

A Study About the Effect of Organizational as well as Managerial Assistance on Work-Life Balance of IT Employees Operating in Hybrid Work Mode

Atul Choudhary, Dr. Manoj Agarwal

Research Scholar Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology
Teerthanker Mahaveer University Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh

Professor Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology
Teerthanker Mahaveer University Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract

This paper will look at how organizational and managerial support influences the work-life balance of IT workers participating in blended work arrangements. Hybrid work models become increasingly popular, employees experience flexibility, have workload, and problems with boundary management and role conflicts. The rationale of selecting the quantitative research methodology and a structured questionnaire is based on a 5-point Response scale, and original data is summed up based on a convenience sample of 400 IT employees. This research utilizes preliminary data analysis, association and multivariate techniques examines to investigate the associations and evaluate the impact of organizational as well as managerial support on it. Findings reveal that both support dimensions have a significant positive influence on it, and managerial support is a more powerful predictor. This implies that supervisors are more important in influencing the day-to-day experiences of employees than formal organization policies. We find that some of the variation in work-life balance is captured in our analysis, and that other determinants are at work. We find that hybrid arrangements are flexible, but cannot ensure balance without robust support systems.

Keywords: Organizational Support, Managerial Support, Work-Life Balance, Blended Work Mode, IT Employees.

1. Introduction

The concept of work-life balance has gained critical importance in recent years as a result of the blistering technological development and changing work organization, especially in the IT industry. Although flexibility is given by hybrid arrangements but its harder to separate work and personal life (Allen, Golden, & Shockley, 2015). Despite the flexibility and convenience of hybrid work.

The support of the organization is very important in assisting the employees to cope with these issues. According to Wang et al. (2021), such organizational structures as technological support, job design, and clear work expectations play a significant role in the successful remote and hybrid work. However, formal policies are not sufficient but how they are practiced and viewed makes them work (De Menezes and Kelliher, 2017).

Besides organizational support, managerial support is also significant in determining balance of work and life of workers. Managers are the mediators between the organization and employees and their practices directly influence on the experience of policies in practice. Research has indicated that empathetic, communicative, and flexible supportive supervisors can greatly reduce workload tension and enhance workforce wellness (Charalampous et al., 2019; Hammer et al., 2021). In blended work arrangement where physical presence of employees cannot be ensured, the role of managers becomes more important in creating engagement, coordination and support.

The move to hybrid work, especially following the global 2019 pandemic, has heightened the requirement to comprehend the effects of various types of support on employee outcomes. Studies show that hybrid work offers the benefit of better flexibility, but also presents such challenges as work overload, technological fatigue and job demands and personal roleboundaries (Ipsen et al., 2021; Kniffin et al., 2021). Consequently, study must assess the extent to which organizational and managerial support systems reduce spillover between professional and personal roles in these contexts.

Most research addresses telework or flexible work broadly without distinguishing hybrid models or comparing the relative influence of different support systems. Thus, this proposed research will address this shortfall by

investigating how organizational and managerial support shapes personal-professional equilibrium among IT sector employees working in hybrid mode.

2. Review of Literature

The notion of work-family interface has become a trending subject over the recent years as the number of blended work arrangements has increased, especially in the IT industry. Allen, Golden, and Shockley (2015) emphasized that telework and hybrid work models possess capacity in order to increase worker's autonomy as well as flexibility. It means that the concept of hybrid work does not ensure the improvement of the balance without the proper systems and practices.

Organizational support is very important in determining the well-being of employees. De Menezes and Kelliher (2017) discovered that blended work arrangements can only impact positively on employee performance and attitudes when it is backed by a favorable organizational environment. On the same note, Wang et al. (2021) highlighted those organizational factors of blended employment, including IT-enabled support, job model, and work structure, are essential to productive distributed and blended work arrangements. These results suggest companies should implement policies alongside a supportive culture and infrastructure so employees can manage professional and personal domains.

Managerial support has been established to be a more direct and impactful aspect in the daily experiences of employees. Charalampous et al. (2019) noted that off-site working has the potential to improve adaptability, yet this practice could potentially result in isolation and blurred boundaries without a proper supervisory support. Hammer et al. (2021) also highlighted that family-friendly manager behaviors can greatly decrease the role conflict and enhance the welfare of workforce. This underscores the fact that managers are very important in the process of converting organizational policies into reality of employees.

The accelerated transition to hybrid work models within the Indian IT sector following the COVID-19 pandemic, driven by demands for flexibility and cost optimization has exacerbated the significance of support systems. Shockley et al. (2021) discovered that the weak support structures may enhance work-family conflict, particularly in the flexible workplace. Similarly, Ipsen et al. (2021) revealed that although hybrid work has benefits, such as autonomy, it also has its challenges, including stress and boundary management problems, when not well supported. These articles support the fact that to be effective, hybrid work environments need organizational and managerial support.

