Occupational Stress and its Impact on Work-Life Balance and Psychological Well-being of Remote Working Women Employees in Information Technology Enabled Sector during Covid-19 Pandemic: An Empirical Study in Hyderabad Metro

K.D.V. Prasad[1]
Institute of Industrial and Human Resources Development, Financial District, Gachibowli, Hyderabad 500032, India

Rajesh Vaidya[2]
Department of Management Technology (DMT), Shri Ramdeobaba College of Engineering & Management, Katol Road, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding author: Institute of Industrial and Human Resources Development, Financial District, Gachibowli, Hyderabad 500032, India Email: Not given

Abstract
The author reports the findings of an empirical study on occupational stress and its impact on work-life balance and psychological well-being of remote working women employees of the information technology-enabled sector during the Covid-19 Pandemic in and around Hyderabad Metro, India. This study was carried out during the second wave of the Covid-19 pandemic when it was at its peak during March-June 2021. The survey was carried out using a structured and undisguised questionnaire as a research instrument published on a google form. The link was provided to around 500 women employees of the IT-enabled sector in and around Hyderabad. The study received responses from 255 employees assessing the women employees' occupational stress and its effect on work-life balance and psychological wellbeing. Before the data analysis, the research instrument was assessed for its internal consistency using a reliability statistic Cronbach alpha, and the overall Cronbach alpha measured at 0.98, occupational stress 0.97, and psychological well-being overall measured at 0.98 indicating the strong internal consistency and reliability of the instrument. The measured Cronbach alpha values are>0.6 indicating the research instrument was consistent and reliable. From the results, it was concluded that there was a statistically significant influence of occupational stress on work-life balance and psychological well-being of remote working women employees of the information technology-enabled sector.

Introduction

Remote working or working from and working from other than office place is a recent phenomenon across the world as the World Health Organization (WHO) declared that Covid19 is pandemic during December 2020 after the identification first Covid-19 case in Wuhan, China. Notwithstanding the sector or type of organization most of the organizations across the world wherever possible opted for working from home or remote working to mitigate the Covid-19 infection to protect the staff and families. Remote working or working outside the traditional office environment, though the concept is not new but has become a buzzword during the Covid-19 pandemic work. The reasons for working remotely before the Covid-19 pandemic, flexible lifestyles, better wealth and well-ness, effectively addressing the role conflict in particular women employees who have different roles as wife, mother, and employee, saving the commutation time, and a renewed passion for one's job are the main reasons for working remote (Remote work, 2020).

The remote working is not devoid of challenges. Employees need to face several challenges like workplace isolation, lack of job control, absence of supervision, absence of peer guidance, family disturbances, and organization climate that an employee needs to face while working remotely (Prasad et. al. 2020). Cost savings enhanced productivity because of increased responsibility and cost savings are some of the benefits to both the employee and employer. Twitter formulated a policy on forever working from home and over 50 percent of the respondents in the United States prefer to working from home or co-location and part-time. Popular technologies like Zoom, Teams, and Webexare used routinely to communicate and have meetings with peers and colleagues. In the recent past, several organizations are acquiring appropriate technologies to bridge the technology gaps for efficiently and effectively working remotely (Wrike, 2020). Apart from few jobs, almost all jobs can be carried out remotely, however, appropriate protocols need to be developed for virtual onboarding of employees, succession planning, and career development programs.

Review of Literature

Prasad et al., (2020) reported the challenges that were faced by the remote working employees. This study further indicated that remote working employees' psychological wellbeing is influenced by the organizational climate, occupational stress during the Covid-19 pandemic period. In another study, the authors reported that peer, role ambiguity, organization climate, and job satisfaction significantly influence the psychological well-being of the employees in the Information Technology Industry. The study also observed statistically significant gender and age group differences and in particular women, employees are more stressed than men. These factors are affecting the psychological well-being of employees (Prasad et al.2020). Alan Felstead and Golo Henseke (2017) measured remote working and its consequences on the well-being and

work-life balance and reported that demographic make-up, flexible type of employment, organizational responses, detachment from the workplace are some of the factors for enhanced remote working. The study further reported that higher organizational commitment, employee well-being, and job satisfaction among the employees due to remote working.

