

## The construction of digital well-being in corporate discourse: The case of Google and Microsoft

Tetiana Leleka\* 

<sup>1</sup>Department of Translation, Applied and General Linguistics,  
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State University,  
Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine

**Abstract.** The aim of this study was to identify the linguistic and communicative mechanisms involved in the construction of digital well-being within the corporate discourse of Google and Microsoft, and to examine their impact on organisational norms, professional roles and corporate culture. The methodological framework consisted of a combination of theoretical, institutional, comparative, functional, discursive and normative analysis, supplemented by methods of systematisation and typologisation. This made it possible to trace the evolution of the concept of digital well-being, examine the normative foundations of its development and compare the corporate practices of the two international technology companies. The analysis confirmed that digital well-being had attained the status of a strategic element of corporate governance. An examination of the regulatory framework revealed that the disclosure of information regarding employee mental health had become an integral part of corporate accountability and management policy. A functional analysis of corporate documents enabled the identification of informational, integrative, regulatory, legitimising and representational functions, which were combined within a single communicative message. In corporate discourse, the normative language of values, positive framing of organisational change, the construction of collective identity and narratives of success were identified as the leading mechanisms for shaping digital well-being. A comparison of corporate policies revealed the dominance of a cultural-behavioural model at Google, based on psychological safety, whilst Microsoft employed a managerial-analytical model prioritising the measurement of digital workload, productivity and work patterns. Despite their different communication approaches, both companies had integrated digital well-being into their human capital development strategies, combining it with policies on sustainable development, inclusivity, digital transformation and leadership development. The findings could be utilised by HR professionals, executives of multinational companies and digital well-being policymakers developing strategies to support employees in the digital environment

**Keywords:** employee engagement; inclusivity; information overload; psychological safety; technostress; facilitator

### INTRODUCTION

The introduction of hybrid working models and digital communication channels has significantly altered the nature of work processes, exacerbating the challenge of striking a balance between employees' productivity and their mental health. In an environment of information overload and constant connectivity, digital well-being has ceased to be solely a matter of personal concern, becoming instead a strategic institutional resource for human capital management. This gives rise to a scholarly need to investigate the mechanisms of discursive construction and representation of digital well-being in the corporate communications of leading international technology companies.

The theoretical understanding of digital well-being was further developed in the work of K. Hall (2025). The

author formulated a comprehensive socio-technical concept that integrated information systems, psychology, philosophy and public administration into a single analytical model. This synthesis made it possible to identify digital social connections, digital education and occupational health as fundamental components of digital well-being, whilst the proposed definition formed the theoretical basis for further research into the interaction between humans and digital technologies.

This line of research was further developed in studies focusing on the role of the organisational environment in supporting employee well-being. A.M. Pisarska *et al.* (2025) found that organisational trust was one of the predictors of digital and eudaimonic well-being among

### Suggested Citation:

Leleka, T. (2025). The construction of digital well-being in corporate discourse: The case of Google and Microsoft. *Journal of Discourse Analysis & Critical Studies*, 1(1), 42-57. doi: 10.67524/verus6/1.2025.42.

\*Corresponding author (lelekatetiana1@gmail.com)



employees in the IT sector. The authors confirmed that transparent communication, psychological safety and support for professional development enhanced the sense of self-actualisation whilst simultaneously reducing the negative impact of digital workload. A comparison between Poland and Italy also demonstrated that the cultural context determined the strength of the relationship between trust and well-being. A similar issue was explored by R. Ranganathan *et al.* (2024), who presented digital transformation as a process with dual consequences for employees. The authors showed that technological development simultaneously expanded employees' professional opportunities and created additional sources of psychological strain. The proposed strategic directions demonstrated that transforming organisational culture, supporting digital health and developing a supportive working environment had become necessary conditions for the effective use of technology. The human dimension of the digital environment was explored further in the study by R. Sode *et al.* (2024). The authors confirmed the positive effects of workplace spirituality and mindfulness on employees' psychological well-being. At the same time, the findings showed that intensive use of digital technologies weakened this positive effect, acting as a moderator of the relationship between employees' internal psychological resources and their level of well-being. The practical recommendations focused on combining digital technologies with mindful management practices.

Another perspective on the development of the topic was proposed by J. Zheng *et al.* (2025), who linked digital well-being to human resource management practices in the healthcare sector. The authors established that mindfulness, emotional intelligence and overall well-being had a positive impact on the mental health of healthcare workers. The findings also demonstrated that digital leadership strengthened this effect through the mechanism of job satisfaction, which acted as a mediator between organisational factors and employees' psychological well-being. The macro-level aspects of this issue were examined in the work by D. Kleina-Šnipke & K. Krēsliņš (2025). The authors summarised global trends in employee engagement and confirmed that it remained critically low in most European countries. The analysis revealed a positive impact of engagement on productivity, innovation, organisational effectiveness and customer satisfaction. The findings also highlighted the need to develop Human Resources strategies focused on psychological well-being, generational diversity and employee support in the context of digital transformation. A. Jorge *et al.* (2025) analysed the digital well-being tools offered by leading technology companies and concluded that most of them focused solely on the quantitative monitoring of screen time. The researchers demonstrated that declarations of ethics and freedom of choice did not ensure genuine empowerment of users, whilst the concept of "useful time" effectively limits the understanding of digital well-being to technical means of regulating behaviour. This approach has cast doubt on the adequacy of existing corporate solutions and highlighted the need for a deeper

understanding of the social and communicative mechanisms of digital interaction.

Existing academic works have examined in detail the psychological, organisational, managerial and socio-technical factors of digital well-being; however, the specific features of its discursive construction in the corporate communications of global technology companies have not been sufficiently explored. The aim of the study was to analyse the characteristics of the construction of digital well-being in the corporate discourse of Google and Microsoft through the prism of communicative models that shape perceptions of employee well-being in the digital environment. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: to conduct a theoretical analysis of the evolution of the concept of digital well-being and approaches to its interpretation; to investigate the functions, linguistic mechanisms and discursive strategies used to represent digital well-being in the corporate documents of Google and Microsoft; to conduct a comparative analysis of the two companies' communicative models and identify the characteristics of the integration of digital well-being into human capital management strategies.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methodological framework of the study was based on a qualitative design utilising theoretical, comparative and discursive analysis. The work was of a review and analytical nature and combined a conceptual synthesis of academic approaches with a comparison of corporate digital well-being practices. The chronological scope covered the period 2015-2025, which made it possible to trace the transformation of the concept of digital well-being following the spread of remote and hybrid working, as well as to assess the current stage of its integration into corporate management. In the first stage, a method of theoretical analysis and synthesis was applied to define the content of the category of digital well-being, the evolution of its academic interpretation and its place in contemporary organisational psychology. The data used were sourced from the International Labour Organization (2024) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2024). These were utilised due to their high level of international representativeness, the systematic nature of their statistical data collection, and their focus on assessing the digital transformation of work. To characterise the psychosocial consequences of digitalisation, data from the World Health Organization (2024) were used, which enabled the integration of mental health indicators into the overall framework of the study on digital well-being. The analysis was carried out by comparing conceptual definitions, identifying common categories, grouping psychosocial risks, classifying organisational factors of digital well-being, and interpreting their interrelationships with human resource management models.

The study of the institutionalisation of digital well-being was carried out using institutional and normative analysis. The source materials were the Directive European

Union No. 2022/2464 (2022) and the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (2023). These materials were selected because they set out requirements for corporate reporting, human capital management and the disclosure of information on employees' mental health. The analysis identified interrelationships between the development of corporate responsibility standards and the integration of digital well-being into corporate strategy. Interpretation was carried out by comparing the content of regulatory documents with theoretical models of organisational psychology and corporate governance. Functional analysis of organisational communication was used to study corporate discourse. The source materials comprised corporate policies, codes of conduct and internal portals. The theoretical underpinnings of the structure of corporate discourse were established using concepts of corporate communication and organisational interaction, following which a functional grouping of communicative practices was carried out. The method of systematisation and typologisation was applied to construct a generalised model. The criteria for analysis were the function of corporate discourse, the primary communicative tool, practical manifestation in international companies, and the organisational outcome. In formulating the generalisation, materials by R. Breeze (2013), P. Catenaccio *et al.* (2021) and R.L. De Castilho Rossoni & M.C. Lima (2025) were utilised.

