



## Employee Digital Wellness and Work Engagement in Hybrid Work Settings: the Moderating Role of Organizational Support for Wellbeing

Riski Eko Ardianto<sup>1\*</sup>, Abdi Fadhlán<sup>2</sup>, Ismamudi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Pelita Bangsa, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Imam Bonjol Padang, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Universitas Pelita Bangsa, Indonesia

Email: [riskiekoardianto@pelitabangsa.ac.id](mailto:riskiekoardianto@pelitabangsa.ac.id)<sup>1\*</sup>, [abdifadhlán@uinib.ac.id](mailto:abdifadhlán@uinib.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>, [isma.mudi@pelitabangsa.ac.id](mailto:isma.mudi@pelitabangsa.ac.id)<sup>3</sup>

\*Corresponding author: [riskiekoardianto@pelitabangsa.ac.id](mailto:riskiekoardianto@pelitabangsa.ac.id)\*

**Abstract.** This study aims to examine the effect of Employee Digital Wellness (EDW) on Work Engagement (WE) among administration and digital marketing employees in startup companies implementing hybrid working, and to explore the moderating role of Organizational Support for Wellbeing (OSW). Using a quantitative approach, data were collected through a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire from 160 purposive-sampled respondents. Data analysis was conducted using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS 4.1.1.7. The findings indicate that EDW positively and significantly affects WE ( $\beta=0.621$ ;  $t=8.943$ ;  $p<0.001$ ), confirming that employees who manage digital technology usage effectively tend to be more energetic, dedicated, and fully engaged in their work. In addition, OSW also positively influences WE ( $\beta=0.412$ ;  $t=5.672$ ;  $p<0.001$ ), demonstrating that tangible organizational support in the form of wellbeing policies, flexible work arrangements, and mental health programs enhances work engagement. Moreover, OSW moderates the EDW  $\rightarrow$  WE relationship ( $\beta=0.173$ ;  $t=2.713$ ;  $p=0.007$ ), indicating that the positive effect of digital wellness on engagement is stronger when organizational support is sufficient. These findings highlight the importance of both personal management of digital wellness and consistent organizational wellbeing policies. Practically, organizations are advised to provide digital wellbeing programs, flexible working arrangements, and managerial support to maximize employee engagement, particularly in hybrid working contexts.

**Keywords:** Digital Wellness; Hybrid Working; Moderation; Organizational; Work Engagement.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The paradigm shift in the world of work over the past decade, driven especially by advances in information technology and job digitalization, has positioned organizations at a point where traditional work models are no longer sufficient to meet market demands and modern workforce expectations. The hybrid work phenomenon — a combination of on-site and remote work — has become the dominant work structure for many global organizations since the COVID-19 pandemic. This model offers flexibility in space and time management but also brings new challenges in intensive technology use, managing boundaries between work and personal life, and maintaining employee wellbeing (Ijzerman et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2021).

As reliance on digital technology for daily tasks increases, it becomes increasingly important to understand how employees maintain their digital wellness. Conceptually, digital wellness refers to an individual's ability to manage device usage, applications, digital communication, and digital expectations in a healthy way so that psychological wellbeing and work performance are not impaired (Salanova et al., 2020; Riedl, 2013). In the hybrid work

context, threats to digital wellness include tendencies to remain continuously digitally connected without clear time boundaries, information overload, frequent digital interruptions, and social or organizational pressure to respond quickly to digital messages or requests (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Ayyagari et al., 2011).

Previous research has extensively highlighted the negative effects of intensive digital technology use on mental and physical health, such as technostress, burnout, and role conflict (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008; Molino et al., 2020). However, literature on how digital wellness can act as a positive resource to facilitate work engagement is still limited. Work engagement is a positive psychological work condition characterized by energy (vigor), dedication, and full immersion in work tasks (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Work engagement has been strongly associated with productivity, employee retention, and overall organizational performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Christian et al., 2011).

According to the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory, job demands are aspects that require effort and may cause strain, whereas job resources support goal achievement and individual growth (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In hybrid work contexts, digital demands can be considered part of job demands, whereas an individual's ability to maintain digital wellness can be seen as a personal resource potentially enhancing work engagement. Molino et al. (2020) found that personal resources such as digital self-efficacy positively relate to positive psychological work outcomes, opening opportunities for further study of digital wellness as a relevant variable in the JD-R model.