Hardil and Green (2003) reported the impact of remote working in the new economy and the 'spatiality' of work remote work other than from the office. The authors suggested the Telecommuting can influence the lifestyles of long-distance and weekly commuters and their families positively. Wang et al. (2021) reported the results of remote working research in the work-design perspective using a mixed-methods investigation to explore the challenges experienced by remote working employees and virtual work characteristics and individual differences that affect these challenges. Prasad (2021) Narrated the remote working challenges, policy shifts, organizational climate changes and suggested developing and include a policy for a remote working pattern to develop a win-win situation between employees and employers. Prasad and Rao (2021) developed a framework for remote working, psychological well-being, remote working and job satisfaction. Using this framework one can easily assess the remote working factors associated with employee wellbeing using the general linear modeling method. Prasad et. al. (2020) developed post-covid work protocols to mitigate the effects of back-to-work situations. These protocols are effective tools that can be utilized to mitigate the back-to-work stress and improves the psychological well-being of employees.

Research Gap

The author critically reviewed several research outcomes and the author could find some research outcomes on occupational stress, work-life balance, and psychological well-being, however, could not find single research that reported the results of a study exclusively carried out on women employees on occupational stress and its impact on work-life balance and psychological well-being of women employee working remotely in information technology enabled sector or any other sector. Therefore, the author carried out Occupational Stress and its Impact on Work-Life Balance and Psychological Well-being of Remote Working Women Employees in Information Technology Enabled Sector during Covid-19 Pandemic in Hyderabad Metro: An Empirical Study and reported the results exclusively carrying out the research on women employees.

Objectives

- To measure the occupational stress experienced by the remote working women employees – and classify the study into Low stress, Moderate Stress or High-stress groups employees in Information Technology Enabled sector in Hyderabad Metro
- To assess the impact of occupational stress on work-life balance and psychological well-being of the remote working women employees in the Information Technology Enabled sector in Hyderabad Metro

Hypotheses

H_{01} Women employees working remotely in the information technology-enabled sector does not experience any occupational stress

H01   Women employees working remotely in the information technology-enabled sector experience any occupational stress

H_{02} There is a statistically significant relationship between occupational stress and work-life balance and psychological well-being of remote working women employees in the information technology-enabled sector

H_{a2} There is no statistically significant relationship between occupational stress and work-life balance and psychological well-being of remote working women employees in the information technology-enabled sector

Table 1
Demography of the sample

Gender		
Women	255	100%
Age		
20-30 years	182	71.4
31-40 years	62	24.3
>40 years	11	4.3
Marital Status		
Married	97	38
Unmarried	158	62
Source: Primary data		

Reliability and internal consistency: The reliability statistic Cronbach's Alpha and the splithalf even were measured to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the research instrument, the questionnaire. The Cronbach Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) values indicate the research instrument is reliable and consistent. The other reliability statistic Split-Half (oddeven) correlation and Split-Half Spearman-Brown Adjustment measured and found be reliable (William Trochim, 2006)

Table 2
Reliability statistics of primary data (n=255)

Sl No	Factor	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Split-Half (Odd-even) Correlation	Split-Half with Spearman-Brown Adjustment
1	Over all (stress[1], work-life balance[1], and psychological wellbeing)	42	0.98	0.97	0.98
2	Psychological wellbeing[2] (Over all)	18	0.98	0.97	0.99
3	Work-life balance	7	0.96	0.94	0.98
4	Job Satisfaction	7	0.90	0.86	0.92
	Remote working	5	0.91	0.88	0.93
	Team work	3	0.73	0.67	0.80
	Peer	3	0.91	0.86	0.93
	Job control	3	0.93	0.86	0.92
	Organizational climate	7	0.95	0.94	0.97
	Technology	4	0.93	0.82	0.91
	Psychological factors	4	0.92	0.84	0.91
	Psychological Wellbeing				
5	Autonomy	3	0.91	0.78	0.88
6	Purpose of Life	3	0.89	0.77	0.87
7	Self-Acceptance	3	0.91	0.83	0.93
8	Positive relations	3	0.93	0.89	0.94
9	Personal Growth	3	0.91	0.89	0.94
10	Environmental Mastery	3	0.61	0.54	0.71

1
Based on 5-point Likert type scale – Where Strongly Agree 5 to and Strongly Disagree 1
2
Based on a 7-point Likert type scale Strongly Agree=7 to Strongly Disagree 1, the
responses from the seven-point scale were converted into a 5-point scale using linear transformation for ease of calculation
Source: Primary data (n=255)