The empirical part of the study was structured as a comparative analysis of two multinational corporations. Google and Microsoft were selected for analysis, as both companies were global leaders in the digital economy, actively shaped standards for the organisation of digital labour, published a large body of open corporate materials, and systematically integrated issues of digital well-being into their human capital management policies. At the same time, they implemented different models of corporate communication, which provided a basis for a meaningful comparison. The research focused on publicly available corporate materials from Google and Microsoft, namely: corporate reports (ESG reports, diversity and inclusion reports), public platforms (Google re:Work, Microsoft WorkLab), corporate blogs, analytical materials (Work Trend Index reports, the "Breaking down the infinite workday" study), as well as guidance for managers and training materials on team development. These sources were selected because they represented official corporate communication, were publicly available and systematically addressed issues of employees' digital well-being. For the analysis, a source base comprising 10 publicly available materials from the period 2015-2025 was compiled, bringing together official documents and communication platforms from Google and Microsoft, as well as specialist academic and expert studies of their organisational practices. This included: Google (2015) – a platform with team assessment tools; A.C. Edmondson (2018) – a study on psychological safety; SOCAP Global (2020) – an analytical report on corporate practices; B. Poyton (2024) – an analysis of Project Aristotle; Microsoft (2024b) – Microsoft's report on diversity and inclusion;

Microsoft (2024a) – Work Trend Index Annual Report; Google (2025) – ESG report; Microsoft (2025a) – study "Breaking down the infinite workday"; Microsoft (2025b) – materials on Viva Insights; Microsoft (2025c) – description of Viva Insights' capabilities. The target audience for these materials comprised corporate employees, managers, HR professionals and external stakeholders (investors, researchers, the general public). The criteria for inclusion in the analysis were: being part of the official corporate discourse of Google or Microsoft; public availability; systematic coverage of issues relating to digital well-being, psychological safety, human capital management or organisational culture; and a timeframe of 2015-2025, covering the period from the launch of Project Aristotle to current ESG reports. The analysed excerpts comprised sections of documents relating to employee well-being, psychological safety, digital workload, corporate values, the roles of employees and managers, as well as psychological support programmes and digital well-being management tools (Microsoft Viva Insights, Google re:Work). It was noted that psychological support programmes (Employee Assistance Programmes, psychological counselling programmes, mental health resources) were mentioned in corporate documents and summarised in a comparative table; however, their actual presentation and communication to employees were not subject to systematic analysis due to a lack of access to internal communication materials. The comparative analysis of the documents was carried out using a unified set of parameters: the strategic objective of the policy, the conceptual framework, core principles, support tools, internal communication channels, the dominant discursive model, the role of the manager, the role of the employee, performance indicators, and the integration of digital well-being into corporate strategies. The unit of analysis consisted of excerpts from corporate documents representing approaches to the construction of digital well-being. The analysis focused on identifying dominant discursive strategies, the linguistic characteristics of corporate communications, the representation of the roles of employees and managers, as well as the ways in which digital well-being was legitimised in publicly available corporate materials from Google and Microsoft. The comparison was carried out by contrasting the content of the documents against common analytical criteria, which made it possible to identify differences in the communicative models of the two companies. A limitation of the study was that it analysed only publicly available corporate materials, without access to internal communication practices or data on the actual use of well-being programmes by employees.

## RESULTS

### **Theoretical foundations for constructing digital well-being in corporate discourse**

Digital well-being had emerged as an interdisciplinary category at the intersection of psychology, information technology, management and the ethics of digital environments. Early research focused on assessing the negative

consequences of excessive digital interaction, including information overload, technostress, digital addiction and an imbalance between work and personal life (Decataldo & Fiore, 2022). The rise of hybrid working, platform work and digital management systems had shifted the research focus. The analysis subsequently centred not only on mitigating the risks of digitalisation, but also on creating organisational conditions under which digital technologies supported psychological well-being, professional effectiveness and sustainable work (Avtalion *et al.*, 2025). Employees interacted not only with digital tools, but also with the rules governing their use, corporate expectations, accessibility standards and models of organisational behaviour. This was precisely why digital well-being was viewed as the result of managerial decisions, rather than merely personal digital hygiene skills. At a conceptual level, digital well-being was characterised as an optimal state of health, safety, social relationships and life satisfaction, achieved through the balanced use of digital technologies rather than by abstaining from them (Vanden Abeele & Nguyen, 2022). This approach had shifted the focus from quantitative measures of screen time to the quality of digital interaction, the level of employee autonomy and the ability to manage digital workload.

The development of the concept of digital well-being was directly linked to the transformation of the nature of work and the rapid digitalisation of the working environment following the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-2023. Remote and hybrid working had transformed digital platforms into the infrastructure for professional interaction. Email, corporate messaging apps, video conferencing systems and cloud services had ensured the continuity of organisational processes regardless of an employee's location. At the same time, the intensity of information flows had increased, the number of digital interactions during the working day had risen, and the boundaries between professional and private time had become increasingly blurred. Research by Eurofound showed that the digitalisation of work was accompanied by a blurring of the boundaries between work and non-working life, and that the issue of contact outside working hours remained a widespread phenomenon in European countries. One in five employees in the EU (European Union) reported having regular work-related contact after the end of the working day at least several times a month. Changes in the structure of work were accompanied by new psychosocial risks. The International Labour Organization (2024) characterised digitalisation as a process that simultaneously increased work efficiency and created the conditions for the emergence of "technostress" – stress associated with the need to constantly adapt to new technologies, digital systems and communication requirements. The risks cited included information overload, constant employee availability, the acceleration of work processes and an increase in cognitive load. Consequently, the issue of digital well-being was viewed not as an individual characteristic of technology users, but as a component of work organisation and corporate

governance. These trends were also confirmed by data from international institutions. An Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2024) report documented a deterioration in a number of intangible well-being indicators following the pandemic. In 2023, nearly 30% of the population in Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries reported physical pain or discomfort, whilst feelings of anxiety and sadness increased in many countries compared with the pre-pandemic period. The proportion of people who felt lonely ranged from 4% to 14%, depending on the country. At the same time, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development launched a dedicated Digital Well-being Hub, signalling the institutionalisation of digital well-being as a distinct area for assessing quality of life. Within the welfare paradigm, the digital environment was considered on a par with indicators of health, social integration and subjective life satisfaction. This issue was also confirmed by global assessments of employees' mental health. According to the World Health Organization (2024), around 15% of the world's working-age population lived with mental disorders, whilst depression and anxiety resulted in the loss of approximately 12 billion working days each year and caused economic losses of USD 1 trillion due to reduced labour productivity. Among the risk factors, the World Health Organization cited excessive workloads, insufficient control over work processes, long working hours and conflict between professional and personal responsibilities. In the digital environment, these factors took on new forms, as they were underpinned by technological capabilities enabling constant communication and continuous access to work.