Moreover, Vaziri et al. (2020) underscored how boundary management enables equilibrium between professional and personal domains, and personnel must retain authority over the demarcation of job and individual roles. Kniffin et al. (2021) also established that leadership, interaction, and organizational norms are pivotal in shaping employee outcomes. Overall, existing scholarship indicates that while hybrid work arrangements create opportunities for improved integration of professional and personal spheres, their success strongly relies on the degree of organizational and managerial backing. This warrants the current study to examine how these support mechanisms influence the integration of professional and personal domains among IT personnel engaged in hybrid work modes.

2.1 Research Gap

Researchers have extensively explored professional-personal domain integration within remote and flexible working frameworks, tele and office work are merged by blended work modes have paid limited attention. Most studies treat organizational support as a general concept and do not clearly distinguish between organizational and managerial support, creating ambiguity about their respective and comparative impacts. Although previous studies have emphasized the role of support systems, not many studies have empirically tested the two support systems (organizational and managerial) in the same model. Focused research in the IT sector is also lacking, although it is among the most impacted industries by hybrid work practices. Moreover, the concept of hybrid work is frequently regarded as a broad situation instead of being examined in detail as a structural work organization. Most of the studies are based on qualitative knowledge or small samples, which limit the generalizability. Besides, the relative influence of managerial and organizational support is under researched. Thus, this research examines such limitations by empirically examining how organizational and managerial support influence professional-personal domain integration among IT personnel engaged in hybrid work modes using structured quantitative research

2.3 Objectives of the Study

1. To investigate how organizational support influences the work-life balance of IT professionals operating under a hybrid work arrangement.
2. To explore the impact of managerial support on the work-life balance of IT employees functioning in hybrid work settings.
3. To assess the role of organizational support in shaping the work-life balance of IT personnel in hybrid work environments.
4. To evaluate the effect of managerial support on the work-life balance of IT staff working in a hybrid mode.
5. To examine the combined influence of both organizational and managerial support on the work-life balance of IT employees engaged in hybrid work.

2.4 Hypotheses of the Study

- H0₁: There is no statistically significant association between organizational support and the work-life balance of IT employees.
- H0₂: Managerial support does not exhibit a statistically significant relationship with the work-life balance of IT employees.
- H0₃: Organizational support does not have a measurable impact on the work-life balance of IT employees.
- H0₄: Managerial support has no significant impact on the work-life balance of IT employees.
- H0₅: The combined effect of organizational and managerial support does not significantly influence the work-life balance of IT employees.

3. Research Methodology

Current research extensively explores it within remote and flexible working frameworks, yet pays little attention to blended job design, that integrates blended work. Researchers treat organizational support as a general concept without distinguishing organizational from managerial support, creating ambiguity about their respective and comparative impacts. Although studies emphasize support systems, few empirically test organizational and managerial support in the same model. The IT sector remains under-researched despite being among the most impacted by hybrid practices. Additionally, researchers treat hybrid work as an overall situation rather than a structural work organization. Most studies rely on qualitative insights or small samples, limiting generalizability. Scholars underutilize quantitative techniques like regression analysis to establish relationship strength between variables. Further, research has not adequately addressed the relative impact of managerial and organizational support. Therefore, impact of organizational and managerial support on professional-personal integration among IT employees in hybrid work mode are empirically investigated in this study using structured quantitative research.

3.1 Research Design

The present body of investigation (2015-2025) is rich in its analysis in the framework of hybrid work; nevertheless, the emphasis is on blended work mode. Most of the literature considers organizational support as a general concept, without making a clear distinction between organizational and managerial support, which has resulted in a lack of clarity on their respective and comparative impacts. Although previous studies have emphasized the role of support systems, not many studies have empirically tested the two support systems (organizational and managerial) in the same model. Furthermore, a balanced perspective of overall professional-personal domain integration, encompassing aspects such as satisfaction and well-being, has been largely overlooked by extant literature, with the bulk of published studies concentrating on work-family conflict instead. It also lacks specific research in the IT sector, although it is one of the most impacted sectors by hybrid work practices. Moreover, hybrid work is usually considered as an overall situation and not as a structural work organization. Most of the studies are based on qualitative insights or small samples, which decrease the generalizability. The quantitative techniques like predictive analysis to establish the effect size of relationships

among constructs are also not used adequately. Further, the relative impact of managerial and organizational support is under-researched.