Determination of sample size: The size of the population is not known and is infinite the following Cochran formula was used

$$n_0 = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2}$$

Where:

e is the level of precision desired
p is the proportion of the population that has the attribute in question, q is 1 – p. therefore at 95% CI level the sample size required is 384, however, 255 was used for this study

The calculated sample size is 384 at 95% level precision; however, due to limitations of the Covid-19 pandemic a sample size of 255 is used for this study

Stress and Work-Life Balance Scale

Both the scales are five-point Likert type scales with 10, 9 statements each respectively, and the values ranged from strongly agree =5 to strongly disagree =1.

Psychological Well-Being Scale

A modified shortened version scale based on Ryff (1995) was used for measuring the psychological well-being of metro commuters. The scale is 18 items seven-point scale with 6 factors measured are autonomy, the purpose of life, personal growth, environmental mastery, self-acceptance positive relations, (range Strongly agree = 7 to Strongly disagree =1), where some statements are reversed. The responses received on a seven-point scale were converted into a five-point Likert-type scale using the linear transformation (Prasad et al., 2020; IBMSPSS 2020, ver 27).

Characteristics of the Psychological Well-Being Study Variables

Self-acceptance: A positive attitude of a person.
Environmental mastery: A person can effectively use the opportunities available to him/her to manage everyday schedule and use the available extra time for personal growth. Positive relations with others: A person's ability to have meaningful relationships with colleagues, or others in the society with intimacy, affection, and reciprocation. Personal growth: A person can continue to develop himself/herself has inquisitiveness to learn new things in the pursuit of professional perfection.
Purpose in life: A person has conviction and goals that he needs to achieve which hold his/her life meaningful.
Autonomy: A person is independent can handle and regulate his/her behavior and is independent of any social, group or political pressures. Review of Literature

Data gathering: The responses were collected using a questionnaire. The demographic, medical history and anthropometric characters gathered using appropriate dichotomous scales. A five-point Likert type scale was used to assess the stress and a seven-point Likert type scale was used to measure the psychological well-being of IT employees. However, the responses collected on a 7-point Likert-type scale were converted into a five-point scale using liner transformation (IBM SPSS, 2021; Prasad et.al. 2020) for ease of calculation.

Determination of Stress Levels

The stress levels were determined following the procedure by Sumathi and Nandagopal (2014; (Francis, 2008; Sumathi and Nandagopal, 2014, Prasad 2019, 2020, 2021). The stress has been

measured in three levels low level, moderate level, and high level based on the standard deviation.

The overall Mean for all the stress factors is: 3.29
Standard deviation=1.15

High level of stress Mean + SD= $\bar{x} + \sigma$ 1.15+3.29 (>4.44)
Low level of stress = Mean – SD = $\bar{x} - \sigma$ 3.29-1.15 (<2.14) `
Moderate level stress = the level between minim and maxium level
2.14 to 4.44

Table 3
Overall mean values of stress variables

Overall Scores	Mean
Job Satisfaction	3.256
Remote working	3.421
Teamwork	3.244
Peer relations	3.336
Job control	3.397
Organizational climate	3.241
Technology	3.327
Psychological Factors	3.249

The mean values indicate that there is moderate stress exists among IT employees. However further analysis was carried out to study the influence of each study variable.

Results

A multivariate generalized linear model analysis was carried out on the data using SPSS version 27 to measure the worK-life balance aid six psychological well-being factors autonomy, the purpose of life, personal growth, positive relations environmental mastery, and self-acceptance a total of 7 continuous dependent variables with one nominal independent variable stress with three categories low, moderate and high. The analysis has also included the work-life balance and age covariates with two-way MANCOVA was run to see any work life balance and age differences. The Tukey posthoc analysis was carried out the see which dependent variable differed significantly within the group.