The institutionalisation of digital well-being was directly linked to the development of organisational psychology. Psychological models of the working environment had traditionally analysed the impact of workload, autonomy, social support and leadership style on occupational health. The spread of digital technologies had introduced a new dimension into this framework – the digital organisation of work. The focus of analysis had shifted to phenomena that determined the quality of working life in the context of digitalisation: digital fatigue – a state of cognitive and emotional exhaustion caused by prolonged interaction with digital tools; techno-stress – psychological strain arising from the inability to adapt to constant change, information overload and the need for constant availability; cognitive overload – a state in which the volume of information and the number of decisions exceeded an employee's cognitive resources, leading to fragmented attention and a decline in the quality of task performance; as well as digital recovery after work – the process of restoring cognitive and emotional resources through psychological disengagement from work-related digital devices, which was critical for preventing chronic fatigue and burnout (Rahmi *et al.*, 2025). Techno-stress arose not so much from the use of technology as from the way it was integrated into organisational processes, monitoring systems and corporate expectations regarding employees' constant availability. Whereas traditional Corporate Social

Responsibility models focused on external stakeholders, environmental issues and engagement with communities, contemporary standards included employers' responsibility for employees' psychological safety. This transformation was evident in the European Sustainability Reporting Standards, which came into force under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (Directive European Union No. 2022/2464, 2022). The European Sustainability Reporting Standards S1 "Own Workforce" standard (European Financial Reporting Advisory Group, 2023) required the disclosure of information on working conditions, mental health, employee well-being, risks to the workforce and mechanisms for mitigating them, thereby shifting the issue of well-being from the sphere of voluntary initiatives to that of corporate accountability.

The ESG framework was also reshaping the management of digital well-being (Abbas, 2025). The social component of ESG encompassed issues of mental health, digital inclusion, safe digital interaction and the responsible use of artificial intelligence in relation to employees. Companies were also assessed on the quality of the environment that they created for their employees, and how well they avoided professional burnout and maintained healthy models of digital work. A similar trend was visible in the evolution of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion strategies within organisations. Many companies initially focused on providing equal opportunities to all individuals, regardless of their social groups. Following the growth of remote working, however, providing equal access to digital resources and support had become increasingly important for these organisations. Inclusivity was assessed not only through HR metrics but also through the quality of the digital experience of employees interacting with corporate platforms, support services and internal communication systems. The concept of employee well-being had also been expanded (Zolak Poljašević *et al.*, 2025). Traditional health or physical well-being programmes had gradually integrated digital components: guidance on digital hygiene, information overload management, psychological counselling via digital services, tools for monitoring working hours and preventing occupational burnout. Employees' psychological well-being was directly linked to levels of engagement and productivity, while organisations that invested in employee well-being tended to have lower levels of emotional exhaustion and staff turnover.

In addition to corporate initiatives, the digital well-being of employees was becoming a matter of government regulation. One such regulatory mechanism was the "right to disconnect", which enshrined the right not to respond to work-related messages, phone calls or emails outside working hours. France became the first country to enshrine this right in law through Law of France No. 2016-1088 "Relating to Work, the Modernisation of Social Dialogue, and the Securing of Professional Training Courses" (2016). Under Article L2242-17 of the French Labour Code, employers were obliged to negotiate the terms of use of digital communication tools to ensure rest periods, respect for employees'

private lives and the prevention of digital overload. A similar approach had been implemented in Italy through Law of Italy No. 81 "Measures for the Protection of Non-Entrepreneurial Self-Employment and Measures to Promote Flexible Work Schedules and Locations" (2017), which regulated remote (smart) working and provided for the establishment of mechanisms to implement the right to disconnect in individual employment contracts. In Portugal, Law No. 83/2021 (Ferraz, 2021) prohibited employers from contacting employees after working hours without a justified operational need, whilst in Belgium the right to disconnect was initially introduced for federal civil servants and subsequently extended to the private sector within the framework of collective labour agreements. The further development of this concept was also supported at European Union level, where the Resolution of the European Parliament No. 2021/2181(INL) "On the Right to Disconnect" (2021), called on Member States to ensure the effective implementation of employees' right to digital disconnection as part of occupational health and safety and mental health protection.

At the same time, state regulation covered the use of digital analytics in relation to employees. The key piece of European Union legislation was the General Data Protection Regulation (2016), which established the principles of lawfulness, fairness, transparency, data minimisation, purpose limitation, proportionality and accountability when processing employees' personal data. The practical application of these principles was set out in detail in Guidelines 3/2019 on the processing of personal data through video devices and Guidelines 2/2023 on the Technical Scope of Article 5(3) of the ePrivacy Directive, prepared by the European Data Protection Board (2019; 2023). These documents made it clear that the use of algorithms, video and digital monitoring technologies were permitted only if it could be demonstrated that such technologies were necessary, proportionate, and did not create excessive interference with the private lives of the employees. The regulation of the digital monitoring of employees was a separate area of focus for this discussion. In France, it was the responsibility of the employer to inform the employee of the use of any form of digital surveillance in advance. Furthermore, the National Commission for Information Technology and Civil Liberties (2023) stated that any use of digital monitoring technologies must be justified, must be proportionate to the reason for its implementation, must be communicated in advance to the employees, and should not lead to excessive restriction of the employee's right to privacy (National Commission for Information Technology and Civil Liberties, 2023). Thus, the European regulatory model was based on the principle that digital monitoring was permitted only where there was a legitimate management objective, the principle of proportionality was observed, and the transparency of personal data processing procedures was ensured.

International standards on psychosocial safety and health at work had become an integral part of regulatory policy. Occupational Safety and Health Convention of the International Labour Organization (1981), Promotional

Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention of the International Labour Organization (2006), as well as the World Health Organization Guidelines on Mental Health at Work (2022), defined mental health as a component of a safe working environment and recommended that employers implement systems for assessing psychosocial risks, preventing occupational burnout, managing digital workload and developing a supportive organisational culture. Furthermore, the international standard ISO 45003:2021 “Occupational Health and Safety Management – Psychological Health and Safety at Work – Guidelines for Managing Psychosocial Risks” (2021) became the first regulatory document to integrate the management of psychosocial risks into occupational health and safety management systems based on ISO 45001 and to establish practical recommendations for creating a psychologically safe working environment.

The elevation of digital well-being to the level of corporate strategy had transformed the nature of organisational communication. Psychological well-being took on a symbolic dimension through corporate policies, codes of conduct, presentations of well-being programmes, management addresses and other communication practices that shaped normative perceptions of the desired employee model. It was at this stage that digital well-being became the subject of corporate discourse, as its content was determined not only by management decisions but also by the linguistic constructs through which the organisation interpreted care for employees, professional responsibility and work culture. Corporate discourse was viewed as a system of texts, communicative practices, symbols and linguistic strategies through which a company defined its own values, interpreted professional roles and constructed acceptable models of interaction between employees (Breeze, 2013). Discourse was not limited to official documents. Its structure included corporate policies, internal portals, codes of ethics, management communications, training materials, presentations on employee support programmes, video messages, corporate blogs and digital platforms for internal communication (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2024). Beyond the decisions of the managers, the culture of an organisation developed through the reconstruction of the meanings that employees associated with the communications from the company. It was for this reason that discourse became the element that created the organisation itself. Such ideas were

reflected in the concept of the Communicative Constitution of Organisation, which stated that the rules, norms, values and identity of an organisation only had meaning through the communicative actions of its members (Nicotera, 2025).

