



Technology Infiltration: Permeable Boundaries and Work-Life Spillover Experiences among Academics in the United Kingdom During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Journal:	<i>Personnel Review</i>
Manuscript ID	PR-10-2022-0693.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Keywords:	ICT, work-life spillover, higher education institutions, academics, united kingdom
Methodologies:	Qualitative

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Technology Infiltration: Permeable Boundaries and Work-Life Spillover Experiences**
4
5 **among Academics in the United Kingdom During the COVID-19 Pandemic**
6
7

8 **Abstract**
9

10
11 **Purpose** – This study explored the challenges academics faced with work structures during the
12 COVID-19 pandemic and their implications for their work-life balance (WLB).
13

14
15 **Design** – Relying on the interpretative paradigm and the qualitative research method, the
16 dataset consists of semi-structured interviews with 43 academics in the United Kingdom.
17

18
19 **Findings** – Our findings indicate that academics in the UK experience issues around increased
20 boundary permeability between work and nonwork domains and role overlap, which engender
21 the transfer of negative rather than positive spillover experiences and exacerbate negative
22 consequences to the well-being of academics. ICTs also reinforced gendered work-family
23 boundaries and generated more negative work-life/family spillover for women than for men.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 **Practical implications** – Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) need to address ICT-related
35 health issues through better work designs and HR initiatives that respond to the health
36 requirements of academics. Policymakers should be futuristic and ensure comprehensive work-
37 life policies for academics, which are necessary for humanising overall organisational well-
38 being.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 **Originality** – Although COVID-19 challenges are common to all workers, the experiences and
47 effects on specific workers (in this case, UK academics) within specific national jurisdictions
48 play out differentially, and they are often experienced with different levels of depth and
49 intensity.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 **Keywords:** ICT, work-life spillover, higher education institutions, academics, United
57 Kingdom
58
59
60

Introduction

The spread of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic to over 150 countries, leading to a global crisis and forcing many economies to shut down (World Health Organisation, 2020), led to many organisations adopting teleworking and remote working practices, particularly working from home (Nash and Churchill, 2020). In a sense, this formed part of the global cost and impact of the crisis, which clearly has implications for academics' work and family life and the broad literature on employee well-being. The emphasis on UK academics is due to their familiar experiences with remote work (and telework), even though the COVID-19 pandemic altered the dynamics of remote work. According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS; 2020a), remote/homeworking increased from approximately 5% pre-pandemic to 46.6% at the beginning of the lockdown and remained high, at least until the pandemic's peak. While there are currently no official statistics for UK academics who worked from home during the pandemic, most universities in the UK were reported to have closed their physical doors and transitioned to online delivery (ONS, 2020b).

The work-from-home debates have oscillated around the degree, type and levels of role involvement, competence needed, and activities undertaken (Cottingham et al., 2020; Akanji et al., 2022). The whole idea of managing and controlling workers beyond the traditional occupational environment or in workers' homes raises several personal, organisational and societal concerns (Nash and Churchill, 2020), such as the decreased perception of employees' flexibility-ability, lower levels of productivity, loss of managerial control and social isolation (Adisa et al., 2022). Now that the pandemic appears to have passed its toughest phase, with academics beginning to engage in more in-person interactions on campus, at least for their teaching roles, it is important to reflect and examine their experiences of managing their work and nonwork lives during the crisis. Therefore, this study explores a fundamental question: what challenges did academics face with work structures during the pandemic and its

1
2
3 implications for their work-life balance? Therefore, we consider academics' work structures,
4 including the intensified use of technology and the increased regularity of working from home
5 during the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 crisis offers a unique opportunity to examine
6 these work structures and the experiences of work-life spillover as the subjective, role-based
7 component that taps the degree to which academics experienced intrusion between their work
8 and nonwork life. We locate our work broadly within spillover theory and work-life balance.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Undertaking a study such as this is valuable since it could reflexively furnish organisations
19 with rich insights into remote/teleworking experiences and their implications for work-life
20 balance. Hence, it would stimulate organisations to intensify their efforts in facilitating human
21 resource management strategies that could improve academic career experiences. Specifically,
22 this paper contributes in two ways. First, we contribute to theorising work-life spillover by
23 advancing our knowledge of academics' experiences with work-life spillover by demonstrating
24 how technology infiltration may increase border permeability and intensify negative spillover
25 experiences, especially during crises. Second, we call attention to the need to avoid
26 counterproductive behaviours caused by ICTs in the workplace by creating reasonable
27 structures, processes and employee-compassionate and supportive WLB policies, particularly
28 during times of crisis. We argue that the routine invasion of academics' nonwork time by work
29 time through technologies structured to manage workers away from the workplace has weighty
30 implications for perceptions of job satisfaction or discontent and feelings of detachment. This,
31 in turn, nurtures hostile workers' responses and behaviours with potential disadvantageous
32 effects, resulting in organisational inefficiency, loss of quality and continuous production and
33 profit. Essentially, comprehensive work-life policies for households are necessary for
34 humanising overall organisational well-being.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57
58 The paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we review the salient literature on work-
59 life balance/spillover and then provide an overview of our empirical research focus. Next, we
60

1
2
3 explain our research methodology. In the penultimate section, we present the findings from our
4
5 empirical inquiry. We conclude the paper by discussing our findings and research implications
6
7 for theory and practice.
8
9

10 **Work-Life Balance, Spillover and ICT**

11
12
13
14 Work-life balance equates to an individual's ability to successfully integrate work and nonwork
15
16 roles with little or no role conflicts (Barber et al., 2019). The concept of WLB is
17
18 organisationally targeted at facilitating the individual worker's well-being without adversely
19
20 affecting organisational productivity (Beauregard, 2014; Boiarintseva and Richardson, 2019).
21
22 It should invariably promote employee flexibility regarding when, how, and where work can
23
24 be performed (Adisa et al., 2022; Akanji et al., 2022). Many conceptualisations and theories
25
26 have been espoused on work-life/family balance. Guest (2002) and Naithani (2010) include
27
28 segmentation, spillover, compensation, instrumental and conflict theories. Several academics
29
30 (e.g., Dilworth 2004) within the work-family literature have pointed out the mix-up created by
31
32 the use of multiple concepts such as spillover, role strain, role permeability, stress crossover,
33
34 stress contagion, compensation, segmentation, conflict, congruence, instrumental, integrative
35
36 and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. Dilworth (2004) has called for better lucidity
37
38 of the terminology used in the literature.
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 One useful way of conceptualising the relationship between work-life and personal-life is
46
47 through the notion of spillovers. In contrast to the underlying assumptions of segmentation
48
49 theory, where work and life are regarded as two distinct spheres of an individual's life and do
50
51 not influence one another (Kreiner et al., 2009), spillover theory suggests that work and life are
52
53 integrated and cannot be separated (Schnettler et al., 2020). However, work and family domains
54
55 are distinct settings with varied features and tasks. Moreover, sometimes, work-home
56
57 boundaries become blurred, permeable, and infused in each other (Adisa et al., 2022), with
58
59
60

1
2
3 spillover occurring as individuals operate as conduits emitting and transferring negative and
4
5 positive feelings within both milieus (Schnettler et al., 2020).
6
7

8 The concept of spillover occurs where the worker is highly involved within work and nonwork
9
10 roles or when there are pressures and overlap between issues that border on “integration (of
11
12 time, place, people and activities within the work), personality (behaviour, mood), skills, and
13
14 cultural pressures at work or home” (Staines 1980). For (Googins, 1991, p. 9), “spillover refers
15
16 to positive and negative feelings, attitudes, and behaviours that might emerge in one domain
17
18 and are carried over into the other”. Spillover theory suggests that individuals transmit their
19
20 feelings, attitudinal approaches, skills and behaviours from the work domain into their personal
21
22 life and vice versa (Sok et al., 2014). These role experiences can positively or negatively impact
23
24 an individual’s experience or role satisfaction within the work and nonwork domains (Catano
25
26 et al., 2010).
27
28
29
30