Results of the multivariate generalized linear model analysis

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Table 4
Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices[a]

Box's M	277.844
F	5.950
df1	42
df2	6979.778
Sig.	.09

Tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups.
a. Design: Intercept + Age + Work-life balance + Stress

The significance value (p-value) of the test is > 0.01, therefore the data has not violated the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices assumption. (i.e., the assumption of homogeneity

of variance-covariance matrices is met).

a

Table 5
Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Work-life Balance	5.951	2	252	0.13
Autonomy	.943	2	252	.391
Purpose of Life	7.198	2	252	0.08
Self-Acceptance	13.464	2	252	.049
Positive Relations	5.868	2	252	.023
Personal Growth	10.123	2	252	0.09
Environmental Mastery				

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.
a. Design: Intercept + Age + Work-life balance+ Stress

To determine the variances between group combinations for the dependent variable are equal. In this study, the significant values for all the dependent variables are greater than .05 indicating that the variances are equal (i.e., the assumption of homogeneity of variances is met). Similarly, all other assumptions to run the general linear model multivariate analysis was met.

Table 6
General Linear model -Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.721	105.332b	6.000	245.000	.000	.721
	Wilks' Lambda	.279	105.332b	6.000	245.000	.000	.721
	Hotelling's Trace	2.580	105.332b	6.000	245.000	.000	.721
	Roy's Largest Root	2.580	105.332b	6.000	245.000	.000	.721
Work-life balance	Pillai's Trace	.061	2.657b	6.000	245.000	.016	.061
	Wilks' Lambda	.939	2.657b	6.000	245.000	.016	.061
	Hotelling's Trace	.065	2.657b	6.000	245.000	.016	.061
	Roy's Largest Root	.065	2.657b	6.000	245.000	.016	.061
Work-life balance	Pillai's Trace	.026	1.069b	6.000	245.000	.382	.026
	Wilks' Lambda	.974	1.069b	6.000	245.000	.382	.026
	Hotelling's Trace	.026	1.069b	6.000	245.000	.382	.026
	Roy's Largest Root	.026	1.069b	6.000	245.000	.382	.026
Stress	Pillai's Trace	.719	23.009	12.000	492.000	.000	.359
	Wilks' Lambda	.300	33.725b	12.000	490.000	.000	.452
	Hotelling's Trace	2.271	46.177	12.000	488.000	.000	.532
	Roy's Largest Root	2.243	91.959c	6.000	246.000	.000	.692

a. Design: Intercept + Age + Work-life balance + Stress

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Age, work-life balance, and stress are significantly influencing the dependent variable psychological well-being Though there are several effects the most commonly used is Wilks' Lambda which is significant. The statistical significance value of .000 indicates that p <0.0005 and

the result is statistically significant. Therefore, there is a < 5 in 10,000 chance of vector means being as different as they are if the null hypothesis is given as true. The results indicate statistically significant differences between the stress levels on the combined dependent variables F(12, 490)=33.725, p<.0005; W; Wilks' Λ = .300; partial η2 = .445; in case of age variables F(6, 245)=2.675, p<.0005; W; Wilks' Λ = 0.939; partial η2 = .061 and for work-life balance F(6, 245)=105.332, p<.0005; W; Wilks' Λ = 0.279; partial η2 = .072 indicating significant differences between the age and work-life balance (Tables 5 and 6).

An individual ANOVA analysis was carried out for each dependent variable with each independent component and Table 6 indicates the results of the analysis. The independent variable age is influencing the outcome of psychological well-being factors Purpose of Life, Personal Relations, Self-acceptance, and personal growth; the values are F(1,250)=8.277, p=0.004, η2, 0.032;F(1,250)=5.598, p=0.019, η2, 0.022; F(1,250)=1.091, p=0.002, η2, 0.039 and F(1,250)=3.901, p=0.049, η2, 0.015 respectively. There is no statistically significant influence of work-life balance among the psychological variables. However, the stress is influencing all the six psychological well-being variables.