Corporate communication served several purposes within the management of an organisation. The informational function of corporate communication was used to convey decisions, procedures, policies and rules of interaction within the organisation. The way in which information was communicated influenced the perception of that information by the employees. Additionally, the integrative function of corporate communication was used to communicate the values of the company to its employees. The regulatory function was used to communicate the standards that employees should follow in the workplace. These were not communicated as orders within corporate discourse. The legitimising function explained the decisions of the management to the employees of the company. Additionally, the representative function was used to shape the image of the company both within the company itself and in its interactions with external parties. These functions combined to form corporate discourse as a tool of social management within the company and effectively guided the behaviour of its employees and managers through voluntary adherence to the values of the company itself (Mumby & Kuhn, 2018; Schoeneborn *et al.*, 2019). Even beyond these functions, however, there were examples of corporate discourse in international companies fulfilling several of these functions within a single communication. For example, at SAP (2024) Global Health, messages about mental health were combined with an explanation of the business value of a healthy working environment, a description of the support services available, and the expected role of managers in creating psychologically safe teams. In the Unilever Well-being Framework, well-being was integrated into corporate culture through regular communication campaigns, manager training and leadership development programmes, transforming individual health care into an element of professional competence (Unilever, 2025). Such integration demonstrated that corporate discourse was gradually shifting from the transmission of information towards the construction of organisational norms within which employees themselves interpreted desirable models of behaviour. The implementation of corporate discourse functions in organisations was presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** The implementation of corporate discourse functions in modern organisations

| Function of corporate discourse | Main communicative tool                                      | Forms of implementation                                                                                        | Potential organisational effect                                            |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Informative                     | Corporate policies, internal portals, codes of conduct       | Publication of hybrid working policies, rules for using digital services, and well-being guidelines            | A shared understanding of corporate rules and procedures                   |
| Integrative                     | Corporate values, success stories, communication campaigns   | Wellbeing and belonging programmes, people first initiatives, mental health awareness weeks                    | The development of organisational identity and employee engagement         |
| Regulatory                      | Guidance for managers, standards of conduct, codes of ethics | Models of inclusive leadership, guidelines for holding team meetings, and policies on respect in the workplace | The standardisation of professional conduct without administrative control |

Table 1. Continued

| Function of corporate discourse | Main communicative tool                                    | Forms of implementation                                                                                   | Potential organisational effect                                                  |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Legitimising                    | Management statements, ESG reports, human capital reports  | Explanations of digital transformation, workflow reform and the implementation of artificial intelligence | Maintaining trust in management decisions and reducing organisational resistance |
| Representative                  | Corporate reports, careers websites, public communications | Presenting the company as an employer that supported well-being, inclusivity and sustainable development  | Strengthening the employer brand and corporate reputation                        |

**Source:** compiled by the author based on R. Breeze (2013), P. Catenaccio *et al.* (2021), R.L. De Castilho Rossoni & M.C. Lima (2025)

The data demonstrated that individual functions of corporate discourse did not operate in isolation. Most corporate documents combined informational, regulatory and legitimising elements within a single communication. This combination made it possible to simultaneously explain the reasons behind management decisions, define the expected behaviour of employees and foster a positive perception of organisational change. This was precisely why the effectiveness of corporate communication was assessed not by the volume of information conveyed, but by its ability to shape organisational culture, the level of trust and the willingness of employees to support the company's strategic objectives.

The linguistic influence of corporate discourse was realised through several interrelated mechanisms. The first mechanism related to prescriptive language, which used the vocabulary of corporate values rather than imperative constructions. This approach was employed in companies' codes of conduct, where behavioural expectations were framed as the organisation's shared values rather than as a list of an employee's duties. For example, Salesforce (n.d.) structured its Code of Conduct around five values: Trust, Customer Success, Innovation, Equality and Sustainability, emphasising that these were "a reflection of who we are and what we stand for". Accenture (n.d.) defined its Code of Business Ethics its core values as Stewardship, Best People, Client Value Creation, One Global Network, Respect for the Individual and Integrity, integrating them into HR processes and communications with employees. The second mechanism was based on positive framing. Organisational changes were interpreted through the lenses of professional development, innovation, flexibility or employee support, where digital transformation was described as an opportunity to create a more human-centred working environment, rather than merely as technological modernisation. The third mechanism was based on the formation of a collective identity through the active use of pronouns such as "we", "our" and "together", which reduced the symbolic distance between management and employees (Fladerer *et al.*, 2021). The fourth mechanism was implemented through success narratives. A study of an Australian financial institution found that multi-level storytelling, which conveyed stories of employees' successful adaptation to change, influenced their attitudes towards change and promoted active engagement, which in turn improved business performance (Nirmal, 2016). Such stories served a normative rather than an informational function, as they demonstrated socially approved

models of professional behaviour and helped to spread them amongst other employees.

Organisational psychology explained the effectiveness of such communication practices through the mechanism of social internalisation. The regular repetition of identical linguistic constructs helped to form stable cognitive schemas, which came to be perceived as a natural part of professional activity. Employees adapted their behaviour not only under the influence of managerial control, but also out of a desire to conform to corporate norms. This was precisely why companies invested resources in developing internal communications, viewing them as a tool for managing human capital. The effectiveness of internal communication was empirically demonstrated. According to Gallup's (2025) State of the Global Workplace report, the global level of employee engagement stood at just 21%, with 62% disengaged and 17% actively working against the company's goals, whilst productivity losses due to low engagement were estimated at USD 438 billion annually. Edelman (2024) confirmed that 77% of employees in Germany trust their employer – the highest level of trust among all social institutions.

In the digital environment, corporate communication extended beyond the transmission of work-related information. It shaped normative expectations regarding an employee's psychological well-being. The organisation determined which forms of digital interaction were considered healthy, which practices were supported by management, and which behavioural models aligned with corporate values. Through such communication, employees received not only information about support programmes, but also an understanding of their own professional role in the digital environment. The concept of psychological safety took on particular significance. Open exchange of views, the ability to report mistakes and seek help depended not only on leadership style but also on day-to-day communication that demonstrated the acceptability of such behaviour (Edmondson, 2018). Digital communication channels either reinforced or undermined such attitudes, depending on the messages the organisation conveyed to employees. If corporate discourse linked psychological well-being to professional effectiveness, the culture gradually integrated care for mental health into the system of organisational values. Digital well-being was integrated into organisational culture precisely through discursive mechanisms. Employee support policies gained practical significance through communication that explained their objectives, legitimised

management decisions and fostered a positive attitude among employees towards the use of relevant programmes.

The identified psychosocial risks of digitalisation were grouped according to the type of impact on the employee. Cognitive risks included information overload, fragmentation of attention and cognitive exhaustion; emotional risks included technostress, anxiety and emotional burnout; behavioural risks included an imbalance between work and personal life, constant availability and digital addiction. This classification distinguished between the levels of impact that digital workload had on employees and identified priority areas for corporate intervention: cognitive risks primarily required changes to the organisation of work processes; emotional risks required psychological support and the development of leadership skills; and behavioural risks required a review of corporate policies on availability and communication. This approach made it possible to move from universal well-being programmes towards differentiated strategies that took the nature of the risk into account. The institutionalisation of digital well-being occurred at three levels. At the global level, international organisations (International Labour Organization, World Health Organization, and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) formulated recommendations that established general policy directions in the field of mental health in the workplace. At the regional level, the European Commission introduced regulatory requirements obliging companies to disclose information on working conditions, mental health and employee well-being, thereby transforming well-being from a voluntary initiative into an area of corporate accountability. These recommendations were implemented by the companies themselves, translating these recommendations into corporate policies. These policies existed within a chain of command, where the recommendations of the global level were translated into regional policies, and the policies of the companies were translated into the communication of these policies to the employees. This communication chain was what gave digital well-being its status as a corporate governance element. Through comparing the definitions of each of these categories, it became possible to determine the four basic categories within the field of study of digital well-being. These categories related to the workload that employees experienced digitally, the protection of those employees and their data from digital threats, the ability of the employees to have control over their digital interactions, and the incorporation of digital well-being practices into the organisational culture of the company. Beyond creating these categories, it was also possible to use these categories to compare the corporate policies of the companies along the same parameters. Structuring the study of digital well-being in this way provided a basis for the comparison of the communication models of Google and Microsoft.