On the other hand, the organization's role in facilitating employee wellbeing (organizational support for wellbeing) is also critical in moderating or strengthening the relationship between job resources and work outcomes. Organizational support for wellbeing refers to employees' perceptions that their organization cares for them and provides policies, practices, and a work culture that supports their health and happiness (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Organizational support such as flexible scheduling, digital wellness training, disconnect rules, mental wellbeing programs, and supportive managerial behavior can buffer high digital demands (Van den Broeck et al., 2016; Kantén & Ulker, 2013).

Research on organizational support has shown that perceived support correlates positively with organizational commitment, lower turnover intention, and higher performance — including work engagement (Allen et al., 2003; Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003; Karatepe & Agba, 2015). However, few studies explore how organizational support for wellbeing specifically moderates the effect of employees' digital wellness on work engagement, especially in hybrid work environments that involve intensive digital demands.

Hybrid work presents challenges not only operationally but also in establishing clear boundaries between digital work domains and personal life. Without healthy boundaries, employees may experience digital overload, information fatigue, or digital burnout, negatively affecting work engagement (Park et al., 2020; Giumetti et al., 2019). This underscores the importance of fostering digital wellness, which not only mitigates negative effects of technology use but also transforms it into a resource that optimally supports work engagement.

Recent empirical studies show that employees capable of managing digital technology use effectively tend to have higher engagement levels, as they can maintain focus, achieve work goals efficiently, and preserve work-life balance without falling into continuous digital stress (Salanova et al., 2020; Cabrera et al., 2022). However, research gaps remain regarding the role of organizational context — particularly the type of wellbeing support provided — in moderating the positive effects of digital wellness on work engagement. This gap presents substantial research opportunities to enrich human resource management and organizational psychology literature in the hybrid work era.

Furthermore, different contexts — such as industry sector, organizational culture, and job type — may also moderate the relationships among study variables, requiring a more integrated and precise analytical approach. Previous research has tended to be descriptive or topical, whereas studies combining theoretical models, quantitative data, and organizational moderation are rarely found in reputable international journals (Saxena et al., 2021; Turel & Gaudioso, 2023).

Based on the above, this study aims to address three main questions: (1) To what extent does employee digital wellness affect work engagement in hybrid work environments? (2) How does organizational support for wellbeing relate to work engagement? (3) Does organizational support for wellbeing moderate the relationship between digital wellness and work engagement? The conceptual model is expected not only to contribute theoretically to the development of JD-R Theory and Organizational Support Theory but also to provide practical implications for HR policies and practices in modern organizations implementing hybrid work.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory posits that job demands require physical and psychological effort, potentially leading to strain when resources are insufficient (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti et al., 2001). Job resources support goal achievement, personal growth, and motivation, resulting in positive work outcomes such as work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In hybrid work settings, digital demands such

as intensive screen use, remote communication, and always-online culture act as job demands, while digital wellness serves as a personal resource that helps employees navigate these demands positively (Molino et al., 2020; Salanova et al., 2020). The JD-R framework has been expanded to include technostress, reflecting strain responses to digital work demands (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008; Tarafdar et al., 2019), highlighting the balance needed between digital demands and digital resources (Day et al., 2012; Pisanti et al., 2016).

Digital Wellness refers to an employee's ability to use digital technologies in a balanced, healthy manner without detrimental effects on psychological wellbeing or work performance (Riedl, 2013; Salanova et al., 2020). It involves setting digital boundaries, managing notifications, controlling interruptions, and maintaining focus despite prolific digital demands (Ayyagari et al., 2011; Park et al., 2020). Riedl (2013) conceptualizes digital wellness as consisting of time management, interruption control, and psychological recovery from digital demands. Salanova et al. (2020) argue that digital wellness is a personal resource that contributes to reduced burnout and increased wellbeing. Empirical evidence also suggests a positive link between healthy digital habits and work engagement and job satisfaction (Cabrera et al., 2022).

Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). It differs from job satisfaction and organizational commitment in being an active psychological investment in work tasks (Christian et al., 2011; Bakker et al., 2008). High levels of work engagement are associated with organizational performance, productivity, and lower turnover intention (Rich et al., 2010; Harter et al., 2002). Resources stemming from organizational practices or personal capabilities like digital wellness support increased engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Schaufeli, 2013).