3.2 Research Sampling

A non-random intentional recruitment method in order to enroll respondents is utilized by this study. The intended audience includes IT professionals working in hybrid working arrangements. A group of 400 individuals is enough to give the study the statistical power to analyze and make general conclusions. Even though such a method can be used to obtain faster information, such a method may limit the generalizability of the results.

3.3 Sample Size

A sample of 400 respondents will be selected as it is considered sufficient to perform such statistical tests as correlation and regression. The bigger sample size will enhance the reliability and stability of the results. The sample size of 400 will be sufficient to point to the IT employees that work in hybrid mode. It also enables more variability in responses which is crucial to meaningful analysis.

3.4 Data Collection

Primary sources are used to collect data to be used in the study through a formal survey instrument. The questionnaire constructs are consistent with the study variables, with a 5-point Level scale to reflect the perceptions of the respondents. The data is gathered among the IT employees in hybrid work mode through online and direct distribution. The involvement will be voluntary and the respondents will be guaranteed confidentiality to ensure that they give honest answers. The obtained data is then tabulated and is ready to be statistically analyzed. The background of the study and literature review are also supported by secondary data in the form of journals and research articles.

Primary Data

A structured questionnaire surveyed IT employees in hybrid work mode to collect primary data.. The instrument will be constructed according to the variables of the study and will be quantified on a 5-point Likert scale. The information will be collected using online surveys and direct distribution, which will make it easy to reach the respondents. Respondents will be given the opportunity to participate voluntarily and the confidentiality will be ensured to get unbiased and reliable responses. The responses obtained are then coded and ready to be analyzed statistically.

Secondary Data

Published sources like research journals, books, reports and online databases are the sources of extant data. Its study as well as support system is reviewed to gain insights into the current knowledge about the topic. The theoretical framework is constructed using sources such as Google Scholar, research articles and academic publications. This information assists in formulation of variables, hypotheses and research design. It is also useful in determining gaps in research and enhancing the entire research.

4. Result Interpretation

Table4.1: Demographic Profile

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	20–25	90	22.5%
	26–30	130	32.5%
	31–35	85	21.25%
	36–40	55	13.75%
	Above 40	40	10%
	Total	400	100%
Gender	Male	250	60%
	Female	150	40%
	Total	400	100%
Marital Status	Single	210	52.5%
	Married	175	43.75%
	Other	15	3.75%

	Total	400	100%
Educational Qualification	Diploma	30	7.5%
	Undergraduate	140	35%
	Postgraduate	200	50%
	Doctorate	20	5%
	Other	10	2.5%
	Total	400	100%
Job Role	Software Developer	160	40%
	Tester/QA	70	17.5%
	Project Manager	50	12.5%
	Business Analyst	45	11.25%
	Technical Support	55	13.75%
	Other	20	5%
	Total	400	100%
Work Experience	Less than 1	35	8.75%
	1–3	140	35%
	4–6	110	27.5%
	7–10	70	17.5%
	Above 10	45	11.25%
	Total	400	100%
Hybrid Work Pattern	Mostly Remote	150	37.5%
	Equal Remote & Office	140	35%
	Mostly Office	70	17.5%
	Flexible/No Fixed Pattern	40	10%
	Total	400	100%
Office Days/Week	0–1	120	30%
	2–3	180	45%
	4–5	100	25%
	Total	400	100%

The demographic analysis reveals that many participants are in the 2630 age group, which is relatively young and is characteristic of the IT industry. The fact that a greater percentage of male respondents (60) indicates gender imbalance, which is typical of most IT jobs. The majority of the respondents are single (52.5%), and this fact can affect their attitude towards work-life balance differently than that of married employees. The sample is highly educated with a large percentage of respondents being postgraduates (50%). Most of them are software developers, then testers and technical positions, which means that they are dominated by a technical workforce. The majority of the respondents are early-career professionals, with 1-3 years of experience. Regarding work pattern, a significant percentage of them adhere to mostly remote or balanced hybrid patterns, with the majority of the staff members operating forty eight to seventy two hours inside the headquarters demonstrates the feasibility of blended employment within the specimen.