The representation of the concept of digital well-being in the internal policies of Google and Microsoft indicated a shift from programmes aimed at providing traditional forms of social support for employees towards a model of

managing the company's human capital. The companies treated the well-being of their employees as a factor that contributed to the company's innovation and productivity. Such an approach to management corresponded to different approaches to corporate governance. Google included provisions in its corporate documents that considered the concept of well-being from the perspective of the integration of physical, psychological, social, and digital dimensions of well-being. The company's annual ESG Report highlighted that one of the components of employee development within Google was the creation of a safe and healthy working environment for employees (Google, 2025). This component of employee development included providing employees with access to mental health support programmes, psychological counselling, digital self-help tools, training for managers in relation to psychological issues in the workplace, and the creation of an inclusive working environment for all employees. The wording of the policy showed another characteristic of Google – the provision of psychological support to employees, as well as the development of their professional potential.

The concept of the well-being of Google employees was closely associated with the concept of psychological safety within the teams. The Aristotle project (Poyton, 2024), which was launched in 2012, played a key role in forming the management of Google's teams. The research demonstrated that the component of psychological safety was the most important component of the effectiveness of the teams, surpassing all other characteristics or elements of the employees within those teams. The study included over 180 teams from different departments across Google (2015), using more than 35 statistical models to analyse hundreds of variables within each team, from characteristics of each individual employee to the dynamics of the employees within the team. Although this study was somewhat dated, it remained the basis of many of Google's corporate practices and was applied within its corporate training programmes to team managers, such as those offered on the re:Work platform.

Microsoft's (2024b) policies demonstrated a different model of digital well-being. A central element of the company's corporate rhetoric was the concept of "thriving at work", which combined productivity, professional development and mental health. The company defined thriving as "being energised and empowered to do meaningful work" and measured this indicator across three dimensions: energy, empowerment and meaningful work. In the Microsoft Global Diversity & Inclusion Report 2024, the company defined psychological well-being as a prerequisite for an inclusive organisational culture, emphasising that diversity and inclusion were an integral part of Microsoft's mission – "to empower every person and every organisation on the planet to achieve more". The document focused on ensuring employees had access to mental health support services, developing empathetic leadership skills, supporting flexible working arrangements, and creating an environment in which employees could openly discuss mental health issues

without the risk of stigmatisation. Unlike Google, Microsoft (2025a) recognised digital workload as an organisational risk. The study “Breaking down the infinite workday” utilised anonymised Microsoft 365 data alongside a survey of over 31,000 employees from 31 countries. The results showed that the average employee received digital notifications approximately every two minutes during working hours (275 interruptions per day), and around half of all meetings took place between 09:00 and 11:00 and between 13:00 and 15:00, which reduced the duration of uninterrupted concentration. The authors of the report linked this pattern of digital interaction to an increase in cognitive load and recommended reviewing the organisation of internal communications, rather than merely training employees in individual time-management techniques. This interpretation shifted the responsibility for digital well-being from the individual to corporate management practices.

The language used in corporate documents from Google and Microsoft demonstrated a shared trend away from directive rhetoric in favour of a values-based model of communication. In Google’s (2015) materials, the core principle of effective team interaction was formulated as “Psychological safety: Team members feel safe to take risks in the face of being seen as ignorant, incompetent, negative, or disruptive”. It was further clarified: “In a team with high psychological safety, teammates feel safe to take risks around their team members”. The wording did not contain verbs such as “must”, “shall” or other imperative constructions. Instead, the lexeme “safe” was repeated, which was used throughout the document as a normative benchmark for the desired organisational environment. The communicative focus shifted from controlling employee behaviour to the organisation’s responsibility for creating conditions in which openness became a socially acceptable model of interaction. Microsoft (2025a) employed a different method of legitimising a similar idea. In a special report entitled “Breaking down the infinite workday”, the issue of digital well-being was not presented as an abstract corporate value, but was introduced through quantitative evidence. Right at the start of the document, it was stated that “employees using Microsoft 365 are interrupted every 2 minutes by a meeting, email or notification”, which amounted to 275 interruptions per day for employees with a heavy communication workload. The authors went on to emphasise that 48% of employees reported that their work was chaotic and fragmented. Statistical argumentation replaced prescriptive directives: the need for digital well-being programmes was explained not by a corporate requirement, but by an objectively identified problem in the organisation of work.

Differences were also observed at the level of linguistic strategies. Google constructed an image of the desired organisational culture through a vocabulary of trust, mutual support and learning. Following the presentation of the results of Project Aristotle (Poyton, 2024), the document offered managers specific behavioural models. The recommendations included phrases such as “Acknowledge your own fallibility”, “Frame the work as a learning

problem, not an execution problem” and “Model curiosity by asking lots of questions”. The use of verbs such as “acknowledge”, “frame” and “model” shaped behavioural scenarios for managers, but did not give the impression of administrative control. The manager was portrayed as a facilitator of psychological safety, rather than a bearer of disciplinary authority. At Microsoft (2025a), the discourse centred on the concept of digital overload. Instead of employees’ psychological characteristics, the parameters of the digital working environment were analysed. The report stated that “60% of meetings are unscheduled or ad hoc, 40% of people online at 6 am are already checking their email, and meetings starting after 8 pm are up 16% year-on-year”. After presenting each indicator, the authors moved on to recommendations regarding changes to the organisation of work, the use of Microsoft Viva and artificial intelligence tools. Thus, corporate discourse framed the problem not as a consequence of employees’ insufficient stress resilience, but as the result of an overburdened digital infrastructure. A comparison of the lexical fields of the two companies confirmed their differing communicative logics. At Google, the categories “psychological safety, trust, meaning, impact, team effectiveness, belonging” recurred. Even in the description of the five factors of team effectiveness, it was emphasised that success depended “less on who is on the team, and more on how the team worked together”. At Microsoft, other concepts dominated: “focus, productivity, agent boss, employee experience, artificial intelligence, work patterns, meaningful work”. Thus, Google described well-being in terms of the quality of social interaction, whilst Microsoft described it in terms of the optimisation of digital work processes.

An analysis of the structure of corporate communications also revealed a common communication pattern. In Google’s documents, a management principle was first set out, followed by the empirical findings of Project Aristotle (Poyton, 2024), and then tools for team self-assessment were proposed. For example, employees were asked to rate the statements “If I make a mistake on our team, it is not held against me”, “Our team has an effective decision-making process” and “The work I do for our team is meaningful to me”. As Google researcher Julia Rozowski noted, teams that were able to answer “yes” to all five questions (psychological safety, reliability, structure and clarity, meaningfulness of work, and impact) were disproportionately more effective and generated higher revenue (Stillman, 2017). Microsoft (2024a; 2025b) used a similar framework, although it filled it with different content: statistical fact → interpretation of the problem → digital tool to solve it. For example, the Work Trend Index 2024 report stated that 75% of knowledge workers used artificial intelligence at work, whilst 60% of managers admitted to lacking a clear plan for its implementation. It then suggested using Viva Insights to analyse work habits and improve work-life balance, specifically as a digital tool for monitoring daily activity and comprehensively optimising the balance between professional and personal life. Neither company actually required

employees to use these support programmes. The discourse was structured in such a way that using well-being tools was perceived as rational and professionally responsible behaviour that aligned with corporate standards.

