalization and the need to specifically model digital job demands (Scholze & Hecker, 2023, 2024). Second, it demonstrates that organizational support is better understood as a protective resource that mitigates strain processes rather than as a direct predictor of well-being across all settings, challenging the simplistic generalizations of *POS theory* and encouraging the testing of the limits of context-based theory and support design. Third, it demonstrates that the mechanism of reduced well-being in digital bureaucracies can operate directly without necessarily leading to *burnout*, broadening the discussion on the causal mechanisms *of technostress* and encouraging a research agenda that includes proximal mediators such as role conflict and digital work control (Kumar, 2024; Scholze & Hecker, 2024).

The context of DP3A and the implementation of a digital performance system based on attendance and daily reporting challenge the limits of theory by demonstrating technological stress, characterized by high control and low flexibility. In this context, *technostress* arises not only from technological complexity but also from policy design that combines technology with sanctions and evaluation, thus reinforcing *techno-invasion* and intensifying administrative work. The literature on digitalization suggests that technological intensity can drain energy resources and decrease engagement when technology is operated as a demand mechanism rather than a resource (Scheuerer et al., 2024). Thus, the context of this research makes it clear that digital governance design has the potential to shift technology from a digital job resource to a digital job demand, and this functional shift constitutes a critical boundary condition for the application of *JDR* in digital bureaucracy.

Managerial and policy implications should focus on improving the design of digital job demands and strengthening specific digital job resources, rather than merely increasing general support. First, organizations need to reduce *techno-overload* by simplifying reporting flows, reducing duplication of input, and creating realistic reporting schedules for field work. This step aligns with the recommendations in the *technostress literature*, which emphasizes interventions to address digital burden and friction as a key strategy to mitigate negative impacts (Kumar, 2024). Second, organizations need to curb *techno-invasion* through work communication boundary policies, set clear response times, and implement task-based exception mechanisms to ensure that digital presence does not negate the reality of service work. Such policy design brings technology closer to a resource function rather than simply a control function.

Third, organizational support must shift from symbolic to measurable operational support, such as concrete task-based training, system guidance, responsive technical support services, and improved reporting interfaces, to reduce cognitive load. The literature on digital job resources emphasizes that effective support increases autonomy, efficiency, and task completion, thus impacting motivation and well-being (Scholze & Hecker, 2023, 2024). Fourth, organizations must strengthen supportive leadership practices that balance accountability and facilitation. Empirical evidence in the public sector suggests that a more supportive leadership style can reduce *technostress*, whereas a style

that emphasizes transactional control tends to increase technostress (Ly & Ly, 2024). Fifth, occupational health policies should be made more proactive by monitoring early indicators *of burnout*, providing counseling channels, and establishing a safe feedback system for reporting digital friction without fear of stigma or administrative consequences. These interventions align with evidence that reducing *burnout* requires a combination of organizational support and strengthening psychological resources, not only procedural adjustments (Ren et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024). Sixth, to significantly improve well-being, organizations need to add motivational components not covered in current models, such as increasing *work engagement* through job enrichment, providing proportionate autonomy, and substantive performance-based recognition, so that well-being improves not only through reduced burnout but also through increased positive work experiences.

CONCLUSIONS

This study confirms that bureaucratic digitalization is not psychologically neutral but shapes the dynamics of employee well-being through the configuration of work demands and resources. Technostress has been shown to act as a digital job demand that increases burnout and directly decreases employee well-being. These findings strengthen the JD-R framework in the context of digitalized work and demonstrate that technological stress in regional public organizations is strong enough to impact well-being without necessarily leading to the accumulation of long-term fatigue. Organizational support has been shown to be effective in suppressing burnout, but it does not have a significant direct effect on well-being. This pattern suggests that support in the context of digital bureaucracy functions more as a protective resource that mitigates strain than as a motivational resource that automatically enhances positive work experience. These results extend the reading of the theory of Perceived Organizational Support by demonstrating that the effects of support are contingent on the design of digital demands and the nature of the implemented work system.