Table 7
General Linear Model: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Purpose of Life	171.420[a]	4	42.855	126.290	.000	.669
	Environmental Mastery	79.834[b]	4	19.958	68.310	.000	.522
	Autonomy	161.110[c]	4	40.277	92.752	.000	.597
	Positive Relations	177.942[d]	4	44.485	121.244	.000	.660
	Self-Acceptance	164.050[e]	4	41.013	112.475	.000	.643
	Personal Growth	182.241[f]	4	45.560	116.784	.000	.651
Intercept	Purpose of Life	142.608	1	142.608	420.253	.000	.627
	Environmental Mastery	158.406	1	158.406	542.162	.000	.684
	Autonomy	145.668	1	145.668	335.448	.000	.573
	Positive Relations	144.268	1	144.268	393.198	.000	.611
	Self-Acceptance	131.826	1	131.826	361.525	.000	.591
	Personal Growth	155.969	1	155.969	399.795	.000	.615
Age	Purpose of Life	2.809	1	2.809	8.277	.004	.032
	Environmental Mastery	.146	1	.146	.499	.481	.002
	Autonomy	.723	1	.723	1.666	.198	.007
	Positive Relations	2.054	1	2.054	5.598	.019	.022
	Self-Acceptance	3.680	1	3.680	10.091	.002	.039
	Personal Growth	1.522	1	1.522	3.901	.049	.015
Work-life balance	Purpose of Life	.822	1	.822	2.422	.121	.010
	Environmental Mastery	.044	1	.044	.149	.700	.001
	Autonomy	.056	1	.056	.128	.721	.001
	Positive Relations	.105	1	.105	.287	.593	.001
	Self-Acceptance	.086	1	.086	.237	.627	.001
	Personal Growth	.765	1	.765	1.960	.163	.008
Stress	Purpose of Life	165.718	2	82.859	244.179	.000	.661
	Environmental Mastery	79.145	2	39.573	135.442	.000	.520
	Autonomy	159.304	2	79.652	183.425	.000	.595
	Positive Relations	174.344	2	87.172	237.585	.000	.655
	Self-Acceptance	158.513	2	79.256	217.357	.000	.635

	Environmental Mastery	73.043	250	.292					
	Autonomy	108.562	250	.434					
	Positive Relations	91.727	250	.367					
	Self-Acceptance	91.159	250	.365					
	Personal Growth	97.531	250	.390					
	Purpose of Life	3052.245	255						
Total	Environmental Mastery	2917.828	255						
	Autonomy	2981.796	255						
	Positive Relations	3176.810	255						
	Self-Acceptance	3068.379	255						
	Personal Growth	3275.501	255						
	Purpose of Life	256.255	254						
	Environmental Mastery	152.877	254						
	Autonomy	269.672	254						
	Positive Relations	269.669	254						
	Self-Acceptance	255.209	254						
	Personal Growth	279.772	254						
	Personal Growth	178.535		2	89.268	228.819	.000	.647	
Error	Purpose of Life	84.834		250	.339				

Table 7
Continues

a. R Squared = .669 (Adjusted R Squared = .664)
b. R Squared = .522 (Adjusted R Squared = .515)
c. R Squared = .597 (Adjusted R Squared = .591)
d. R Squared = .660 (Adjusted R Squared = .654)
e. R Squared = .643 (Adjusted R Squared = .637)
f. R Squared = .651 (Adjusted R Squared = .646)

The results from the parameter estimate Table 8 indicate that work-life balance and low and moderate stress levels are statistically significant and influencing the outcome of the dependent variable purpose of life keeping high-level stress as reference. Similarly, all other five psychological well-being variables are influenced by a low and moderate level of stress with high stress as reference. Statistically, significant differences can be observed among work-life balance on the psychological well-being variables positive relations, self-acceptance, and personal growth.
 From the Tukey posthoc results (Table 9) it can be observed that the factor work-life balance had statistically significantly higher mean scores for low, moderate, and high-stress levels (Asaad et al., 2014). Similarly, the purpose of life the values are statistically significant for low and moderate stress not with High-level stress. Self-Acceptance is not statistically significant to the posthoc test not

627

carried out. The factors positive relations, personal growth, and environmental mastery had statistically significant higher means scores with low and moderate level of stress but not with higher levels of stress.