Another tool was the personalisation of communication. The Microsoft (2025c) Viva Insights platform clearly distinguished between analytical levels depending on the user's job role. For instance, through "Personal insights", ordinary employees received individual guidelines for behavioural hygiene: booking uninterrupted focus time for deep work, scheduling regular breaks throughout the day, and consciously winding down digital activity outside working hours. Managers, by contrast, had access to Team insights, which enabled them to identify potentially harmful working

patterns that might have contributed to burnout and stress, including excessive numbers of meetings, working outside normal hours or insufficient focus time, and to receive recommendations for developing a healthy team culture. Digital platforms also changed the nature of feedback. Whilst traditional corporate communications were predominantly one-way, internal services facilitated interactive engagement between employees and the organisation. Surveys, discussions, reactions and comments enabled the perception of well-being programmes to be assessed almost in real time. Communication became a cyclical process in which corporate messages were constantly adjusted in response to employee feedback. A comparison of Google's and Microsoft's policies on digital well-being was shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Comparative analysis of Google and Microsoft policies on digital well-being

| Comparison criterion                  | Google                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Microsoft                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic objective of the policy     | Fostering an organisational culture based on psychological safety, trust, inclusivity and effective team collaboration. Well-being was regarded as a prerequisite for innovation and productive collaboration  | Supporting a sustainable digital working environment through the optimisation of the digital workload, the development of the employee experience, the responsible use of AI, and the enhancement of organisational resilience |
| Conceptual framework                  | Organisational Psychology; Psychological Safety; Team Effectiveness; Inclusion; People Analytics                                                                                                               | Employee Experience; Human-Centred AI; Digital Well-being; Future of Work; Responsible AI; Workplace Analytics                                                                                                                 |
| Key principles                        | Psychological safety, open communication, mutual trust, learning from mistakes, inclusivity, collaboration                                                                                                     | Employee well-being, digital balance, flexible working, empathetic leadership, responsible use of technology, support for hybrid working                                                                                       |
| Key support tools                     | re: Work, manager development programmes, internal training modules, recommendations on psychological safety for teams, Employee Assistance Programme (locally), programmes to foster an inclusive environment | Microsoft Viva (Insights, Learning, Engage), Employee Assistance Programme, WorkLab, Microsoft 365 Analytics, Copilot Dashboard, manager development programmes, mental health resources                                       |
| Key internal communication channels   | Internal portal, Google Workspace, corporate newsletters, training courses, re: Work, internal HR communications                                                                                               | Microsoft Teams, Viva Engage, Viva Connections, Viva Learning, corporate portal, WorkLab, internal communication campaigns                                                                                                     |
| Dominant discursive model             | Cultural and behavioural. Communication changed behaviour by fostering trust, psychological safety and shared responsibility within teams                                                                      | Management and analytics. Organisational decisions were underpinned by statistics, digital analytics and research into working practices                                                                                       |
| Role of the manager                   | The manager acted as a facilitator of open communication, supported employees' right to express their ideas, acknowledged their own mistakes and encouraged team learning                                      | Managers monitored their digital workload, promoted healthy working practices, and used Viva and WorkLab analytics tools to inform management decisions                                                                        |
| Role of the employee                  | An active participant in team interaction who openly discussed issues, contributed to the development of a psychologically safe environment and fostered a culture of mutual trust                             | A responsible user of digital technologies who managed their own digital workload, utilised well-being tools and maintained a healthy balance between productivity and well-being                                              |
| Key performance indicators            | Quality of team interaction, psychological safety, level of trust, team effectiveness, employee engagement                                                                                                     | Employee Experience, digital workload, productivity, staff engagement, hybrid working efficiency, use of Viva tools                                                                                                            |
| Integration into corporate strategies | ESG (Social), Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Leadership Development, Learning & Development, Organisational Culture                                                                                             | ESG, Human Capital, Responsible AI, Future of Work, Employee Experience, Digital Transformation, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion                                                                                                  |

**Source:** compiled by the author based on Google (2015; 2025), A.C. Edmondson (2018), SOCAP Global (2020), B. Poyton (2024), and Microsoft (2024a; 2024b; 2025a; 2025b; 2025c)

A comparison of corporate policies showed that Google and Microsoft employed different models for fostering digital well-being, although their strategic objectives were aligned. Both companies viewed mental health and digital well-being as part of the long-term development of human capital, rather than as a separate area of corporate

social responsibility. At the same time, the methods used to achieve this goal differed. Google's policies were based on a socio-psychological model of organisational management. Central to this was the concept of "psychological safety", which emerged following the internal Project Aristotle study (Poyton, 2024). It was the findings of this project that

formed the basis for most of the recommendations in the re:Work platform. The company's documents focused on fostering interpersonal trust, open dialogue, and employees' right to report mistakes and participate in collective decision-making. Well-being was viewed as a characteristic of organisational culture that arose from high-quality team interaction, rather than merely individual psychological support programmes. Microsoft's policies followed a different logic. They integrated digital well-being into the concept of the employee experience and the organisation's digital transformation. The company made extensive use of aggregated Microsoft Graph data, the results of international surveys and behavioural analytics to inform management decisions. Well-being was interpreted as a factor in effective human interaction with artificial intelligence, digital services and hybrid working arrangements. Differences could also be seen in the organisation of corporate communications. Google drove behavioural change through cultural narratives that emphasised trust, inclusivity and team learning. Microsoft employed evidence-based management reasoning, where most recommendations were underpinned by statistical indicators of digital workload, productivity and the use of digital services. In the first case, corporate discourse served a culture-shaping function; in the second, a managerial and analytical one.

Google's cultural and behavioural model, which emphasised psychological safety and interpersonal trust, created the conditions for open communication, experimentation and innovation. At the same time, this model placed responsibility on managers as facilitators of a safe environment, which could be challenging within a large organisation with diverse teams. An excessive emphasis on team harmony could lead to groupthink, where employees avoided constructive criticism in order to maintain psychological comfort. There was also a risk of individualising responsibility for well-being, where the organisation delegated the responsibility for looking after one's own mental health to the employee, whilst ignoring the structural causes of digital overload – an excessive number of online meetings, the intensity of communication and a culture of constant availability. Microsoft's management and analytical model offered a structured approach to tackling the problem of digital overload. However, the excessive reliance upon analytical data could pose certain risks to the organisation as a whole. For instance, the use of such data to evaluate employees' well-being could lead to the reduction of complex issues to simple metrics. Furthermore, the instrumentalisation of the concept of well-being could lead to a focus on that aspect of employees as a means of increasing the productivity of the employees, rather than considering their well-being as a value of the company itself. Finally, the reliance upon analytical data could lead to the development of an illusion of objectivity within the company, ignoring aspects of the organisation that cannot be measured or quantified.

The practices of both Google and Microsoft were consistent with those of other nations in the regulation of the digital well-being of their employees. For instance, both

companies' approaches to asynchronous communication, focus time, and delayed messaging were aligned with the "right to disconnect", a measure supported by the European Parliament to protect the mental health of their employees. Finally, the use of Google Workspace and Microsoft Viva Insights was consistent with the General Data Protection Regulation (2016) governing employees' data. The analytical tools that the companies offered were based on aggregated metrics of the employees' activities, in line with the recommendations of the European Data Protection Board regarding the monitoring of employees' activities in the workplace without significantly interfering with their right to privacy. Although the companies offered a range of digital tools to enable the monitoring of employees' work processes, European Union requirements stipulated that such monitoring should be conducted in a way that was necessary, proportional to the aims of the monitoring, and notified to the employees in advance. The measures that Google and Microsoft took to manage their employees' workload and prevent occupational burnout and poor mental health were in line with the recommendations in the World Health Organization Guidelines on Mental Health at Work (2022) and ISO 45003:2021. Each of these models for managing employees' mental health could have been implemented within public sector organisations, provided that the requirements regarding the protection of their personal data were met. Google and Microsoft both included digital well-being as part of their management of employee mental health. Each company's mental health programmes were also integrated with policies regarding inclusivity, leadership development, digital transformation, ESG initiatives, and organisational culture. Thus, each company treated the well-being of its employees as one of the resources that determined its long-term competitiveness.

## DISCUSSION

Expanding the understanding of the concept of digital well-being, the study demonstrated that its content was not determined solely by the degree of digitalisation of workplaces or the amount of use of technological devices in the workplace. The significance of the model discussed in the corporate world lay in determining norms of professional behaviour in the organisation, the assessment of the psychological health of employees, and the legitimising of managerial decisions. These aspects went beyond the traditional understanding of digital well-being. Digital well-being had become an element of human capital management in organisations and was incorporated into the corporate culture, communication, and organisational values. This conclusion was consistent with the study by X. Li *et al.* (2025), which also linked digital well-being with organisational characteristics of the working environment. At the same time, this study demonstrated a broader logic underlying the formation of digital well-being. Whereas the authors focused on technostress, digital culture, HR practices and digital leadership as factors affecting mental health, this analysis showed that the effectiveness of these elements

depended on the way in which they were discursively represented. The findings demonstrated that the same management tools could acquire different psychological meanings depending on the linguistic strategies through which an organisation explained the nature of digital transformation to its employees. This interpretation did not contradict the conclusions of X. Li *et al.* but extended them by incorporating the communicative dimension into the mechanisms through which digital well-being was formed.