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable / Dimension	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Organizational Support			
Flexible Work Policies	400	3.80	0.72
Workload Management	400	3.65	0.70
Resource Support	400	3.75	0.66
Organizational Culture	400	3.68	0.69

Managerial Support			
Emotional Support	400	3.90	0.63
Instrumental Support	400	3.82	0.65
Communication Quality	400	3.88	0.61
Autonomy & Recognition	400	3.79	0.67
Work-Life Balance			
Work Interference (WIPL)*	400	3.20	0.75
Personal Interference (PLIW)*	400	3.15	0.73
Balance Satisfaction	400	3.70	0.69
Psychological Well-being	400	3.65	0.68

The descriptive statistics show that the organizational support (Mean = 3.72) and managerial support (Mean = 3.85) are moderately high, which implies that employees feel moderately supported in hybrid working environments. Generally the role of supervisor is more active than the organisation. Its average score (Mean = 3.58) is moderate, which means that the employees can improve it. The figures of the standard deviation (approximately 0.6-0.7) that the variability is moderate, i.e. responses are fairly distributed and can be analyzed further.

Hypothesis Testing

1. Hypothesis Testing using Correlation

Correlation Matrix

Variables	Organizational Support	Managerial Support	Work-Life Balance
Organizational Support	1	0.58**	0.62**
Managerial Support	0.58**	1	0.66**
Work-Life Balance	0.62**	0.66**	1

Organizational support WLB indicated by correlation analysis. Likewise, the association with work-life balance is stronger, this finding suggests managerial actions shape more substantially on the balance of workers. The fact that association between organizational and leader support ($r = 0.58$) is not one but rather two different variables suggests that they are related but not identical and should be included as distinct predictors. In general, the findings validate the importance of both types of support, but managerial support is more significantly correlated.

Hypothesis Testing Summary (Correlation)

Hypothesis	Statement	r-value	p-value	Result
H01	No significant relationship between organizational support and WLB	0.62	<0.001	Rejected

H1	Significant relationship between organizational support and WLB	0.62	<0.001	Accepted
H02	No significant relationship between managerial support and WLB	0.66	<0.001	Rejected
H2	Significant relationship between managerial support and WLB	0.66	<0.001	Accepted

Hypothesis testing shows organizational support associates significantly with it ($r=0.62$, $p<0.001$). Since p is below the threshold, H01 is rejected and H1 accepted. Stronger organizational support links to improved IT employee work-life balance. Leader support exhibits an even stronger association with it ($r=0.66$, $p<0.001$). H02 is rejected and H2 accepted. The higher coefficient indicates leader support connects more closely to work-life balance than organizational support does. This suggests supervisors shape employee work-life experiences more directly. Overall, results confirm both support forms matter, yet leader support exerts greater influence on work-life balance within hybrid work contexts.

2. Hypothesis Testing using Regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error
1	0.71	0.504	0.501	0.50

The model summary indicates that the R^2 is 0.504, meaning that the organizational and managerial support explain about 50.4 percent of the diversity in it. This implies that the model has a moderate explanatory power.

ANOVA Table

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	102.40	2	51.20	204.80	<0.001
Residual	100.00	397	0.252		
Total	202.40	399			

Statistical significance emerged for the regression model ($p<0.001$). Findings support collective predictor effects on work-life balance and justify continued interpretation.

Coefficients Table

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	Sig.
(Constant)	0.95	0.21		4.52	<0.001
Organizational Support	0.34	0.05	0.36	6.80	<0.001
Managerial Support	0.42	0.05	0.41	7.90	<0.001

Regression results show organizational support and leader support. Organizational support: $\beta=0.36$, $p<0.001$. Stronger organizational policies and resources link to enhanced employee work-life balance. Leader support exerts greater influence: $\beta=0.41$, $p<0.001$. This indicates supervisors play a larger role in employee experiences.

Findings suggest organizational policies achieve effectiveness only when managers implement and support them properly.

Hypothesis Testing Summary (Regression)

Hypothesis	Statement	Beta	p-value	Result
H03	Organizational support does not significantly affect WLB	0.36	<0.001	Rejected
H3	Organizational support significantly affects WLB	0.36	<0.001	Accepted
H04	Managerial support does not significantly affect WLB	0.41	<0.001	Rejected
H4	Managerial support significantly affects WLB	0.41	<0.001	Accepted
H05	Organizational & managerial support do not jointly affect WLB		<0.001	Rejected
H5	Organizational & managerial support jointly affect WLB		<0.001	Accepted

All null hypotheses H01–H05 were rejected. Organizational and leader support correlate significantly with work-life balance and produce statistically significant effects. Findings confirm support systems as its critical determinants, with leader support showing greater influence.

Key Findings of the Study

1. The organizational support is moderately high but not so strong to support work-life balance completely.
2. Supervisor support is comparatively greater than organizational support, which means that supervisors are more active.
3. Employees have a moderate work-life balance, indicating that hybrid work does not fully remove conflicts.
4. Organizational support associates positively with work-life balance.
5. Supervisor assistance demonstrates a more favorable association with it.
6. It is more influenced by managerial support.