The role of burnout as a negative predictor of well-being confirms that emotional exhaustion and cynicism remain the primary mechanisms for the degradation of the quality of work experience. However, the failure of full mediation in some pathways suggests that the impact of digitalization does not always follow the classic stress pathway. Technological stress in the context of social service bureaucracies can directly reduce well-being through the disruption of work boundaries and administrative intensification, thus testing the theoretical limits of the assumption that all demands must first undergo a process of exhaustion. The scientific contributions of this study are threefold. First, this study extends the generalization of JD-R theory to the context of regional bureaucracies with intensive digital performance evaluation systems, thus adding evidence that digital job demands are relevant in the public sector of social services. Second, this study refines the position of the Perceived Organizational Support theory by showing that organizational support is a more dominant strain-reducing mechanism than a direct driver of well-being in conditions of high digital demand. Third, this study demonstrates that employee well-being in public organizations must be understood as a strategic resource that is sensitive to digital governance design, thus opening up space for integration between organizational behavior perspectives and resource-based strategic approaches. Conceptually, this study confirms that the success of digital transformation in the public sector depends not only on system efficiency but also on the organization's ability to balance technological demands with adaptive resource design. Employee well-being is not merely a byproduct but a key element in determining the sustainability of an organization's service capacity.

Research Limitations and Agenda

This study has several limitations that need to be read reflectively within the framework of theoretical development. First, the cross-sectional research design limits the ability to explore the temporal dynamics between technostress, burnout, and employee well-being. The JD-R model conceptually assumes a process that develops over time, where the accumulation of demands produces strain that then affects well-being. With a single-measurement design, the identified relationships represent structural associations at a single point in organizational conditions, thus failing to capture the long-term processes of adaptation, habituation, or escalation of digital stress itself. This limitation highlights the need for a longitudinal design capable of dynamically testing the stability and change of causal pathways. Second, the research model positions burnout as the sole mediating mechanism, while recent literature suggests that the impact of technostress may operate through other proximal mediators, such as digital role conflict, disruption of work-life boundaries, perceived loss of control, or decreased work engagement. The absence of alternative mediators limits the model's ability to explain the direct pathway between technostress and well-being. This indicates that causal mechanisms in the context of digital bureaucracy may be more complex than the classic strain

framework and therefore need to be tested using a multiple mediation model approach that integrates affective and motivational variables simultaneously. Third, the research context, which focuses on a single regional public organization, limits cross-institutional and cross-sector generalizations. The nature of the e-performance system, hierarchical structure, and work culture of social services at DP3A have the potential to create unique configurations of demand and resources. This context tests the limits of the applicability of Job Demands, Resources, and Perceived Organizational Support theories; however, it simultaneously raises questions about the extent to which similar relationship patterns would emerge in public organizations with greater digital flexibility or in the private sector with varying levels of work autonomy.

Fourth, the model fails to integrate organizational-level variables, such as digital governance design, leadership style, and institutional technological capacity. The dynamic capability perspective emphasizes that an organization's ability to reconfigure processes and policies significantly determines whether technology functions as a demand or resource. By not explicitly including organizational-level factors, the model remains at the individual level and thus fails to fully capture cross-level interactions that could enrich the theoretical understanding. Further research is needed to expand the causal mechanisms more comprehensively. First, longitudinal or panel studies are needed to test whether technostress triggers burnout gradually or whether an adaptation phase mitigates its effects. This approach allows for testing a process model that more closely aligns with JDR's theoretical assumptions while distinguishing between the short- and long-term effects of digitalization.

Second, the development of multiple mediation models is necessary by incorporating constructs such as work engagement, psychological capital, or digital-life work conflict as alternative or parallel mediators. Integrating these motivational and affective mediators would broaden theoretical contributions by explaining how digital stress not only drains energy but also impacts the positive psychological resources that shape well-being. This approach could also address the insignificant mediation results of this study. Third, future research could examine the moderating role of contextual variables, such as leadership style, digital autonomy level, and organizational culture. By including moderating variables, research could identify theoretical boundary conditions, such as whether organizational support is more effective in organizations with flexible work designs than in those with strict digital controls. This approach enhances the integration of Perceived Organizational Support theory and dynamic capability by examining how an organization's adaptive capability influences the strength of causal pathways.

Fourth, cross-sector and cross-regional extensions are essential for testing the generalizability of the model across different digitalization configurations. Comparative studies between public and private organizations or between regions with different levels of digital maturity can identify whether technostress consistently functions as a dominant demand or transforms into a resource in specific contexts. With this approach, the theory is not only strengthened through replication but also tested under boundary conditions, expanding its external validity and conceptual depth. Fifth, the integration of multi-level perspectives and mixed-method quantitative-qualitative analysis can enrich our understanding of how employees interpret technology as a pressure or opportunity. An in-depth qualitative approach allows for the exploration of narratives of digital experiences not captured by quantitative indicators, thus expanding theoretical contributions beyond mere model testing to context-based conceptual developments. Overall, the limitations of this study are not merely technical but also serve as a starting point for broadening theoretical horizons regarding the relationship between digitalization, job demands, organizational resources, and employee well-being. The proposed research agenda aims to further integrate organizational behavior perspectives and capability-based strategic approaches, moving theory development from confirming relationships to a richer understanding of boundary conditions and cross-level mechanisms during the era of digital transformation.