31
32 In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, separating the working environment from the
33
34 home/living environment and blending work and family time was one of the difficulties of
35
36 working from home (Geraghty et al., 2022). Therefore, given that the majority of those who
37
38 worked from home experienced imposed integration of the work and home domains, it raises
39
40 a concern regarding the deliberate awareness of preventing negative work-to-home spillover
41
42 (Adisa et al., 2022; Syrek et al., 2022). Furthermore, studies such as Wang et al. (2021) have
43
44 reported that the reduced social support from coworkers during the pandemic was another
45
46 challenge for employees working from home. This is because working from home may result
47
48 in isolation, prevent employees from collaborating with their coworkers, and limit their access
49
50 to supervisors and managers, thus making it more challenging to feel like a team member and
51
52 receive help when necessary, exacerbating negative spillovers. However, this is not to say that
53
54 the pandemic only resulted in negative spillover experiences, as a few studies have also
55
56 identified that employees who employ effective boundary management (crisis) strategies tend
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to experience positive spillovers (Metselaar et al., 2022) or reduce excessive negative spillovers
4
5 (Adisa et al., 2022).
6
7

8 Spillover is often segmented into work-to-family and family-to-work categories (Dilworth,
9
10 2004). Numerous studies utilising the work-to-family and family-to-work categories
11
12 (Dilworth, 2004; Cottingham et al., 2020) have found, among many other findings, that gender-
13
14 based divisions still exist, both in time obligations and gender-segmented tasks in the division
15
16 of housework and childcare chores. Studies such as Sok et al. (2014) have identified that
17
18 families could suffer negative spillover if they have several young children, which could drain
19
20 working parents/caretakers. More specifically, in a crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic,
21
22 studies such as Adisa et al. (2022) have demonstrated that academics working from home may
23
24 suffer from inflexible rather than flexible boundaries, which may result in experiences of
25
26 negative spillovers. In a different study, Akanji et al. (2022) argued that the COVID-19 crisis'
27
28 increasing blurring of the lines separating work and family life also contributed to the finite
29
30 nature of resources (physical, mental and emotional), which means that repeated demands in
31
32 one domain reduce the availability of resources and limit what is left for optimal functioning
33
34 in the other domain, leading to negative work-to-home and home-to-work spillover effects.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Although spillover theory is well known in the WLB subfield, there are criticisms of this model.
42
43 According to Guest (2002), spillover theory is generally referred to as the generalisation
44
45 model/theory. However, this generalisation allows the model to be useful for this exploratory
46
47 study (Staines, 1980; Schnettler et al., 2020). Spillover theory is also instrumental when
48
49 detailed propositions about nature, causes, and spillover consequences are identified for the
50
51 specific study (Guest, 2002). Although spillover is usually seen in either positive or negative
52
53 light, they can coexist to some extent (Li et al., 2021). For instance, a job that provides a high
54
55 degree of negative spillover due to long hours and stress generated by long working hours can
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 transfer or spill over to the home life domain. At the same time, the positivity of a high salary
4 paid job could enhance positive family experiences (Schnettler et al., 2020).
5
6

7
8 Furthermore, since the advent of technology, the work environment has become more dynamic,
9 generating implications for the future of work (Barber et al., 2019). Several ICTs have emerged
10 to enhance flexible working (e.g., telework) that promotes work-life balance (Boell et al.,
11 2016). Technology has successfully created hybrid workspaces that promote work
12 respatialisation and changed organisations' structural design and managerial practices
13 (Holtgrewe, 2014). Technology continues to engender the creation of virtual offices and
14 promotes remote/teleworking among employees (Boell et al., 2016). In a sense, employees can
15 control and manage how they combine their work responsibilities and personal commitments
16 (Schnettler et al., 2020). Sok et al. (2014) argue that ICTs can boost the psychological well-
17 being of employees absent from home and family.
18
19

20
21 Despite the benefits of using technology at work to enhance work-life balance, extant research
22 also highlights its adverse effect. Note that there is an increasing concern that technology usage
23 after regular work hours engenders significant implications for WLB (Barber et al., 2019;
24 Siegert and Löwstedt, 2019). Many studies have argued that ICTs increase the level of work
25 interference in the domestic space and increase permeability between the two domains, making
26 it difficult to maintain boundaries (Ladkin et al., 2016; Fernandez and Shaw, 2020; Nash and
27 Churchill, 2020). Moreover, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, studies have revealed
28 that the rising reliance on ICTs has the potential to increase technostress, a form of stress that
29 can be brought on by using technology (Ma et al., 2021). For instance, Califf and Brooks (2020)
30 noted how technostress resulting from information overload, technology malfunctions, an
31 unbalanced work-life schedule, and cyberbullying could contribute to burnout among teachers.
32 In another study, Mushtaque et al. (2022) found a negative correlation between technostress
33 and readiness to employ online learning among academics during the pandemic. Their research
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emphasised how technostress brought on by a mismatch between academics and other
4 university-related factors can negatively affect academics' performance, resulting in job
5 burnout and even escalating the perception of job insecurity. Against this backdrop, we
6
7
8
9
10 examine academics' work structures, including the intensified use of technology and the
11
12 increased regularity of working from home due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
13
14

15 **Work-Life Balance in Academia**

16
17
18 Extant literature has moved forward the debate on the work-life balance of academics,
19 especially in the Western hemisphere, where technology usage is well-versed (Catano et al.,
20 2010; Husin et al., 2018). Generally, academics are characterised as having large amounts of
21 work autonomy and flexibility; they are often their own supervisors despite being employees
22 (Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013). Regardless of the high level of work flexibility, academics
23 also battle with work intensity and long working hours, resulting in severe burnout symptoms,
24 low levels of job satisfaction, high stress levels, sleeplessness, and struggles with achieving
25 WLB (Husin et al., 2018). More often than their men counterparts, women academics face
26 these challenges to the detriment of their physical and psychological well-being, given that
27 they take up more domestic work than men (Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Specifically, the focus on UK academics relates to their familiarity with working remotely,
43 although the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the dynamics of remote/teleworking,
44 particularly for academics (Adisa et al., 2022). This is because remote working may be
45 problematic for academics who often find their jobs mentally taxing and sometimes physically
46 and emotionally exhausting due to the need to “possess a superhero ability to multitask” (Times
47 Higher Education, 2016), among several commitments besides teaching that needs to be
48 fulfilled. Accordingly, it may be challenging for academics to cope, particularly in the home
49 environment where the freedom to engage productively may be lacking due to the perceived
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 blurring of boundaries, as was the case during the COVID-19 crisis (Adisa et al., 2022). For
4 academics working from home with children's presence, finding a suitable workspace poses a
5 different challenge. In addition, fostering a positive attitude toward work and personal life
6 amidst the constant usage of ICTs to perform work-related tasks may also engender significant
7 threats to their WLB. Thus, the higher education (HE) sector as the research context was
8 deemed appropriate to examine academics' work-life spillover experiences during the COVID-
9 19 lockdown. Even though this study focused on academics, we recognise that not all HE staff
10 had the choice to work remotely, as some nonacademics (especially essential workers) were
11 required to work on campus.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 More broadly, academics appear to have weaker boundaries between their work and life
25 domains, which makes them prone to work-home boundary violation, where a total mental
26 disconnection from work proves abortive (Ashforth et al., 2000; Kreiner et al., 2009). For
27 Santos (2015), academics' WLB experiences can be grouped into two categories. On the one
28 hand, they experience complementarity between work and family; on the other hand, work and
29 family are subordinates of each other. Furthermore, work and family complementarity, which
30 was most evident in their study, was based on the assumption that work and family/personal
31 life are two distinct roles. Thus, based on the differences in the nature of the two roles,
32 academics find it arduous to prioritise rather, they make them complementary to each other
33 (Santos, 2015). The subordination between work and life depends on the academic's personal
34 identity, values and career ambitions. Research suggests that older academics are often family-
35 oriented; hence, they slow their work pace to make themselves available for other nonwork-
36 related activities (Toffoletti and Starr, 2016). Conversely, younger academics tend to be career-
37 oriented, and with technological advancement, they allocate a significant amount of time to
38 work over their personal commitments. In addition, studies such as Santos (2015) have also
39 noted that the effects of work-family complementarity and boundary-crossing in relation to
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 work-life strategies vary and depend on academics' career stage. The study suggests that early-
4 career academics may more likely encounter work-life conflict since they frequently juggle
5 personal obligations with new teaching and research commitments. Conversely, mid-career
6 academics may find it easier to achieve work-life balance since they are more likely to have
7 more time to establish work-home routines. However, late-career academics may be more
8 likely to enjoy work-family flexibility due to their potential greater control over their workload
9 and obligations.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Therefore, it will be interesting to examine the challenges academics encountered with work
21 structures during the pandemic and their effects on their WLB in light of the difficulties
22 surrounding the COVID-19 crisis and the new strategies being debated or implemented by
23 employers to ingrain the hybridity of current work designs, which permit academics to work
24 from the traditional workplace and increasingly at home.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 32 **Methods**