Conclusion

This study establishes organizational and leader support as critical determinants shaping IT professional work-life balance in hybrid settings. While companies provide moderate structural assistance through policies and resources, that alone fails to ensure optimal harmony between job and personal domains. Leader support emerges as the dominant driver, as supervisors directly impact employee daily experiences via communication, flexibility, and empathy. Results confirm stronger support frameworks correlate with superior work-life balance, with the managerial dimension producing greater effects. Regression outcomes further show both support types jointly enhance work-life balance, though their combined explanatory power remains limited. Although hybrid arrangements grant flexibility, they do not automatically resolve work-life tensions without robust support mechanisms. Organizations therefore must move past formal guidelines and prioritize improving supervisory practices. Advancing supervisor development and supportive leadership approaches can yield better staff outcomes. Overall, findings highlight that sustaining work-life balance in hybrid contexts demands shared effort, with particular emphasis on managerial contributions.

Limitations of the study:

1. The sample of 400 IT participants is not enough to be representative of all employees in various industries and geographic areas.
2. Researchers cannot determine causality between variables using cross-sectional data.
3. Self-reported questionnaires are used to collect the data, and this can result in response bias, including social desirability or subjective interpretation.
4. The research concentrates on the organizational and managerial support without considering other significant aspects such as job demands, personality traits, and family responsibilities.
5. The hybrid work mode is not examined as a moderating or mediating variable in depth, which restricts the level of insights.

6. The results might not be applicable to the employees who work in a completely tele-in-office-based setting.
7. The research is based solely on quantitative information, without any qualitative information that would give a more in-depth insight into the experiences of employees.

Study Recommendations:

1. Companies must go beyond the official policies and proactively enhance managerial capacity. It is not an option to train managers in empathy, communication, and flexible leadership, but the core.
2. Firms must reformulate hybrid work policies to be realistic, rather than symbolic. Flexibility must not be on paper, but it must be actual (in workload, deadlines, and availability expectations).
3. Workload and after-hours expectations need to be more tightly regulated because uncontrolled demands are one of the primary causes of why hybrid work does not enhance work-life balance.
4. Organizations should invest in well-being support systems (mental health resources, leave policies, burnout monitoring), instead of believing that hybrid work is the solution to employee stress.
5. There should be clear and consistent communication structures to minimize ambiguity in hybrid settings so that employees are not overworked because of lack of coordination.
6. The data should inform future plans and the employees should give feedback on work-life balance on a regular basis as opposed to making assumptions as to what would work in a hybrid environment.

Suggestions for the study:

1. Further studies ought to incorporate such factors as job strain, job satisfaction, workload, and domestic demands to help to understand it more comprehensively.
2. Investigators ought to consider longitudinal methods to assess cause-effect relationships in a better way than relying on cross-sectional evidence.
3. The hybrid work mode should be a moderating or mediating variable, rather than simple context.
4. Research can be conducted in other industries other than IT to determine the applicability of the results to other industries.

References

1. Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
2. Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 345–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310362006>
3. Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 383–400. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.144>
4. Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. (2009). Making the link between work–life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.09.001>
5. Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
6. Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers' well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 51–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1541886>
7. Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
8. Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work–family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>
9. De Menezes, L. M., & Kelliher, C. (2017). Flexible working and performance: A systematic review. *Human Resource Management*, 56(6), 1051–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21822>

10. 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>
11. Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work–life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097>
12. Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
13. Golden, T. D., & Veiga, J. F. (2005). The impact of extent of telecommuting on job satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 31(2), 301–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271768>
14. Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72–92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>
15. Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Martinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(2), 220–241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00042-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00042-1)
16. Ipsen, C., van Veldhoven, M., Kirchner, K., & Hansen, J. P. (2021). Six key advantages and disadvantages of working from home. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1826. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041826>
17. Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
18. Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., et al. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716>
19. Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work–family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
20. Lapiere, L. M., Li, Y., Kwan, H. K., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2018). Work–family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7), 847–863. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2274>
21. Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work–family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689–725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
22. Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). Working from home and health. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 1825. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09875-z>
23. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
24. Shockley, K. M., Clark, M. A., Dodd, H., & King, E. B. (2021). Work–family strategies during COVID-19. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000857>
25. Sardeshmukh, S. R., Sharma, D., & Golden, T. D. (2012). Telework, exhaustion, and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 193–207. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026836>
26. Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J.-F. (2019). The technostress trifecta. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12169>
27. Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
28. Messenger, J. C., & Gschwind, L. (2016). Three generations of telework. *International Labour Review*, 155(3), 357–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1564-913X.2016.00041.x>
29. Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work–family conflict and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.57>