

Technostress, Psychological Capital, and Burnout Among IT Professionals: A Moderated-Mediation Model

Mr. M. Nandha Kumar¹, Ms. Yuva Sree²

¹MSc Applied Psychology, ²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology

^{1,2}Rathinam College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore

Abstract

The rapid assimilation of digital infrastructure within corporate ecosystems has markedly escalated occupational strain among Information Technology (IT) practitioners, a condition academically conceptualised as technostress (Tarafdar et al., 2007). Although existing scholarship robustly links technostress to occupational burnout, there remains a paucity of empirical inquiry into the psychological reservoirs that may attenuate these deleterious impacts in high-velocity work environments (Ayyagari et al., 2011). Addressing this lacuna, the current investigation scrutinizes the buffering mechanisms by exploring the mediating function of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) within the technostress-burnout nexus (Luthans et al., 2007). Furthermore, anchored in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) paradigm, this study interrogates whether perceived job demands serve as a moderator in this trajectory (Demerouti et al., 2001). The empirical data were derived from a cohort of IT professionals ($N = 150$) employing validated psychometric instruments, specifically the Technostress Creators Scale, the PCQ-12, the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, and the Job Demands Scale (Author, 2024). The findings offer a refined analytical framework to aid organisational entities in architecting resilience-centric interventions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Keywords: Technostress, Burnout, Psychological Capital, Job Demands, JD-R Model, IT Professionals.

1. Introduction

The architecture of the modern workplace has undergone a radical transformation, propelled by the relentless velocity of digital evolution (Tarafdar et al., 2007). At the nucleus of this paradigm shift stand Information Technology (IT) professionals, who are compelled to incessantly adapt to emerging software ecosystems, hardware configurations, and digitized workflows (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). While such technological proliferation enhances operational efficacy, it concurrently engenders a distinct variant of psychological pressure termed "technostress" (Brod, 1984). This phenomenon describes the maladaptive psychological response experienced by individuals struggling to cope with rapidly fluctuating technological requirements (Brod, 1984). Contemporary evidence suggests that elevated technostress is endemic within the IT workforce, precipitating significant psychological distress (Srivastava et al., 2015). The correlation between technostress and detrimental occupational outcomes is well-documented in organizational psychology (Ayyagari et al., 2011).

Specifically, chronic exposure to technostress is identified as a potent precursor to burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Burnout is defined as a psychological syndrome emerging from prolonged responsiveness to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job (Maslach et al., 2001). In the IT sector, the mandate for perpetual connectivity and technical proficiency fosters a climate ripe for exhaustion and cynicism (Tarafdar et al., 2010). Despite the established link between technostress and burnout, minimal scholarly attention has been directed toward protective factors that might disrupt this association (Author, 2024).

This scholarly void warrants investigation, as organizations necessitate strategies to conserve human capital (Luthans et al., 2007). Psychological Capital (PsyCap)—an aggregate of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism—has surfaced as a vital personal resource (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Theoretical perspectives suggest that individuals endowed with robust PsyCap are better equipped to navigate workplace stressors (Avey et al., 2011). Yet, sparse research within the Indian context has empirically tested PsyCap's mediating role in the technostress-burnout dynamic (Author, 2024). Elucidating this mechanism is crucial for designing resilience-oriented organizational interventions (Luthans et al., 2007). Moreover, technostress does not operate in a vacuum; it is contingent upon the broader occupational milieu (Johns, 2006). Per the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, the impact of stressors is exacerbated by elevated job demands (Demerouti et al., 2001). Consequently, it is imperative to ascertain if this relationship fluctuates based on perceived job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). To address these gaps, this study proposes a moderated-mediation framework (Hayes, 2017).

2. Literature Review

Technostress: The Digital Stressor

Technostress is a multifaceted construct encapsulating the deleterious impacts of technology on the workforce (Tarafdar et al., 2007). It comprises five core dimensions: techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity, and techno-uncertainty (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). Techno-overload manifests when technological inputs necessitate faster and more efficient work, increasing cognitive burden (Tarafdar et al., 2010). Techno-invasion refers to the permeation of work boundaries into personal domains, fostering an "always-connected" lifestyle (Gaudioso et al., 2017). Techno-complexity arises from feelings of incompetence regarding the mastery of new systems (Srivastava et al., 2015). Techno-insecurity involves the fear of job redundancy due to automation or peer competence (Tarafdar et al., 2007). Finally, techno-uncertainty stems from the unpredictability of constant system upgrades (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). Collectively, these dimensions deplete employee cognitive resources (Hobfoll, 1989).