33
34
35 This study adopted a qualitative method deemed fit to explore in-depth academics' lived
36 experiences to provide rich insights into the researched phenomenon and allow academics to
37 provide a detailed account of their experiences with work structures during the COVID-19
38 crisis. This study was guided by interpretivism, allowing the researchers to discover rich
39 narratives from individuals' lived experiences (Saunders et al., 2019). This approach was used
40 following the authors' interest in obtaining an in-depth understanding of the researched
41 phenomenon by drawing inferences from the patterns that occurred during the event (Creswell
42 and Creswell, 2018).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Our study adopted purposive and snowball sampling. Given the decision to focus on the HE
55 sector – where the researchers belong – we began searching for participants starting with some
56 of our friends and acquaintances who further nominated some of theirs that fit our research
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 enquiry. While this may come with some ethical considerations, such as selection bias towards
4 social groups and power imbalances (Saunders et al., 2019), we ensured that fieldwork
5 interactions were established in accordance with the research project by providing participants
6 with an information sheet to ensure that they were well informed of the research purpose and
7 promoting transparency throughout the process. Moreover, these sampling techniques were
8 cost and time effective for our kind of research that does not rely on funds from major grant-
9 awarding bodies. Participants were solicited across the four geopolitical regions in the UK –
10 Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England. After completing 38 interviews, we reached
11 data saturation, where no new information was recorded, but we conducted 5 more interviews
12 to substantiate the existing themes. Overall, 43 academics across 12 universities were recruited
13 as our study participants and comprised academics from all university ranks (see Table I for
14 detailed demographic details).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Please insert Table I about here

Data were collected using video conferencing platforms, including Zoom, Skype and Microsoft Teams. This communication medium was deemed appropriate to reach a wider demographic of academics in the UK. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions were considered suitable for allowing the participants to express their views on the subject in a detailed manner (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). The interviews, lasting an average of 40 minutes, were audio and video recorded and stored on an encrypted storage device for security purposes. In addition, following standard research ethical procedures, pseudonyms (e.g., Participant 1, 2...43) were used to conceal the participants' real identities (Saunders et al., 2019), as promised to the participants in the consent form.

To address our main research question, we created an interview protocol (see Appendix I) based on the research objective and literature review, consisting of leading questions

1
2
3 complemented by follow-up and probing questions based on the interviewee's replies. The
4
5 interviews began with open-ended questions. For instance, the participants were asked to
6
7 describe the nature of their work during the COVID-19 crisis, the challenges (if any) of using
8
9 ICTs while working from home, and the implications or consequences of these challenges for
10
11 their work and nonwork lives. These questions enabled the researchers to investigate if and
12
13 how the academics experienced work-life spillover. It propelled the participants to describe
14
15 their perceived ability to manage their work-related and nonwork-related roles while working
16
17 from home. It also enabled the researchers to examine the impact of ICTs on increasing border
18
19 permeability, leading to work-life spillover. It brings to our understanding the relationship
20
21 between ICT and work-life spillover in the context of the changes to work conditions as a result
22
23 of the pandemic. Along with building a strong rapport with the interviewees, we also ensured
24
25 that the interview questions were objective, non-threatening and non-embarrassing to reduce
26
27 social desirability bias throughout the interviews.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Following the interviews, data were transcribed by the second and third authors, after which
35
36 the first author carefully reviewed the recordings to ensure that the information gathered was
37
38 captured and recorded verbatim. Furthermore, the first and second authors adopted the thematic
39
40 analysis procedure (TAP) to manually uncover the main themes and sub-themes that emerged
41
42 from the interview extracts. TAP enables researchers to discover key themes arising from data
43
44 by focusing on the similarities and differences within the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). To do
45
46 this, we developed a coding frame (see Table II). Starting with the open-order coding
47
48 technique, we created several thematic categories and used axial coding to further categorise
49
50 the data into higher-order themes (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Following the infusion of work
51
52 into the academics' domestic space, we also uncovered evidence of the spillover effect, where
53
54 negative and positive feelings, attitudes, and behaviours were transferred within both milieus.
55
56 After uncovering the key themes, the third author carefully compared the notes to reflect
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 critically on the information gathered. Finally, all authors revisited the themes to ensure that
4 the patterns were consistent with the research questions. The patterns revealed the experiences
5 and understanding of academics relating to their work-life balance.
6
7
8
9

10
11 *Please insert Table II about here*
12

13 **Findings and Discussion**

14 **Experiences of academics' work-life spillover during the COVID-19 pandemic**

15
16
17 Our findings were divided into five key themes: (1) technostress-induced spillover, (2) work
18 demand and intensification, (3) intrusion of work and nonwork roles, (4) gender role strain and
19 spousal support, and (5) health and emotional challenges.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Technostress-induced spillover*

27
28
29 A dominant spillover factor raised by all the participants is using ICTs to perform their work-
30 related responsibilities. The use of ICT in UK higher education institutions (HEIs) is not novel,
31 as academics utilise them for teaching and nonteaching (e.g., meetings and administration)
32 responsibilities (Nash and Churchill, 2020; Adisa et al., 2022). In our study, the common ICTs
33 identified and used by the participants included Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Skype, Blackboard
34 Collaborate, Panopto, Moodle, Canvas, Padlet and Kahoot. However, our findings show that
35 the difficulties with using ICTs for many academics (particularly those who were less tech-
36 savvy) were having such a vast array of ICTs that it became overwhelming to learn and interact
37 with them, especially within a short timeframe due to the sudden advent of the pandemic. **Our**
38 **participants claimed to have found it challenging to deal with such issues, especially given that**
39 **new technologies not necessarily popularised within academia pre-pandemic were developed**
40 **to cater to the transition to online delivery during the pandemic.** With the crisis leading to
41 changes in academics' work structures, a significant finding is that ICTs led to stress-related
42 spillover experiences for most participants **(at least 70%), regardless of their age or career**
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **stage.** The prevalence of ‘technostress’ – an adaptive deficiency and stress-inducing situation
4
5 caused by the inability to cope with new technologies (Ma et al., 2021) – triggered negative
6
7 spillover experiences among most academics. The following quotations typify some of the
8
9 shared views of the respondents:
10
11
12

13 *Some of these virtual platforms are unfamiliar to me because they are just too many; I’m*
14 *learning about them as I go. I encounter several technical difficulties, especially when*
15 *using them during the pandemic. For example, when students were unable to see the*
16 *lecture slides that I thought were displayed on the screen, I had to spend time speaking*
17 *to the technical team [from home] for assistance. This was extremely difficult for me*
18 *because it was mentally and physically draining, let alone embarrassment. (Participant*
19 *19)*
20
21

22 *It is annoying and frustrating that although working from home should, in theory, bring*
23 *me closer to my family, I discovered that having a constant online presence [during the*
24 *pandemic] is equivalent to working in an office away from home. It’s worse if you are a*
25 *module leader or take up administrative responsibilities because the university requested*
26 *us to respond to students’ issues within 48 working hours. When you have to perform*
27 *other things besides administrative work, such as teaching and research, how do you*
28 *accomplish this aim by responding to a tonne of emails during regular business hours?*
29 *(Participant 1)*
30
31