Table 8
Parameter Estimates

Dependent Variable	Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Partial Eta Squared
Purpose of Life	Intercept	4.681	.202	23.140	.000	4.282	5.079	.682
	Work-life balance	.240	.083	2.877	.004	.076	.405	.032
	Age	-.105	.067	-1.556	.121	-.238	.028	.010
	[SL=1.00]	-3.244	.169	-19.162	.000	-3.578	-2.911	.595
	[SL=2.00]	-1.323	.148	-8.912	.000	-1.615	-1.030	.241
	[SL=3.00]	0ª	.	.	.	.	.	.
Environmental mastery	Intercept	4.480	.188	23.868	.000	4.110	4.849	.695
	Work-life balance	.055	.077	.706	.481	-.098	.207	.002
	Age	-.024	.063	-.386	.700	-.147	.099	.001
	[SL=1.00]	-2.352	.157	-14.968	.000	-2.661	-2.042	.473
	[SL=2.00]	-1.102	.138	-8.002	.000	-1.373	-.831	.204
	[SL=3.00]	0ª	.	.	.	.	.	.
Autonomy	Intercept	4.741	.229	20.722	.000	4.291	5.192	.632
	work-life balance	.122	.094	1.291	.198	-.064	.308	.007
	Age	-.027	.076	-.358	.721	-.178	.123	.001
	[SL=1.00]	-3.245	.192	-16.944	.000	-3.623	-2.868	.535
	[SL=2.00]	-1.403	.168	-8.357	.000	-1.734	-1.072	.218
	[SL=3.00]	0ª	.	.	.	.	.	.
Positive relations	Intercept	4.733	.210	22.501	.000	4.318	5.147	.669
	Work-life balance	.205	.087	2.366	.019	.034	.376	.022
	Age	-.038	.070	-.535	.593	-.176	.101	.001
	[SL=1.00]	-3.322	.176	-18.866	.000	-3.668	-2.975	.587
	[SL=2.00]	-1.347	.154	-8.726	.000	-1.650	-1.043	.233
	[SL=3.00]	0ª	.	.	.	.	.	.
Selfacceptance	Intercept	4.533	.210	21.619	.000	4.120	4.946	.652
	Work-life balance	.275	.087	3.177	.002	.104	.445	.039
	Age	-.034	.070	-.487	.627	-.172	.104	.001
	[SL=1.00]	-3.182	.176	-18.128	.000	-3.527	-2.836	.568
	[SL=2.00]	-1.307	.154	-8.498	.000	-1.610	-1.004	.224
	[SL=3.00]	0ª	.	.	.	.	.	.
Personal growth	Intercept	4.805	.217	22.154	.000	4.378	5.232	.663
	Work-life balance	.177	.090	1.975	.049	.000	.353	.015
	Age	-.101	.072	-1.400	.163	-.244	.041	.008
	[SL=1.00]	-3.276	.182	-18.045	.000	-3.634	-2.919	.566
	[SL=2.00]	-1.230	.159	-7.727	.000	-1.543	-.916	.193

[SL=3.00]	0^a	.	.	.	.	.	.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Table 9.
Post-hoc comparisons of three low, moderate and high-level stress for dependent variables

Factor	Low stress (n = 75)	Moderate stress (n = 275)	High stress (n = 76)
Work-life balance	3.23 ± 0.0207^c	3.76 ± 0.0213^b	4.57 ± 0.0412^a
Purpose of life	3.25 ± 0.102^b	3.86 ± 0.0376^a	4.18 ± 0.0718^a
Self-Acceptance	3.87 ± 0.0767	4.13 ± 0.0385	4.28 ± 0.0514
Positive relations	3.45 ± 0.0956^b	4.17 ± 0.0351^a	4.21 ± 0.0585^a
Personal growth	3.94 ± 0.0966^b	4.19 ± 0.0356^a	4.36 ± 0.0889^a
Environmental mastery	3.59 ± 0.0789^b	4.25 ± 0.0333^a	3.89 ± 0.0891^a

Values are means ± SEM.
Means in a row without a common superscript letter differ ($P<0.05$) as analyzed by one-way ANOVA and the TUKEY test

Conclusions

Upon surveying the remote working women employees, the study reveals that remote working women employees experience a moderate level of stress.   The employee also experiences stress due to commutation problems during Covid-19. Role conflict is another factor causing stress and affecting psychological well-being and work-life balance. On average, the participants felt, that two hours a day they are spending for commutation. Workplace isolation, absence of peers' advice, missing fun also causing stress and impacting the psychological well-being of women employees who are working remotely. The technology available is enough for the women employees to work remotely. Most of our findings are similar to the studies of Prasad et al., (2020), Aderibigbe et al., (2021), and Tommasi et a.., (2021).   These studies reported the stress, psychological well-being and psychological disease, and occupational stress of Italian firefighters and Nigerian graduate employees respectively. The researchers used one-way ANOVA, t-test, MANOVA, and follow-up ANOVAs and posthoc comparisons. The authors also carried out the MANOVA, one-way ANOVA, and posthoc comparisons in the present study and reported the results.