The propositions put forward by O. Uslu (2025) were also consistent with the findings of this study. The author viewed digital well-being as a multidimensional construct combining digital literacy, mental health, work-life balance and the responsible use of technology. This study confirmed this multidimensionality, although the interpretation of its origins differed. An analysis of corporate documents from Google and Microsoft revealed that the various components of digital well-being did not exist in isolation but were integrated into corporate policies through a unified system of organisational communication. The findings demonstrated that digital literacy, psychological support, workload management tools and leadership development programmes functioned as interrelated elements of corporate strategy. This conclusion aligned with the conceptual framework proposed by O. Uslu, although this study shifted the focus from general models of digital well-being to the specific mechanisms through which they were institutionalised via corporate discourse.

A similar pattern was observed when comparing the results with the work of R. Singha & S. Singha (2025). The researchers focused on the behavioural mechanisms of digital addiction, the psychological characteristics of users and the need for early risk diagnosis. This study did not analyse internet addiction as a subject in its own right; however, it demonstrated that corporate policies were directed not at responding after psychological problems had arisen, but at creating an organisational environment capable of minimising the risks of their occurrence. An analysis of corporate documentation revealed that Google and Microsoft defined normative models of healthy digital behaviour even before the negative consequences of digital stress arose. This conclusion aligned with the researchers' recommendations, although it shifted the emphasis from the psychological diagnosis of the individual to the preventative function of corporate communication.

The findings of K. Silchenko (2025) represented one of the key points of comparison between the two studies. The author demonstrated how the digital well-being market had developed a model that was inherently contradictory, as the technologies were both the cause of the problems and the solution to those problems. While this study identified a contradiction in the digital world in general, the digital policies of companies such as Google and Microsoft showed the same contradictions. These companies did not deny the existence of digital workload. However, they used their platforms to promote the resolution of the issues created by their digital technologies. Microsoft

created Viva Insights to recognise digital overload. Google promoted the concept of psychological safety through its digital platforms. Through these platforms and the content published on them, the companies sought to validate the contradiction between the problems of digital overload and the solutions created through digital technologies.

A comparison of the results with the study by T. Kempainen & T.E. Paananen (2024) also revealed a high degree of conceptual similarity. The authors identified nine dualities of digital services, demonstrating that the very same technology could simultaneously support well-being and create psychological strain. This study confirmed this ambivalence of digital environments, although it explained it in a different way. An analysis of corporate discourse showed that the psychological significance of digital services was determined not only by their functional capabilities but also by the organisational interpretation of how they were used. Google described digital platforms as tools for fostering trust and team collaboration. Microsoft presented digital services as a means of optimising work processes and reducing cognitive load. This conclusion was consistent with the authors' findings, although the study demonstrated that the source of positive or negative impact was not only the technology itself, but also the system of corporate meanings that had developed around it.

The work of H. Honglei *et al.* (2025) was also closely aligned with the findings obtained in this study. The authors demonstrated the positive impact of digital transformation on employees' psychological well-being provided that a risk management culture was in place. This study confirmed the role of organisational factors, while providing a more detailed account of the structure of their interrelationships. An analysis of corporate materials showed that risk management culture was implemented through linguistic mechanisms for legitimising digital change, corporate psychological support policies, recommendations for managers, and internal communication campaigns. The findings demonstrated that the positive impact of digital transformation did not occur automatically, but depended on how the organisation explained the nature of digital reforms to employees, clarified expected behaviour, and defined the role of digital well-being in professional activity. A systematic review by L. Polanco-Diges *et al.* (2022) also confirmed the importance of human-centred management models for digital well-being. This study supported this approach, although it demonstrated a different mechanism for its implementation. An analysis of corporate policies revealed that a human-centred approach was not limited to the development of employee support programmes. It was shaped through everyday communication practices, corporate messaging, linguistic constructs, models of interaction between managers and teams, and the interpretation of psychological safety as an organisational norm. This conclusion was consistent with the views of academic researchers, although the analysis revealed that a human-centred strategy only acquired practical significance once it had been integrated into corporate discourse.

A comparison of the results with the findings of L. Buga & S. Mihailă (2025) also demonstrated a high degree of consistency. The authors described digital transformation as a process that simultaneously created new opportunities and new risks for employees. This study confirmed the dual nature of digitalisation, although it placed a different analytical emphasis. The results showed that the effectiveness of digital transformation was determined not only by the level of digital literacy, HR practices or the professional training of employees. Of decisive importance was how corporate discourse interpreted digital changes, explained their rationale, legitimised new requirements and determined employee readiness to support organisational reforms. The overall comparative picture confirmed a consistent pattern. Most studies had analysed digital well-being through psychological, behavioural, technological or organisational factors. This study revealed another dimension to the formation of this phenomenon. The findings demonstrated that digital well-being did not arise solely under the influence of digital services, psychological support or HR programmes. Its essence was determined by a system of corporate meanings, which were shaped through organisational communication, language strategies, corporate values, mechanisms for legitimising management decisions, and the representation of a desired model of professional behaviour. This explained why Google and Microsoft, whilst pursuing similar strategic goals, had developed fundamentally different models of digital well-being. Google had linked it to trust, psychological safety and the quality of team interaction. Microsoft, on the other hand, interpreted digital well-being through the lens of workflow analytics, digital behavioural patterns and the optimisation of organisational efficiency. This pattern complemented academic approaches to digital well-being and demonstrated that corporate discourse acted as one of the factors in its institutionalisation within organisations.

## CONCLUSIONS

The study confirmed that digital well-being was conceived as a strategic management tool, the content of which was determined by the organisational communication model. Theoretical analysis demonstrated the evolution of the concept of digital well-being from an assessment of the negative consequences of digitalisation to an integrated model of human capital management, in which mental health, digital workload and organisational culture were regarded as interdependent elements. Institutional analysis showed that the European Sustainability Reporting Standards S1 requirements regarding the disclosure of information on employee mental health shifted the issue of well-being from the sphere of voluntary initiatives into the sphere of corporate accountability. A functional analysis of

corporate discourse enabled the identification of five functions – informational, integrative, regulatory, legitimising and representational – and established that corporate documents combined these functions within a single message, ensuring that they simultaneously informed, regulated behaviour and legitimised management decisions. Four discursive mechanisms for constructing well-being were identified: the normative language of corporate values, the positive framing of organisational change, the formation of collective identity through inclusive pronouns, and narratives of success that demonstrated socially approved models of professional behaviour.

A comparative analysis of Google's and Microsoft's policies revealed that Google was dominated by a cultural-behavioural model based on the concept of psychological safety, developed following the findings of Project Aristotle, which established that team effectiveness depended not on employees' individual characteristics but on the quality of interaction between them, primarily on psychological safety. In this model, the manager acted as a facilitator of open communication, acknowledging their own mistakes and encouraging team learning, whilst the employee was an active participant in team interaction, openly discussing problems and fostering a culture of mutual trust. Microsoft used a management and analytical model that legitimised decisions through statistical data: according to the company's internal research, the average employee experienced 275 digital interruptions per day, and 48% of employees reported that their work process was chaotic. Here, the manager monitored the digital workload, whilst the employee acted as a responsible user of digital technologies, maintaining a healthy balance between productivity and well-being. It was established that Google's lexical field was shaped by categories of psychological safety and trust, whilst Microsoft operated with concepts of focus, productivity and the analysis of work patterns. Both corporations integrated digital well-being into strategic human capital management, combining it with policies on ESG, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, leadership development and digital transformation. An empirical examination of the impact of various discursive models on the actual level of employees' digital well-being and their professional engagement was identified as a promising area for further research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

## FUNDING

None.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abbas, J. (2025). When and how corporate digital responsibility contributes to a firm's reputation in society: Scale development and structural analysis. *Technology in Society*, 84, article number 103067. doi: [10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103067](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103067).