32 The above quotes, like many others, revealed that ICTs contributed to technostress. The
33 participants implied that the unpreparedness of their universities for the pandemic, similar to
34 most other organisations even outside of academia, increased the demands of working from
35 home and changed their work structures **compared to pre-pandemic conditions**. For example,
36 the increased need for synchronous and asynchronous teaching meant that the academics
37 needed extra private time to record lectures, upload lecture materials and attend to several
38 emails (especially from students), which could have been better managed in a face-to-face
39 learning environment. The common notion was that the increased usage of ICTs during the
40 pandemic engendered more work pressure than pre-pandemic and induced technostress for
41 academics. For instance, Participant 25 remarked, “we were treated like lecturers that were
42 originally engaged to do online teaching”.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Similar to other studies (Ayyagari et al., 2011, Harris et al., 2021), our findings demonstrate
4 that during the COVID-19 crisis, technostress from information overload, rising workload, and
5 prolonged online presence caused panic, stress, mental fatigue, and physical exhaustion for
6 many academics. Most participants felt compulsive and forced to constantly connect to work,
7 respond to work-related issues in real time, and exchange continuous updates with work
8 colleagues. Consequently, they made references to the spillover of stress, anxiety and
9 exhaustion (both physical and mental) between work-life domains. Broadly, they implied that
10 fatigue resulting from navigating several ICTs and dealing with prolonged online presence
11 impacted their ability to spend quality time and enjoy considerable satisfaction from interacting
12 with family members despite being at home with them. Recent studies such as Hung et al.
13 (2015) and Harris et al. (2021) have confirmed technostress as a managerial problem across
14 organisations, mostly in technologically dependent working environments (e.g., HEIs), where
15 constant online presence is required at work. A corollary to the increased use of ICT is around
16 work intensity tipping over and spilling into family or nonwork relationships. For instance,
17 when asked if their constant use of ICTs had implications on their attitudes and behaviour with
18 family members, some participants (both male and female) reported a transfer of aggression
19 and negative behaviours resulting in work-to-family negative spillover experiences:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *The stress from persistent online presence at work can be dangerous for family members*
44 *because it can transmit negative attitudes. (Participant 2)*

46 *I noticed that my regular use of ICTs, even on the weekends, enabled the transfer of*
47 *excessive hostility to others, particularly my children, who at intervals demanded*
48 *attention and became recalcitrant when not given. (Participant 16)*
49

50 These experiences emerge from technostress, labelled psychological responses to negative
51 experiences of using ICTs in modern workplaces (Ma et al., 2021), thus generating negative
52 spillover experiences. Furthermore, the COVID-19 crisis made it more common for negative
53 work-life spillover experiences to occur, leading to increased mental exhaustion for many
54 academics than pre-pandemic. This is especially true for those who are poor at self-care and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 even worse for those who exhibit some degree of masochism. Therefore, their experiences of
4 work-to-family or family-to-work spillovers are inevitable, as they transfer negative
5 behaviours and attitudes between both milieus. Our participants' negative work-life spillover
6 experiences corroborate four out of five techno-stressors discussed in Tarafdar et al.'s (2011)
7 study. First, academics experienced techno-overload resulting from ICT use, necessitating
8 faster and longer work, such as responding quickly to emails and organising work meetings.
9
10 Second, they were also exposed to techno-invasion associated with their constant connectivity
11 to work that intruded into their personal time and space. Additionally, techno-complexity
12 emerged from the need to find time and exert efforts to learn and interact with the diverse ICTs
13 needed to perform their work-related responsibilities. Last, ICTs expose academics to techno-
14 uncertainty, depriving them of the chance to develop a core understanding of initial
15 technologies resulting from constant updates. **While these encounters are not particularly novel
16 to academics, they were not as prevalent pre-pandemic.**

33 *Work demand and intensification*

34
35 An assessment of the nature of academics' work during the heat of the pandemic also revealed
36 that working conditions deteriorated, with most participants experiencing an increased
37 workload and more intense work demands than pre-pandemic conditions. For the participants,
38 working from home required extra effort, leading to a dramatic increase in long working hours
39 for the majority. The average working time was 47 hours before COVID-19 and 61 hours
40 during COVID-19. The following quotations typify some of the shared views of the
41 respondents:
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 *Working from home made it difficult to maintain the self-discipline required to work from
54 9 am to 5 pm. I have my iPad, mobile phone, and laptop, and one of these gadgets will
55 be with me at any point in time. Therefore, you never know when you start reading an
56 email that pops up and feel compelled to answer even when it is outside my normal
57 working hours. The reality is, I will still have to answer at some point. (Participant 11)*
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Throughout the pandemic, I worked an average of over 72 hours weekly... I always felt like I was living on these online platforms... It appeared that there was no turning off from the moment you woke up until late at night ... it was like living at work. (Participant 27)

Notably, our research demonstrates that frontline academics who held administrative positions further up in the leadership cadre suffered longer working hours (mostly unregulated) and work intensity:

There was an increase in my workload. For instance, our teaching was extended to 15 weeks against the usual 12 weeks in my university. This was in an attempt to give more support to the students. In addition, I organised an extra hour for Q and A [questions and answers] for the students (as a way to further support them). At one point, I had approximately 176 pupils, just 20 of them showed up every week, and they were the same students. These Q and A sessions were not time-tabled, but I had to do it to reduce the failure rate and avoid having to mark more scripts as resits, given my previous experiences. All these were due to the work structures during the pandemic. The above is in addition to the fact that I was a module leader for many modules and had to create the contents and coordinate the visiting lecturers. With all these, I found it very challenging and impossible to work from 9 am to 5 pm. (Participant 18)

Generally, as academics witnessed the relocation of work into their domestic space, the time spent attending to work-related responsibilities increased drastically. This led to working from morning to late nights and more weekends than usual while attending to growing demands from an intense high-performance work environment. Particularly, the rising use of ICTs when working from home was the main cause of the lengthy and unstructured work hours, as several participants highlighted their experiences with “dwelling on these online platforms,” “increasing virtual meetings,” and “unending emails”. This growing and continuing phenomenon intensified the spillover of work to home as the boundaries between work and home became blurred (Fernandez and Shaw 2020).

Intrusion of work and nonwork roles

Boundary blurring due to the lockdown negatively impacted the ability to manage work and nonwork obligations across a vast majority of participants. Following the experiences of work

1
2
3 intensification and increased work demands, most participants struggled with their WLB as
4
5 they perceived significant intrusion of work into their personal and family space and vice versa:
6
7

8
9 *It isn't easy to delineate between work and nonwork activities, especially when working*
10 *entirely from home. While it is true that as academics, we ordinarily work from home,*
11 *the pandemic conditions made it more intense than ever, especially as work dragged till*
12 *late and emails kept flying around beyond 5 pm. This notwithstanding, it can be beneficial*
13 *working from home. I walked my dog every morning approximately 8 am after having*
14 *my bath, prepared something light for breakfast and got on with work, knowing fully well*
15 *that I would work till late. Even now that most academic activities are back to face-to-*
16 *face interactions, I'm still struggling with my WLB (Participant 17)*
17

18
19 In addition, the majority of participants mentioned cutting back on their time spent on personal
20
21 and familial activities due to being overwhelmed by their work-related activities. Therefore,
22
23 regardless of participants' marital status, the time spent on personal or family matters was
24
25 considered inadequate:
26
27

28
29 *It was harder to separate work and nonwork roles under the pandemic circumstances,*
30 *especially for me, who was also doing my doctorate at the time. My kitchen table was*
31 *permanently my study, and when working, family calls kept creeping in...students*
32 *became more demanding as they found themselves in the unshattered water. At a point,*
33 *I had to disconnect my official email from my mobile phone to reduce the pressure and*
34 *retain my sanity. COVID-19 was an extreme case of highly competing demands from*
35 *work and family commitments. My children kept complaining about not getting enough*
36 *attention... Work-life balance has never been more blurry. (Participant 33)*
37
38