Burnout in IT Professionals

Burnout is widely recognized as a severe occupational hazard in the IT domain (Srivastava et al., 2015). It consists of three facets: exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Exhaustion, the central component, represents the depletion of emotional and physical energy (Kristensen et al., 2005). Cynicism entails a detached, negative attitude toward work duties (Maslach et al., 2001). Professional inefficacy relates to diminished feelings of competence and achievement (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Research consistently indicates that IT professionals report higher burnout rates than other sectors

due to intensive cognitive demands (Author, 2024). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory is frequently utilized to gauge this construct (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Prior empirical studies establish a strong positive correlation between technostress creators and burnout (Srivastava et al., 2015). When facing techno-overload, employees exert compensatory effort to maintain performance, leading to exhaustion (Tarafdar et al., 2010). Techno-invasion prevents psychological detachment, which is vital for recovery (Sonnetag & Fritz, 2015). Without recovery, physiological activation from stress accumulates, resulting in chronic burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Thus, it is hypothesized that technostress positively predicts burnout (H1) (Author, 2024).

Psychological Capital (PsyCap) as a Mediator

Psychological Capital is defined as a positive psychological state of development (Luthans et al., 2007). It represents a resource comprising four components: hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism (HERO) (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Hope involves goal-directed perseverance and pathway generation (Snyder et al., 1991). Efficacy denotes confidence in exerting effort to succeed at challenging tasks (Bandura, 1997). Resilience is the capacity to rebound from adversity (Masten, 2001). Optimism involves positive attributions regarding success (Seligman, 1998).

According to Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, individuals strive to retain and protect resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Technostress threatens these resources, consuming time and energy (Tarafdar et al., 2010). PsyCap functions as a personal resource that buffers this loss (Avey et al., 2011). HighPsyCap employees view technological challenges as opportunities rather than threats (Luthans et al., 2007). Resilience aids recovery from system failures, while efficacy provides confidence to master tools (Bandura, 1997). Consequently, PsyCap can mitigate the adverse impact of technostress (Avey et al., 2011). Therefore, it is hypothesized that Psychological Capital mediates the technostress-burnout relationship (H2) (Author, 2024).

Job Demands as a Moderator

Job demands encompass the physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of a job requiring sustained effort (Demerouti et al., 2001). In IT, these include workload, time pressure, and emotional demands (Karasek, 1979). Per the JD-R framework, excessive demands impair well-being by exhausting resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Under high job demands, the effort required to cope with technostress intensifies (Srivastava et al., 2015).

When demands are high, employee resources are rapidly depleted (Bakker et al., 2014), amplifying the effect of technostress on burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001). Conversely, low demands allow employees to manage technological changes more effectively (Karasek, 1979). This interaction is central to the JDR model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Thus, it is hypothesized that job demands moderate the effect of technostress on burnout (H3)

3. Methodology

Research Design

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional design to evaluate the proposed hypotheses (Creswell, 2014). Cross-sectional designs allow for the assessment of variables at a single time point, providing a snapshot of technostress and burnout levels (Bryman, 2016). The approach is deductive, testing hypotheses derived from the JD-R model and COR theory (Creswell, 2014). An online survey method was selected for its cost-effectiveness and ability to reach a dispersed population (Dillman et al., 2014).

Sample and Participants

The target population includes IT professionals across sectors like software development and support in India (NASSCOM, 2023). A non-probability convenience sampling strategy was used via professional networks such as LinkedIn (Bryman, 2016). The sample size targeted 120-150 participants, deemed sufficient for statistical analysis (Hayes, 2017). Inclusion criteria required current employment in an IT role with at least one year of experience (Author, 2024).

Measures

Technostress: Assessed using the Technostress Creators Scale (Tarafdar et al., 2007). This 23-item instrument covers five dimensions: overload, invasion, complexity, insecurity, and uncertainty (RaguNathan et al., 2008), rated on a 5-point Likert scale (Tarafdar et al., 2007).

Psychological Capital: The PCQ-12 (Luthans et al., 2007) was utilized. This validated short version measures hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism with reliable consistency (Avey et al., 2011; Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017).

Burnout: The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) assessed burnout levels (Kristensen et al., 2005). The CBI focuses on exhaustion and is applicable across domains (Kristensen et al., 2005), with a focus on work-related burnout (Author, 2024).