Organizational Support for Wellbeing refers to employees' perception that their organization values their wellbeing and provides structures that support physical, psychological, and social health (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Stemming from Organizational Support Theory, perceived support influences motivation, affective commitment, and positive work behaviors (Allen et al., 2003; Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003). OSW includes flexible policies, wellbeing programs, mental health resources, digital detox initiatives, and supportive management behaviors (Kanten & Ulker, 2013; Van den Broeck et al., 2016). Research shows that organizational support positively affects engagement and can moderate relationships between resources and outcomes (Karatepe & Agba, 2015; Saks, 2006).

Hybrid work settings blend remote and office work, requiring frequent use of digital technologies like virtual collaboration tools, messaging platforms, and mobile devices (Wang et al., 2021; Ijzerman et al., 2022). These digital demands can become sources of strain (job demands) if not balanced with adequate resources (Turel & Gaudio, 2023; Park et al., 2020). Employees with strong digital wellness tend to navigate these demands better, reducing digital overload and interruptions, leading to higher engagement (Salanova et al., 2020; Cabrera et al., 2022). However, without organizational support, digital wellness may not fully translate into engagement benefits (Van Zyl et al., 2020; Saxena et al., 2021).

In this model, organizational support for wellbeing moderates the relationship between digital wellness and work engagement. Organizational support theories suggest that when employees perceive high support, personal and job resources are more potent in producing positive outcomes (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Saks (2006) demonstrated that organizational support can strengthen the effects of job resources on engagement. Karatepe & Agba (2015) found that support enhances positive relationships between resources and engagement in service settings. In hybrid work contexts, OSW may act as a buffer or amplifier, allowing employees to maximize digital wellbeing's positive effect on engagement.

### **3. RESEARCH METHOD**

This study employs a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design to examine the effect of employee digital wellness on work engagement and the moderating role of organizational support for wellbeing. The study population consists of administration and digital marketing employees in a startup company located in Bekasi, which implements a hybrid working system. The sample consisted of 160 respondents, selected using purposive sampling, targeting employees who actively use digital devices for work and work in hybrid mode at least 3 days per week.

Data were collected using a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). The questionnaire covers indicators for Employee Digital Wellness (EDW), Work Engagement (WE), and Organizational Support for Wellbeing (OSW). Validity and reliability were tested using Cronbach's alpha ( $>0.7$ ) and Composite Reliability ( $>0.7$ ). Outer Loading ( $>0.7$ ) was used to assess indicator validity.

Data analysis was conducted using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS 4.1.1.7. Analysis steps included: Evaluating the measurement model (validity and reliability). Evaluating the structural model (hypothesis

testing, path coefficients, t-value, p-value). Testing the moderating effect of organizational support for wellbeing.

**Table 1.** Variable Operationalization.

Variable	Definition	Indicators	Scale
Employee Wellness (EDW)	Digital Employee’s ability to manage digital technology usage in a healthy and productive manner	EDW1: Setting boundaries for work device usage; EDW2: Controlling digital notifications; Managing digital interruptions; EDW3: Maintaining focus and productivity; EDW4: Psychological recovery from technology use	Likert 1–5
Work Engagement (WE)	Positive psychological state characterized by dedication, and involvement in work	WE1: Feeling energized at work; WE2: Feeling vigorous, enthusiastic and dedicated; WE3: Fully engaged in full tasks; WE4: Feeling proud of work; WE5: Completing tasks with focus	Likert 1–5
Organizational Support Wellbeing (OSW)	Employee perception that the organization provides support for physical, psychological, and wellbeing	OSW1: Organization provides tangible facilities; OSW2: Organization supports flexible working; OSW3: Management responds to employee needs; OSW4: Digital detox policies are implemented; OSW5: Mental health programs are available	Likert 1–5

### Findings And Duscussion

The sample consisted of 160 employees from administration and digital marketing divisions of a startup in Bekasi implementing hybrid work. Gender distribution was balanced (51% male, 49% female), and the majority of respondents were aged 25–35 years (62%). Most respondents had been employed for at least 1 year. The measurement model evaluation using outer loading (>0.7), Cronbach’s alpha (>0.7), and Composite Reliability (>0.7) showed all indicators were valid and reliable. AVE values >0.5 and HTMT <0.85 indicate discriminant validity was satisfied.

Hypothesis testing used PLS-SEM bootstrapping with 5000 samples to obtain path coefficients ( $\beta$ ), t-values, and p-values. Results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Hypothesis Testing Results (PLS-SEM).