39 Like the above quotation, participants frequently prioritised their work over personal and
40
41 familial roles, leaving them with little or no time to attend to other nonwork-related aspects of
42
43 their lives. While some academics reported having more time with their family, the majority
44
45 mentioned that familial responsibility sometimes interfered with their work activities, which
46
47 led to the transfer of negative emotions from home to work (family-to-work spillover).
48
49 Likewise, job dissatisfaction was another effect of feeling detached from both work and home:
50
51

52
53 *...Even more terrible was that the lockdown prevented my kids from attending school. I*
54 *sometimes had to play the role of a teacher to my kids, and when I could not do so because*
55 *of my work, they kept making distressing noises that interfered with my ability to get work*
56 *done. We occasionally yelled at one another nonstop. I was on the verge of insanity.*
57 *(Participant 22)*
58
59
60

1
2
3 *My work definitely affected my nonwork life at the height of the pandemic. I recall vividly*
4 *how I did not step out of my house in the first one hundred days of the lockdown, and I*
5 *did not realise it as I was overwhelmed with my work... My house was like a business or*
6 *call centre because the [virtual] meetings were very frequent...the use of digital*
7 *technologies triggered an imbalance in my work and nonwork roles, and I felt extremely*
8 *detached and dissatisfied. (Participant 5)*
9

10 Our findings are also consistent with the study of Ladkin et al. (2016), which found that
11
12 utilising ICT increases the permeability between work and nonwork roles and exacerbates work
13
14 intrusion into the domestic sphere. **Although spillovers are not a new phenomenon, the**
15 **COVID-19 crisis brought them to a new level of intensity due to the increased degree of**
16 **boundary blurring brought on by being confined at home. Compared to pre-pandemic**
17 **conditions, many academics experienced more negative spillovers from work-to-family and**
18 **family-to-work as the feelings and behaviours emerging from one domain were carried over to**
19 **another (Dilworth, 2004; Delanoije et al., 2019).**
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 A closer examination of the work structures during the crisis indicates that ICT builds bridges
31
32 across the work-life border. Individuals are involved in cross-border activities due to the
33
34 increased border permeability of using ICTs (Siegert and Löwstedt, 2019; Adisa et al., 2022),
35
36 facilitating work-life spillover experiences. The ICT-driven intrusions from constant
37
38 connectivity to work could deplete individual resources necessary for performing in the
39
40 nonwork domain. Moreover, it is challenging for individuals with less control over what
41
42 penetrates these boundaries, resulting in the need to face the consequences (Li et al., 2021).
43
44
45 Consequently, work and family microsystems increase the possibility of boundary permeability
46
47 and the transfer of negative and positive spillover of behaviours or emotions (Grzywacz et al.,
48
49 2002). Notably, this study is primarily a case of negative work-life spillover linked to increased
50
51 levels of distress, job dissatisfaction, work-life detachment and other problematic outcomes.
52
53
54 Note that our study does not support pre-COVID-19 findings that ICT helps workers reconcile
55
56 work, family, and nonwork roles, leading to improved individual health and overall well-being
57
58
59
60 (Ter Hoeven and Van Zoonen, 2015; Ladkin et al., 2016).

1
2
3 *Gender role strain and stress*
4
5

6 The gendered nature of WLB dilemmas continues to threaten individual well-being, further
7 exacerbated during the COVID-19 crisis. Our findings reveal that the female participants
8 experienced excessive overlap between their work and nonwork roles, which led to higher
9 spillover levels than their male counterparts:
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 *During the pandemic, I had a routine. I would go to bed approximately 9.30 pm, wake*
17 *up at 2 am and then start my work till my children woke up approximately 7 am...once*
18 *they woke up, I couldn't function anymore because they do come up with many things for*
19 *me to help them with... If I don't get up very early to start working, I become frustrated*
20 *during the day, which then turns into irritation and anger... I usually sacrificed my sleep,*
21 *engaged with university work before family duties in the morning, and switched back to*
22 *work (Participant 9).*
23
24

25 *It was a tough one during the pandemic. I have three young children, a husband, my*
26 *mother and my father-in-law, who also live with us...they all depend on me to care for*
27 *them alongside doing the house chores and my paid job... I don't have any Au pair, so*
28 *having a balanced life wasn't possible for me. It's not a matter of who does what with*
29 *the domestic chores. My culture dictates that a man shouldn't be involved in household*
30 *chores...all domestic chores are done by the woman (Participant 35).*
31
32

33 As Participant 35 expressed, culture – especially those with deep-rooted patriarchal ideologies
34 – is a crucial part of the decision regarding the division of domestic labour within the home
35 (Adisa et al., 2019). Therefore, regardless of being resident in the UK – a country known for
36 its egalitarian values – most immigrant and migrant academics from patriarchal societies
37 upheld their cultural traditions, where the women shouldered the bulk of domestic work. This
38 is not to say that non-immigrant academic women did not shoulder more domestic
39 responsibilities than men; rather, there were significant variances compared to their
40 counterparts.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Interestingly, most male participants expressed their appreciation for spousal support from their
52 partners:
53
54

55
56 *My wife teaches part-time (three days a week), but the other two days involve planning*
57 *for her sessions, making it more of a full-time job. However, I could focus and work more*
58 *effectively because she was present, and I didn't have to worry about childcare or*
59 *housework on those other two days, and for these, I truly appreciate her. However, there*
60

1
2
3 *were occasions when the pressure heightened, and she challenged me for not being*
4 *supportive. There have been times when I was supposed to assist with loading the*
5 *dishwasher or washing machine but got carried away with work. She usually becomes*
6 *upset, but my mind is actually at work. (Participant 4)*
7
8

9 The above quote demonstrates that even amid the COVID-19 crisis, women continued to
10 shoulder a significant amount of unpaid domestic work in addition to their paid jobs. Women
11 are generally saddled with maternal responsibilities and stuck in an endless circle of caring for
12 kids, husbands, and parents-in-law. One would anticipate that the COVID-19 crisis would
13 significantly blur some gender norms, given that men being at home due to the lockdown would
14 offer considerable assistance in reducing the burden of domestic chores on women. However,
15 despite being appreciated by their male partners, many women in our study felt their partners
16 needed to take up more or an even share of the household chores. For them, it is beyond the
17 physical activities (e.g., cleaning and preparing family meals) but also sharing the mental load
18 associated with running the household:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 *There is a lot to do around the house, and men need to take on more of these. For*
34 *instance, planning meals and playdates, clearing out children's outgrown clothes,*
35 *remembering costume days and other social activities are subsumed into women's daily*
36 *lives. (Participant 28)*
37

38 As seen in the quotes above, the impact of gender (roles) within the academic community
39 regarding WLB cannot be overlooked, given the differences associated with and ascribed to
40 men who are traditionally seen as breadwinners and women as homemakers (Nash and
41 Churchill, 2020). Additionally, the work structures were unlike the pre-COVID-19 era, when
42 most women reported moving from their first shift at work (mostly ending in the late afternoon)
43 to the second shift at home (i.e., household duties in the evening) (Cottingham et al., 2020).
44 Female academics in this study (especially those with dependents) reveal a case of back-to-
45 back shifts between work and nonwork commitments. This meant they were engrossed in work
46 and nonwork duties at several intervals, leading to stress and role strain.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, the inadequacy of familial or spousal support structures during the COVID-19
4 crisis exacerbated the incidence of work-life conflict. These findings are consistent with
5 Jackson's (2010) study, which shows that women who combine work with multiple domestic
6 responsibilities face serious personal challenges, career setbacks, and an increasing number of
7 women who rebel against the traditional family structure, increasing work-family conflict.
8 Similarly, studies suggest that due to gender role socialisation, men and women are distinct in
9 their usage of resources (i.e., time, energy and attention) (Toffoletti and Starr, 2016). Men make
10 fewer trade-offs to harmonise work and family responsibilities (Delanoëje et al., 2019). In
11 contrast, women are more concerned about integrating work and family obligations and are
12 frequently involved in more border-crossing activities, leading them to experience more work-
13 to-family and family-to-work spillovers than men (Dilworth, 2004; Schnettler et al., 2020).