Job Demands: Adapted from the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) (Karasek, 1979), this scale assesses workload and pace. Higher scores indicate greater demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Field, 2013). Descriptive statistics (mean, SD) and reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha) were conducted (Field, 2013). Pearson correlation examined bivariate relationships (Cohen, 1988). Hypotheses were tested using the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2017): Model 4 for mediation and Model 7 for moderated-mediation. Bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples generated confidence intervals (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

4. Results

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 1 displays means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for all scales exceeded 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978). Supporting H1, Technostress showed a significant positive correlation with Burnout ($r = .48, p < .01$). PsyCap was negatively correlated with Burnout ($r = -.35, p < .01$). Job Demands correlated positively with Technostress ($r = .32, p < .01$) and Burnout ($r = .41, p < .01$).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable	Mean	SD	α	1	2	3
1. Technostress	3.45	0.62	.85			
2. PsyCap	3.12	0.58	.82	-.28**		
3. Burnout	3.67	0.71	.88	.48**	-.35**	
4. Job Demands	3.89	0.65	.79	.32**	-.15	.41**

Note. $N = 150$, ** $p < .01$.

Mediation Analysis (Hypothesis 2)

PROCESS Model 4 (Hayes, 2017) tested if PsyCap mediates the Technostress-Burnout link. Technostress negatively predicted PsyCap ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$). When both were entered predicting Burnout, PsyCap remained a significant negative predictor ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$), and the direct effect of Technostress remained significant but reduced ($\beta = .38, p < .01$). Bootstrapping confirmed a significant indirect effect (Effect=.057, 95% CI [.02, .11]), supporting H2.

Moderated Mediation Analysis (Hypothesis 3)

Hypothesis 3, positing that Job Demands moderate the Technostress-Burnout relationship, was tested using PROCESS Model 7 (Hayes, 2017). The interaction term (Technostress \times Job Demands) was significant ($\beta = .19, p < .05$). Conditional effects analysis showed that at high Job Demands (+1 SD), the relationship was stronger (Effect=.52, $p < .01$), compared to low Job Demands (-1 SD) (Effect=.28, $p < .05$). This confirms that high demands exacerbate technostress impacts, supporting H3.

5. Discussion

This study aimed to evaluate technostress effects on burnout among IT professionals and explore the roles of PsyCap and Job Demands (Author, 2024). Findings support the moderated-mediation model, providing insights into the stress process (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Consistent with prior literature, technostress significantly predicted burnout (Srivastava et al., 2015), reaffirming cognitive load as a driver of exhaustion (Tarafdar et al., 2007).

Significantly, the study establishes PsyCap as a mediator (Luthans et al., 2007), suggesting that hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism buffer technostress (Avey et al., 2011). However, technostress can erode these resources, leading to burnout (Hobfoll, 2001). Moderation analysis clarifies that context is crucial; high job demands accelerate the burnout process (Demerouti et al., 2001).

6. Implications and Conclusion

Practically, organizations should implement "PsyCap training" to enhance resilience (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017) and monitor job demands (Karasek, 1979). Addressing technostress requires a holistic approach building personal resources while managing organizational demands (Author, 2024).

References

1. Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 127-152.
2. Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), 831-858.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
4. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 389-411.
5. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
6. Brod, C. (1984). *Technostress: The human cost of the computer revolution*. Addison-Wesley.
7. Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.
8. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
9. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
10. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.
11. Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Wiley.
12. Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.
13. Gaudioso, F., Turel, O., & Galimberti, C. (2017). The mediating roles of strain facets and coping strategies in translating techno-stressors into adverse job outcomes. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 69, 189-196.
14. Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regressionbased approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Publications.
15. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
16. Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 337-421.
17. Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 386-408.
18. Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308.

22. Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory:
23. A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 192- 207.
24. Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 339-366.
25. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541-572.
26. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103-111.
27. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
28. Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227-238.
29. Author. (2024). Technostress, Psychological Capital, and Burnout Among IT Professionals: A Moderated Mediation Model. Unpublished Manuscript.
30. NASSCOM. (2023). Strategic review: The IT-BPM sector in India, NASSCOM.
31. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
32. Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879-891.
33. Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417-433.
34. Seligman, M. E. (1998). *Learned optimism: How to change your mind and your life*. Pocket Books.
35. Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., ... & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 570.
36. Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1), S72-S103.
37. Srivastava, S. C., Chandra, S., & Shirish, A. (2015). Technostress: Conceptualization, measurement, and impact. *Information Systems Journal*, 25(4), 319-357.
38. Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2010). Impact of technostress on end-user satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 27(3), 303-334.
39. Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(1), 301-328.