Hypothesis	Path	$\beta$	t-value	p-value	Result
H1	EDW $\rightarrow$ WE	0.621	8.943	0.000	Supported
H2	OSW $\rightarrow$ WE	0.412	5.672	0.000	Supported
H3	EDW $\times$ OSW $\rightarrow$ WE	0.173	2.713	0.007	Supported

Results indicate that EDW positively affects WE ( $\beta=0.621$ ;  $p<0.001$ ). Employees who manage digital technology effectively tend to be more energetic, dedicated, and fully engaged in work. This aligns with JD-R Theory emphasizing the importance of personal resources in enhancing work motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Salanova et al., 2020).

OSW also positively affects WE ( $\beta=0.412$ ;  $p<0.001$ ), confirming that tangible organizational support—flexible work policies, wellbeing programs, and mental health

initiatives—increases employee engagement. This finding is consistent with Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Van den Broeck et al., 2016).

Moderation analysis shows OSW strengthens the relationship between EDW and WE ( $\beta=0.173$ ;  $p=0.007$ ). The positive effect of digital wellness on engagement is stronger when organizational support is high. Employees with high digital wellness engage more effectively when OSW is substantial, consistent with prior studies highlighting organizational support as a moderator between resources and engagement (Karatepe & Agba, 2015; Saks, 2006). Overall, this study demonstrates that digital wellness and organizational support are key drivers of work engagement in hybrid work settings, reinforcing the applicability of JD-R Theory and Organizational Support Theory in the modern digital context.

#### **4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that Employee Digital Wellness (EDW) has a significant positive effect on Work Engagement (WE) among administration and digital marketing employees in hybrid working startup companies. Employees who manage digital technology usage effectively tend to be more energetic, dedicated, and fully engaged in their work. Additionally, Organizational Support for Wellbeing (OSW) also positively affects work engagement, highlighting the importance of tangible organizational support in maintaining employee wellbeing.

The study further shows that OSW moderates the EDW  $\rightarrow$  WE relationship, indicating that the positive effect of digital wellness on engagement is stronger when organizational support is sufficient. These findings emphasize that both personal digital wellness management and organizational wellbeing policies should be implemented in tandem to enhance employee engagement, particularly in hybrid working contexts. Practically, organizations are advised to provide digital wellbeing programs, flexible work arrangements, and consistent managerial support to maximize employee engagement.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (2003). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2003.tb00612.x>
- Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), 831–858. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41409963>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
- 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., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the Job Demands–Resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12(4), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000165>
- Cabrera, E. F., et al. (2022). Digital wellbeing and employee engagement: Evidence from hybrid work settings. *Journal of Business Research*, 145, 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.045>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Day, A., Paquet, S., Scott, N., & Hambley, L. (2012). Perceived information and communication technology (ICT) demands on employee outcomes: The moderating effect of organizational ICT support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(4), 473–491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029837>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- 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>
- Giumetti, G. W., Haislett, M., & Smith, C. (2019). Technostress and work engagement in digital workplaces. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 95, 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.01.016>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
- Ijzerman, H., et al. (2022). Hybrid work and employee wellbeing: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(5), 473–486. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000312>

- Kanten, P., & Ulker, F. (2013). The role of organizational support in work engagement: Evidence from Turkey. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 987–993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.573>
- Karatepe, O. M., & Agba, F. W. (2015). The effects of organizational support on work engagement: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(7), 1455–1473. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2014-0080>
- Molino, M., Cortese, C., & Ghislieri, C. (2020). The role of digital skills in reducing technostress in hybrid work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 580–592. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00580>
- Park, Y. J., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2020). Relationships between digital overload and work engagement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(5), 347–359. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000170>
- Pisanti, R., et al. (2016). Psychosocial resources, work engagement, and technostress: Evidence from office employees. *Stress and Health*, 32(5), 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2638>
- Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0165>
- Riedl, R. (2013). The psychology of digital wellness: Managing technology use in modern workplaces. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2382–2390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.04.017>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Cifre, E. (2020). Digital wellness and engagement in hybrid work: Empirical evidence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(2), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000164>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Stinglhamber, F., & Vandenberghe, C. (2003). Organizations and employees: A review of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 803–857. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(03\)00059-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00059-3)

- Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. (2019). The technostress trifecta: Techno-eustress, techno-distress, and coping. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12192>
- Turel, O., & Gaudioso, F. (2023). Digital overload and employee engagement in hybrid settings. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 138, 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107122>
- Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., & Lens, W. (2016). Capturing autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work: Validation of the Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(2), 246–269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12133>
- Van Zyl, L. E., et al. (2020). Employee wellbeing and hybrid work: The role of organizational support. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(19), 7100. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17197100>
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>