14 *Health and emotional challenges*

15
16 The consequences of work-to-home spillover were further exacerbated by the COVID-19 crisis
17 and had significant implications for academics' health and emotional well-being. Many
18 participants reported struggles and tensions with managing work and nonwork activities, which
19 exacerbated underlying health issues and emotional disorders. The following responses
20 exemplify the health and emotional challenges encountered by some of the participants:

21
22 *During the pandemic, it was more physically, mentally, and emotionally taxing. To be
23 honest, it had never been this difficult since I started working in academia more than six
24 years ago, but this period called for a deep reflection. I lost my step-sister (46 years old)
25 to hidden stress during the pandemic, and she worked at a university too. Part of the
26 challenge was sitting for too long while working from the kitchen. It was scary...but for
27 my dog, I would have missed my daily walk-out many times as I struggled to balance
28 things. Therefore, I have seen the need to look after myself. I put a regimented eating
29 pattern in place, especially after realising I had gained a lot of weight. (Participant 13)*

30
31 *Because I was in a toxic relationship at the time, working from home gave me anxiety.
32 Working away from home was a way of escaping from the home pressure because some
33 things could have been better contained in the office...but it became apparent that
34 everyone at home could feel the frustration (Participant 32).*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
I live alone, so working from home wasn't a palatable experience because I struggled with depression from being isolated. It was mentally exhausting and emotionally draining, and I once passed out in front of my laptop without realising it. Spending so much time on virtual platforms, with increased work demands, also affected my social life and my ability to get a partner. I felt like the universities turned our homes into worksites...there was just so much work-induced physical and psychological stress (Participant 15).

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
Some participants raised significant concerns regarding their emotional state while working from home. They emphasised how the pandemic conditions led to a significant decline in student engagement compared with pre-pandemic conditions, which resulted in high assignment nonsubmission rates and extensions, multiple resubmissions, unending emails, and increased teaching weeks, adversely affected their emotional stability and led to negative spillover experiences:

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
While I will not contest the beauty of technology in ensuring the continuous delivery of lectures during the pandemic, it was more challenging for me to measure students' engagement levels. For instance, I had to put on my video when delivering my live lectures, but the students didn't have to. Therefore, it wasn't uncommon to have about fifty students on my participants' list, but less than half were listening. You only know when you call out their names to check their understanding or ask a question; then, you don't get any response. This affected my psyche, as I didn't know for how long I had been talking to myself. Thus, such online delivery in the manner I have described undermines the significance of communication, as facial expression and body language are lost. (Participant 7).

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
These findings demonstrate that the COVID-19 crisis engendered serious health and emotional consequences for academics. The competing demands of work and home resulted in an overlap of both domains, particularly in this case, where work spilled over into the home space and fostered work-life conflict, negatively impacting academics' health and emotional well-being. The multiple issues academics encountered, particularly in the wake of COVID-19, are evidenced by negative spillover consequences. As Schnettler et al. (2020) evince, the transfer of negative or positive feelings, attitudes, behaviours or skills within the home and work is associated with the level of permeability and flexibility across borders to allow spillovers. Thus, academics have become more susceptible to adverse health conditions with the

1
2
3 intensified usage of ICTs, which is evidenced as a work stressor and leads to increasing border
4 permeabilities.
5
6

7
8 Conclusively, this study addresses the experiences of work spillover among academics in the
9 UK and its implications. The research utilises spillover theory in underpinning and discussing
10 the narratives behind academics' perceptions of how work invaded their nonwork domain
11 during the COVID-19 pandemic and how various spillover effects affected their WLB more
12 than they did in the pre-COVID era. A key contribution of this paper is that it contributes to
13 our understanding of the relationship between ICT and work-life spillover in the context of the
14 changes to work conditions resulting from the pandemic.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Implications, Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

25 *Theoretical implications*

26
27
28 From the theoretical stance, we suggest a significant relationship between the infiltration of
29 technology (owing to the persistent use of ICTs) and the cohabitation of work and nonwork
30 activities within the domestic space as determinants of negative spillover experiences among
31 academics. In addition, we argue that the increased boundary permeability between work and
32 nonwork domains and overlap of roles favour the transfer of negative rather than positive
33 spillover experiences, which exacerbates negative consequences for the well-being of
34 academics. Grzywacz (2002) suggests that individual control over what passes through these
35 boundaries determines the outcomes experienced. **Thus, from this study, unlike pre-pandemic
36 conditions where working from home increased the level of autonomy and flexibility of
37 individuals (Boell et al., 2016), we understand that pandemic conditions made it more
38 challenging for individuals to control what passes through the boundary due to the loss of
39 autonomy and flexibility over the domains.** This is caused by the infiltration of technology,
40 leading to increased online presence, technostress, work overload, detachment, personality
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 disorder and pressures from the overlap between work and nonwork within the same space.
4
5 The pandemic conditions meant that academics had no choice in deciding when and not to
6 work from home. Conditions that were absent pre-pandemic (e.g., children schooling at home,
7 other family members constantly working from home) appeared to constrict the work-home
8 borders such that they became highly permeable and intensified work-life spillovers. Thus,
9
10 supporting other studies (e.g., Delanoetje et al., 2019; Cottingham et al., 2020, Adisa et al.,
11 2022), we suggest that boundary control is a critical factor for mitigating work-life conflict and
12 negative spillovers between work-life domains. Having substantive control over the occurrence
13 of cross-boundary factors and the extent of role integration can reduce negative spillover
14 experiences. More importantly, the experience of negative spillovers is likely to constitute the
15 lives of academics as they continue to perceive high levels of vulnerability due to the increased
16 usage of ICTs without commensurate organisational policies to alleviate the dysfunctional
17 interferences between work and nonwork domains.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 *Practical implications*

35
36 From the practical stance, following the debates on HEIs embracing a hybrid workplace design
37 and the pitfalls that have been identified with the model (Nash and Churchill, 2020; Adisa et
38 al., 2022), we suggest that HEIs must consider the needs of academics to get the best out of
39 them. In this regard, HR managers' involvement is crucial since clear communication with the
40 staff is necessary to allay any concerns they may have about the hybrid working design (Sampat
41 et al., 2022). Therefore, across HEIs, HR managers should consider training and educating
42 managers on how to manage employees utilising the hybrid working model. Assuming that
43 academics know how to behave and would use their initiatives is a mistake. We suggest that
44 HR managers prioritise policies that will help academics manage the pressure from using the
45 hybrid working model. For example, there should be policies on when work starts and ends
46 and guidelines pertaining to sending or responding to emails after work and on the weekend.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, there is a need to address the negative outcomes associated with the intensified
4 usage of ICTs among academics. Our findings show that academics face high susceptibility to
5 adverse health conditions, evidenced among individuals with less control over what penetrates
6 the work-nonwork boundaries (Li et al., 2021). As academics, we tend to pass the wrong
7 message to the management that we can do so much working from home, and management
8 may exploit us moving forward as they may find this current structure cheaper. The chances
9 are high for increased hybrid learning, making academics do more and adding to the existing
10 pressure. Management is likely to think there is no excuse for not working online even after
11 the pandemic, as it will be a chance to raise revenue generation. Therefore, we recommend that
12 HR managers take up their role of creating a safe work environment (Roy et al., 2022) by
13 emphasising the value of self-care and having more conversations with academics about their
14 physical and mental health. HR managers should critically consider how to address ICT-related
15 health issues through better work designs and HR initiatives that respond to the health
16 requirements of academics. Essentially, comprehensive work-life policies for academics are
17 necessary for humanising overall organisational well-being.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 38 *Limitations and future research* 39

40
41 While this study advances our understanding of the work spillover among academics in the
42 UK, certain limitations within our study may provide some directions for future research. First,
43 the sample of academics may not be nationally representative of the entire population in the
44 UK; therefore, further research is recommended to broaden and provide more nuances.
45 Furthermore, despite the evidence that links technology infiltration and permeable boundary
46 issues as fundamental determinants of negative spillovers among academics, future research
47 may also explore how a broad range of ICTs are used, such as the expectations associated with
48 their controlled usage to generate positive or negative outcomes and experiences for their users.
49 The impact of technological intrusion may also be studied to understand its effects on the social
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 structure of employees and their families. This is deemed necessary because the notion of
4 permeable boundaries may become irrelevant for the next generation, who may not experience
5 life in another way should ICTs persist in blurring the boundaries. Furthermore, based on our
6 study's small coverage, future research may also explore the experiences of academics in other
7 countries (e.g., other parts of Europe and North America) to identify the similarities and
8 differences, as well as developing countries, particularly in regions (e.g., Africa and Asia) that
9 are behind in terms of technology advancement.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

References

Adisa, T.A., Abdulraheem, I., and Isiaka, S.B. (2019), "Patriarchal hegemony: Investigating the impact of patriarchy on women's work-life balance", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp.19-33.