Limitations and Suggestions

The study was carried out when the second wave of the Covid-19 pandemic in its peak from April to Mid-June 2021. The author has published the questionnaire and provided the link to the women employees working IT-enabled sector. The study is limited geographically to Hyderabad Metro city. The authors strongly recommend carry out similar types of studies across Indian metro stations. Though the study has been conducted in Hyderabad the results can be generalized as the authors have taken all the care from measuring internal consistencies, reliabilities, fulfilled all the assumptions that are required general linear model univariate analysis. Gender parity tests with men employees will reveal more findings and the author suggest in this direction to carry out future studies.

References

Annamalai, S., &Nandagopal, R. (2014). Occupational stress: A study of employee stress in Indian ITES industry (Vol. 1). Allied Publishers.

Assaad H, Zhou L, Carroll RJ, Wu G (2014). Rapid publication-ready MS-Word tables for one-way ANOVA. SpringerPlus3, 474

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. psychometrika, 16(3), 297-334

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.

Hardill, I., Green, A. (2003). Remote working—altering the spatial contours of work and home in the new economy. New Technology, Work and Employment, 18(3), 212-222 Prasad KDV. (2021). Remote Working Challenges and Opportunities during Covid-19

Pandemic. Journal of Business Strategy, Finance and Management. 2(1&2):1-

Prasad, D. K., Mangipudi, D. M. R., Vaidya, D. R., Muralidhar, B. (2020). Organizational climate, opportunities, challenges and psychological wellbeing of the remote working employees during COVID-19 pandemic: a general linear model approach with reference to information technology industry in hyderabad. International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology (IJARET), 11(4).

Prasad, D. K., Mangipudi, D., Rao, M. (2021). A General Linear Model Approach:

Development Of Psychological Well-Being, Remote Working, Employee Engagement,

Job Satisfaction, Scales, Data Analysis and Reporting Concerning to Information Technology Sector. Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government, 27(1), 1006-1035.

Prasad, K. D. V., Mangipudi, M. R. (2020). The Post-Covid19 Pandemic Back to workplace Policies and Procedures: A Case Study with Reference to Agricultural Research Sector, Hyderabad. European Journal of Business and Management Research, 5(4).

Prasad, K. D. V., Vaidya, R. W., Mangipudi, M. R. (2020). Effect of occupational stress and remote working on psychological well-being of employees: an empirical analysis during covid-19 pandemic concerning information technology industry in hyderabad. Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies, 11(2), 1-13

Remote work. (2020). New to remote work? Here are answers to all of your burning questions — including what it is and why people do it. https://www.remoteyear.com/resources/intro-to-remote-work

Ryff, C. D., Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal of personality and social psychology, 69(4), 719.

Ryff, C.D., Singer, B.H., Love, G.D. (2004) Positive health: connecting wellbeing with biology. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, 359, 1383-1394.

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.

William Trochim, K. M. (2006). Types of reliability. Research Methods Knowledge Base. Web Center for Social Research Methods. http://www. socialresearchmethods. net/kb/reltypes. php.

Wrike. (2020). What is Remote work. https://www.wrike.com/remote-work-guide/what-isremote-work

Christy, Veena, and S. Duraisamy. "Influence of Psychological Contract Breach on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Mediating Effects of Authentic Leadership Style and Psychological Well-Being-a Working Paper." International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research (IJHRMR) 4 (2014): 69-76.

Zarabi, Puneet Sandhu1& Dazy. "Self-Regulated Strategy: Effect on Self-Efficacy and WellBeing of Students with Learning Disability." International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research (IJHRMR) 9 (2019): 29-38.

Varghese, Reney, T. Selvin Norman, and Samuel Thavaraj. "Perceived stress and self-efficacy among college students: A global review." International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research 5.3 (2015): 15-24.

Sundharavadivel, G., and B. Zipporah Matilda. "A Study on Occupational Stress among Working Womens." International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research (Ijhrmr) 8.6 (2018): 113-120.

Verma, Jyotsna, and Archana Kumari. "A study on addiction to social networking sites and psychological well-being among working adults.„." International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences" (IJHSS) (2016): 5-153.