REFERENCES

Aleksić, D., Černe, M., Dysvik, A., & Škerlavaj, M. (2023). Understanding meaningful work in the context of technostress, Covid 19, frustration and corporate social responsibility. Human Relations. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221139776

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

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. Journal of

Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2023). Job demands resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 28(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000329

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Luypaert, G. (2020). The impact of work engagement and workaholism on well-being: The role of perceived organizational support. European Management Journal, 38(3), 452–461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.10.001

Califf, C.B., Sarker, S., Sarker, S., & Fitzgerald, C. (2020). The bright and dark sides of technostress: A mixed methods study. MIS Quarterly, 44(2), 809–844. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2020/14818

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

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Gaspar, M., et al. (2024). Burnout and employee well-being in contemporary workplaces. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 33(2), 145–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2024.2301123

Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS SEM) (3rd ed.). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483394985

Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.). Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483394985

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 103–128. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640

Kaltenegger, H., Becker, L., & Maier, C. (2024). Technostress and burnout: A longitudinal examination of digital work demands. Information Systems Journal, 34(1), 88–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12489

Kock, N. (2023). Harman single factor test in PLS SEM: A cautionary note. International Journal of e Collaboration, 19(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJeC.2023040101

Kumar, P. S. (2024). Technostress: A comprehensive literature review on dimensions, impacts, and management strategies. Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 16, 100475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2024.100475

Ly, B., & Ly, R. (2024). Technostress in times of change: Unveiling the impact of leadership styles in Cambodia's public organizations in the wake of COVID 19. Cogent Business & Management, 11(1), 2331645. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2331645

Mansuroğlu, E., & Smith, A. P. (2026). Technostress and employee well-being: A systematic review. Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 21, 100941. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2026.100941

Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M.L., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C.G. (2020). Well being costs of technology use during Covid 19 remote working. Sustainability, 12(15), 5911. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155911

Ren, Y., Li, G., Pu, D., He, L., Huang, X., Lu, Q., Du, J., & Huang, H. (2024). The relationship between perceived organizational support and burnout in newly graduated nurses from southwest China: The chain mediating roles of psychological capital and work engagement. BMC Nursing, 23, 719. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02386-x

Salvagioni, DAJ, Melanda, FN, Mesas, AE, González, AD, Gabani, FL, & Andrade, SM (2022). Physical, psychological and occupational consequences of job burnout: A systematic review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(3), 1117. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031117

Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2022). Partial least squares structural equation modeling. In Handbook of market research. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05542-8_15-2

Schaufeli, W.B. (2023). Burnout in 2023: A renewed perspective. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 25–52. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-050521

Scheuerer, J., Mueller, E.F., & Thaler, J. (2024). The dark side of digital external networking: A job demands resources

perspective. European Management Journal. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2024.11.004

Scholze, A., & Hecker, A. (2023). Digital job demands and resources: Digitization in the context of the Job Demands Resources model. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20(16), 6581. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20166581

Scholze, A., & Hecker, A. (2024). The job demands resources model as a theoretical lens for the bright and dark side of digitization. Computers in Human Behavior, 155, 108177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108177

Sonnentag, S., & Lühring, J. K. (2021). Job stressors and burnout. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8, 139–165. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091352

Spagnoli, P., Molino, M., Molinaro, D., Giancaspro, M.L., Manuti, A., & Ghislieri, C. (2021). Workaholism and technostress during Covid 19 emergency: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion. Sustainability, 13(14), 7901. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147901

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7 <509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z

Tu, L., Liu, H., Zhang, Y., & Li, X. (2025). Technostress, burnout, and job satisfaction: An empirical study of STEM teachers' well-being and performance. Behavioral Sciences, 15(7), 992. https://doi.org/10.3390/behavsci15070992

Zhang, H., Hoe, V. C. W., & Wong, L. P. (2024). Burnout and perceived organizational support among nurses. Heliyon, 10, e39371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39371

Zhang, H., Hoe, V. C. W., & Wong, L. P. (2024). The association between burnout, perceived organizational support, and perceived professional benefits among nurses in China. Heliyon, 10(20), e39371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39371

Zheng, X., et al. (2024). Organizational support and professional quality of life: Evidence from healthcare workers. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 80(2), 410–423. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15567