Adisa, T.A., Antonacopoulou, E., Beauregard, T.A., Dickmann, M. and Adekoya, O.D. (2022), "Exploring the impact of COVID-19 on employees' boundary management and work-life balance", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 33, pp.1694-1709.

Akanji, B., Mordi, C., Ajonbadi, H. and Adekoya, O. (2022), "The impact of COVID-19 on the work-life balance of working mothers: Evidence from Nigerian academics", *Personnel Review*, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2020-0636>

Ashforth, B., Kreiner, G. and Fugate, M. (2000), "All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp.472-491.

Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., and Purvis, R. (2011), "Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp.831-858.

1
2
3 Barber, L.K., Conlin, A.L., and Santuzzi, A.M. (2019), “Workplace telepressure and work–life
4 balance outcomes: The role of work recovery experiences”, *Stress and Health*, Vol. 35,
5
6 pp.350–362.
7
8

9
10
11 Beaugard, T.A. (2014), “Fairness perceptions of work-life balance initiatives: Effects on
12 counter-productive work behaviour”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 25, pp.772-789.
13
14

15
16 Boell, S.K., Cecez-Kecmanovic, D., and Campbell, J. (2016), “Telework paradoxes and
17 practices: The importance of the nature of work”, *New Technology, Work and Employment*,
18
19 Vol. 31, pp.114-131.
20
21

22
23 Boiarintseva, G. and Richardson, J. (2019), “Work-life balance and male lawyers: A socially
24 constructed and dynamic process”, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp.866-879.
25
26

27
28 Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006), “Using thematic analysis in psychology”, *Qualitative
29 Research in Psychology*, Vol. 3, pp.77–101.
30
31

32
33
34 Califf, C. B. and Brooks, S. (2020), “An empirical study of techno-stressors, literacy
35 facilitation, burnout, and turnover intention as experienced by K-12 teachers”, *Computers &
36 Education*, Vol. 157, 103971.
37
38
39

40
41
42 Catano, V.M., Francis, L., Haines, T., Kirpalani, H., Shannon, H., Stringer, B., and Lozanski,
43 L. (2010), “Occupational stress in Canadian universities: A national survey”, *International
44 Journal of Stress Management*, Vol. 17, pp.232-258.
45
46

47
48
49 Cottingham, M.D., Chapman, J.J., and Erickson, R.J. (2020), “The constant caregiver: Work-
50 family spillover among men and women in nursing”, *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 34
51
52 No. 2, pp.281-298.
53
54

55
56
57 Creswell, J.W., and Creswell, J.D. (2018), *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and
58 mixed methods approaches*, Thousand Oaks, C.A: Sage.
59
60

1
2
3 Delanoeije, J., Verbruggen, M., and Germeys, L. (2019), "Boundary role transitions: A day-to-
4 day approach to explain the effects of home-based telework on work-to-home conflict and
5 home-to-work conflict", *Human Relations*, Vol. 72 No. 12, pp.1843-1868.
6
7

8
9
10 Dilworth, J.E.L. (2004), "Predictors of negative spillover from family to work", *Journal of*
11
12 *Family Issues*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp.241–261.
13

14
15
16 Geraghty, S., Oliver, K. and Wang, C. C. (2022), "Working from home during the COVID-19
17 pandemic for midwifery and nursing academics", *British Journal of Midwifery*, Vol. 30, No.
18
19 10, pp.546-553.
20
21

22
23
24 Googins, B.K. (1991), *Work/Family Conflicts: Private Lives-Public Responses*, New York:
25
26 AuburnHouse.
27

28
29 Grzywacz, J.G., Almeida, D.M. and McDonald, D.A. (2002), "Work-family spillover and daily
30 reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force", *Family Relations*, Vol. 51, pp.28–
31
32 36.
33
34

35
36 Guest, D.E. (2002), "Perspectives on the study of work-life balance", *Social Science*
37
38 *Information*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp.255–279.
39

40
41
42 Harris, K.J., Harris, R. B., Valle, M., Carlson, J., Carlson, D. S., Zivnuska, S., and Wiley, B.
43
44 (2021), "Technostress and the entitled employee: Impacts on work and family", *Information*
45
46 *Technology and People*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp.1073-1095.
47

48
49 Holtgrewe, U. (2014), "New new technologies: The future and the present of work in
50 information and communication technology", *New Technology, Work and Employment*, Vol.
51
52 29, pp.9-24.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hung, W., Chen, K., and Lin, C. (2015), “Does the proactive personality mitigate the adverse
4 effect of technostress on productivity in the mobile environment?”, *Telematics and*
5
6
7
8 *Informatics*, Vol. 32, pp.143–157.

9
10
11 Husin, N.A., Ghazali, A.S.M., Abdullah, N., and Bin Abdul Hadi, M.I. (2018), “Work-life
12 balance of Malaysian lecturers”, *Australian Academy of Business and Economics Review*, Vol.
13
14
15 4 No.1, pp.43-49.

16
17
18 Jackson, E. (2010), “Women’s role in maintaining and/or resisting patriarchy”, *Feminism and*
19
20
21 *Contemporary Indian Women’s Writing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan..

22
23
24 Ladkin, A., Willis, C., Jain, J., Clayton, W., and Marouda, M. (2016), “Business travellers’
25 connections to home: ICTs supporting work-life balance”, *New Technology, Work and*
26
27
28 *Employment*, Vol. 31, pp.255-270.

29
30
31 Li, A., Cropanzano, R., Butler, A., Shao, P. and Westman, M. (2021), “Work–family crossover:
32 A meta-analytic review”. *International Journal of Stress Management*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp.89–
33
34
35 104.

36
37
38 Ma, J., Ollier-Malaterre, A. and Lu, C-q. (2021), “The impact of techno-stressors on work–life
39 balance: The moderation of job self-efficacy and the mediation of emotional exhaustion”,
40
41
42 *Computers in Human Behavior*, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106811>

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Metselaar, S. A., den Dulk, L. and Vermeeren, B. (2022), “Teleworking at different locations
outside the office: Consequences for perceived performance and the mediating role of
autonomy and work-life balance satisfaction”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*,
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X221087421>

Mushtaque, I., Waqas, H. and Awais-E-Yazdan, M. (2022), “The effect of technostress on the
teachers’ willingness to use online teaching modes and the moderating role of job insecurity

1
2
3 during COVID-19 pandemic in Pakistan”, *International Journal of Educational Management*,
4
5 Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 63-80.
6
7

8 Naithani, P. (2010), “Overview of work-life balance discourse and its relevance in current
9
10 economic scenario”, *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 6 No. 6, pp.148-155.
11

12 Kreiner, G.E., Hollensbe, E.C., and Sheep, M.L. (2009), “Balancing borders and bridges:
13
14 Negotiating the work–home interface via boundary work tactics”, *Academy of Management*
15
16 *Journal*, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp.704–730.
17

18 Nash, M., and Churchill, B. (2020), “Caring during COVID-19: A gendered analysis of
19
20 Australian university responses to managing remote working and caring responsibilities”,
21
22 *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 27, pp.833–846.
23
24
25

26 Office for National Statistics (2020a), “Coronavirus and homeworking in the UK: April 2020”,
27
28 available at:
29
30 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/bulletins/coronavirusandhomeworkingintheuk/april2020>
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Office for National Statistics (2020b), “Coronavirus and the impact on students in higher
38
39 education in England: September to December 2020”, available at:
40
41 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/educationandchildcare/articles/coronavirusandtheimpactonstudentsinhighereducationinenglandseptembertodecember2020/2020-12-21>
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Rafnsdóttir, G.L., and Heijstra, T.M. (2013), “Balancing work–family life in academia: The
50
51 power of time”, *Gender, Work and Organisation*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp.283–296.
52
53

54 Roy, I., Arefin, M.S. and Rahman, M.S. (2022), “How do work–life support practices impact
55
56 bank employees' subjective well-being?”, *Personnel Review*, available at:
57
58 <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2021-0050>
59
60

1
2
3 Sampat, B., Raj, S., Behl, A. and Schöbel, S. (2022), “An empirical analysis of facilitators and
4 barriers to the hybrid work model: a cross-cultural and multi-theoretical approach”, *Personnel*
5
6
7
8 *Review*, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2022-0176>

9
10 Santos, G.G. (2015), “Work and family life among Portuguese academics”, *Gender, Work and*
11
12
13 *Organization*, Vol. 22, pp.1-15.

14
15
16 Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2019), *Research Methods for Business Students*,
17
18 Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

19
20
21 Schnettler, B., Miranda-Zapata, E., Grunert, K.G., Lobos, G., Lapo, M., and Hueche, C. (2020),
22
23
24 “Testing the spillover-crossover model between work-life balance and satisfaction in different
25 domains of life in dual-earner households. *Applied Research Quality Life*, Vol. 16, pp.1475–
26
27
28 1501.

29
30
31 Siegert, S., and Löwstedt, J. (2019), “Online boundary work tactics: An affordance
32
33
34 perspective”, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, Vol. 34, pp.18-36.

35
36
37 Sok, J., Blomme, R., and Tromp, D. (2014), “Positive and negative spillover from work to
38
39
40 home: The role of organisational culture and supportive arrangements”, *British Journal of*
41
42
43 *Management*, Vol. 25, pp.456–472.

44
45
46 Staines, G.L. (1980), “Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the
47
48
49 relationship between work and nonwork”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp.111-129.

50
51
52 Strauss, A., and Corbin, J.M. (1998), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and*
53
54
55 *Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

56
57
58 Syrek, C., Kühnel, J., Vahle-Hinz, T. and De Bloom, J. (2022), “Being an accountant, cook,
59
60
61 entertainer and teacher—all at the same time: Changes in employees’ work and work-related

1
2
3 well-being during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic”, *International Journal of*
4
5 *Psychology*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp.20-32.

6
7
8 Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, T., and Ragu-Nathan, B. (2011), “Crossing to the dark
9
10 side: Examining creators, outcomes, and inhibitors of technostress”, *Communications of the*
11
12 *ACM*, Vol. 54, pp.113–120.

13
14
15 Ter Hoeven, C.L., and Van Zoonen, W. (2015), “Flexible work designs and employee well-
16
17 being: Examining the effects of resources and demands”, *New Technology, Work and*
18
19 *Employment*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp.237–255.

20
21
22 Times Higher Education (2016), “Do lecturers have enough time for their students?”, available
23
24 at: [https://www.timeshighereducation.com/student/news/do-lecturers-have-enough-time-](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/student/news/do-lecturers-have-enough-time-their-students)
25
26 [their-students.](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/student/news/do-lecturers-have-enough-time-their-students)

27
28
29 Toffoletti, K. and Starr, K. (2016), “Women academics and work–life balance: Gendered
30
31 discourses of work and care”, *Gender, Work and Organisation*, Vol. 23, pp.489– 504.

32
33
34 Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J. and Parker, S. K. (2021), “Achieving effective remote working
35
36 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective”, *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 70,
37
38 No. 1, pp.16-59.

39
40
41 World Health Organisation (2020), “COVID-19 weekly surveillance report”, available at:
42
43 [http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/weekly-](http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/weekly-surveillance-report)
44
45 [surveillance-report](http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/weekly-surveillance-report)

Appendix A – Interview Protocol

1. We would like to get an overview of your current work role:
 - What is your current rank or position?
 - For how long have you been working as an academic?
 - What are your average working hours daily?
 - Besides teaching, do you have any other primary administrative responsibility? **If yes**, what and how many hours (average) are given to this?
2. We would like to get an overview of your non-work-related responsibilities:
 - Are you married and with children? **If yes**, how many children and dependents do you have?
 - **If not**, how many dependents do you have?
 - What other responsibilities besides family commitments do you engage in?
3. What are the ICTs utilised since working from home?
4. What do you use each of the ICTs for?
5. What are the challenges (if any) that come with the use of ICTs while working from home?
6. Do you think your work affects your non-work life?
7. To what extent does your work intrude into family space and vice versa?
8. To what extent do you think working from home transmits positive or negative feelings, attitudes, emotions or behaviour between work and home?
9. To what extent have you benefited from spousal support in managing your work and family responsibilities?
10. Are there any known organisational family-responsive policies in your organisations, and to what extent are such effective to cater for working from home?
11. What are the implications of these work-life challenges for you as an academic?

Table I: Demographic characteristics of participants

Qualitative Research Demographics	
Categories	Tally
Universities in the United Kingdom Region	
England	5
Northern Ireland	2
Scotland	2
Wales	3
Gender	
Male	29
Female	14
Age range	
26 – 35	9
36 – 45	15
46 – 55	13
56 – 65	6
Family status	
Single	3
Married	36
Divorced/Separated	4
Number of dependent children	
1-2	22
3-4	15
Above 4	6
Academic rank	
Teaching fellow	4
Lecturer	9
Senior lecturer	16
Associate professor	9
Full professor	5

Source: Authors' computation

Table II: Key themes and codes

Themes	Categorical codes	Frequency of participants' comments per category	Implications	Illustrative quotes
Technostress-induced spillover	• Several ICTs utilised across universities	43 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress-related spillover • Behaviour-based work-life conflict • Negative spillover 	Using ICTs during this unprecedented period is worse than ever before. It is so exhausting and leads to feeling so stressed after work that I can hardly do other things (Participant 34).
	• Information overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-uncertainty	30 (70%)		
	• Prolonged online presence	37 (86%)		
	• High mental exhaustion	28 (65%)		
	• Aggressive behaviours (e.g. shouting, swearing)	34 (79%)		
Work demand and intensification	• Increased workload	43 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-based work-life conflict • Strain-based work-life conflict 	The work pressure has increased...my working time has been unregulated since the pandemic started (Participant 12).
	• Intense work demands	39 (91%)		
	• Long and unregulated working hours	35 (81%)		
Intrusion of work and nonwork roles	• Relocation of work into domestic space	43 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work-to-family spillover effects • Family-to-work spillover effects 	There is no distinction between work and home because of the competing demands from both areas...they both affect each other (Participant 10).
	• Intense work-home boundary blurring	38(88%)		
	• Depleted resources (physical, emotional, mental)	35 (81%)		
	• Prioritising work over family	29 (67%)		
Gender role strain and spousal support	• Gender norms and gender role socialisation	26(61%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role strain • Higher negative spillovers for women 	In my culture, the woman carries the home, and they feel the stress more...that may bring about tension (Participant 31).
		31 (72%)		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back-to-back shifts of work-home obligations 	13 (30%)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequacy of familial and spousal support 			
Health and emotional challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlying health issues • Emotional instability and disorders 	33 (77%) 21 (49%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strain-based work-life conflict • Negative spillover effects 	My health is negatively impacted, and sleeplessness has become my norm since working from home...I think I may be facing emotional trauma, I am distressed (Participant 18)

Source: Authors' computation

Personnel Review