- [2] Accenture. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.accenture.com/au-en/about/company/business-ethics>.
- [3] Avtalion, Z., Aviv, I., Hadar, I., Luria, G., & Bar-Gil, O. (2025). The impact of digital climate on employee wellbeing in the digital transformation era. *IEEE Access*, 13, 78992-79006. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3566211.
- [4] Breeze, R. (2013). *Corporate discourse*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [5] Buga, L., & Mihailă, S. (2025). Navigating the digital wave: Enhancing organizational commitment and employee well-being. *The USV Annals of Economics and Public Administration*, 25(41), 52-58. doi: 10.4316/aepa.2025.25.1(41).52-58.
- [6] Catenaccio, P., D'Avanzo, S., & Jacobs, G. (2021). *Storytelling in corporate discourse – a critical introduction*. *I-LAND Journal*, 1, 3-9.
- [7] De Castilho Rossoni, R.L., & Lima, M.C. (2025). Critical discourse analysis in corporate reports: Legitimation strategies in the context of environmental controversies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 33(3), 3563-3581. doi: 10.1002/csr.70341.
- [8] Decataldo, A., & Fiore, B. (2022). Digital-Insecurity and overload: The role of technostress in lecturers' work-family balance. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 14(3), 75-102. doi: 10.14658/pupj-ijse-2022-3-4.
- [9] Directive European Union No. 2022/2464 "Amending Regulation (EU) No. 537/2014, Directive 2004/109/EC, Directive 2006/43/EC and Directive 2013/34/EU, as Regards Corporate Sustainability Reporting". (2022, December). Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32022L2464>.
- [10] Edelman. (2024). *2024 Edelman trust barometer special report: Trust at work*. Retrieved from <https://www.edelman.com/trust/2024/trust-barometer/special-report-trust-at-work>.
- [11] Edmondson, A.C. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] European Data Protection Board. (2019). *Guidelines 3/2019 on processing of personal data through video devices*. Retrieved from <https://surl.li/dshuxg>.
- [13] European Data Protection Board. (2023). *Guidelines 2/2023 on technical scope of article 5(3) of the eprivacy directive*. Retrieved from [https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/documents/public-consultations/2023/guidelines-22023-technical-scope-art-53-eprivacy\\_en](https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/documents/public-consultations/2023/guidelines-22023-technical-scope-art-53-eprivacy_en).
- [14] European Financial Reporting Advisory Group. (2023). *ESRS S1 own workforce (delegated act 2023-5303, annex 1)*. Retrieved from [https://www.efrag.org/sites/default/files/sites/webpublishing/SiteAssets/ESRS%20S1%20Delegated-act-2023-5303-annex-1\\_en.pdf](https://www.efrag.org/sites/default/files/sites/webpublishing/SiteAssets/ESRS%20S1%20Delegated-act-2023-5303-annex-1_en.pdf).
- [15] Fairhurst, G., & Putnam, L.L. (2024). Analysis of tensions and paradoxes in qualitative organizational communication research. In B. Brummans, B. Taylor & A. Sivunen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in organizational communication* (pp. 531-550). London: SAGE. doi: 10.4135/9781529674729.n29.
- [16] Ferraz, G.A. (2021). *The duty to refrain from contact: A critical analysis of Article 199-a of Law No. 83/2021*. Retrieved from <https://estudogeral.uc.pt/handle/10316/118204?locale=en>.
- [17] Fladerer, M.P., Haslam, S.A., Steffens, N.K., & Frey, D. (2021). The value of speaking for "us": The relationship between CEOs' use of I- and we-referencing language and subsequent organizational performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(2), 299-313. doi: 10.1007/s10869-019-09677-0.
- [18] Gallup. (2025). *State of the global workplace 2025 report*. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>.
- [19] General Data Protection Regulation. (2016). Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>.
- [20] Google. (2015). Retrieved from <https://rework.withgoogle.com/intl/en/guides/understand-team-effectiveness>.
- [21] Google. (2025). Retrieved from <https://sustainability.google/reports/google-2025-eu-nfrd-report/>.
- [22] Hall, K. (2025). *Shaping digital well-being: Developing a well-being lens on the socio-technical systems perspective in information systems research*. (Doctoral thesis, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany). doi: 10.15495/EPub\_UBT\_00008254.
- [23] Honglei, H., Khan, A.N., Shahzad, K., & Soomro, M.A. (2025). Empowering SMEs for sustainable development: The role of digital transformation and employee well-being. *Sustainable Development*, 33(S1), 873-884. doi: 10.1002/sd.70048.
- [24] International Labour Organization. (2024). *Mental health at work in the era of digitalization*. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/mental-health-work-era-digitalization>.
- [25] ISO 45003:2021 "Occupational Health and Safety Management – Psychological Health and Safety at Work – Guidelines for Managing Psychosocial Risks". (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.iso.org/standard/64283.html>.
- [26] Jorge, A., Amaral, I., & de Matos Alves, A. (2025). *"Time well spent": The ideology of temporal disconnection as a means for digital well-being*. *International Journal of Communication*, 19, 1346-1365.
- [27] Kemppainen, T., & Paananen, T.E. (2024). Dualities of digital services: Everyday digital services as positive and negative contributors to customer well-being. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 464-490. doi: 10.1108/JSTP-03-2023-0075.

- [28] Kleina-Šnipke, D., & Krēsliņš, K. (2025). Employee engagement across borders: A gallup-based analysis of global workforce. *Management*, 41(2), 25. doi: 10.38104/vadyba.2025.2.02.
- [29] Law of France No. 2016-1088 “Relating to Work, the Modernisation of Social Dialogue, and the Securing of Professional Training Courses”. (2016, August). Retrieved from <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000032983213>.
- [30] Law of Italy No. 81 “Measures for the Protection of Non-Entrepreneurial Self-Employment and Measures to Promote Flexible Work Schedules and Locations”. (2017, May). Retrieved from <https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/id/2017/06/13/17G00096/sg>.
- [31] Li, X., Seah, R.Y., & Yuen, K.F. (2025). Mental wellbeing in digital workplaces: The role of digital resources, technostress, and burnout. *Technology in Society*, 81, article number 102844. doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102844.
- [32] Microsoft. (2024a). Retrieved from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/worklab/work-trend-index/2024>.
- [33] Microsoft. (2024b). Retrieved from [https://cdn-dynmedia-1.microsoft.com/is/content/microsoftcorp/microsoft/dni/documents/presentations/microsoftcorp\\_gdi\\_report\\_2024\\_final.pdf](https://cdn-dynmedia-1.microsoft.com/is/content/microsoftcorp/microsoft/dni/documents/presentations/microsoftcorp_gdi_report_2024_final.pdf).
- [34] Microsoft. (2025a). Retrieved from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/worklab/work-trend-index/breaking-down-infinite-workday>.
- [35] Microsoft. (2025b). Retrieved from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-nz/training/modules/analyze-microsoft-365-workplace-data-use-microsoft-viva-insights/3-explore-personal-insights>.
- [36] Microsoft. (2025c). Retrieved from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/training/modules/describe-analytics-capabilities-microsoft-365/2-describe-capabilities-of-viva-insights>.
- [37] Mumby, D.K., & Kuhn, T.R. (2018). *Organizational communication: A critical introduction*. New York: Sage Publications.
- [38] National Commission for Information Technology and Civil Liberties. (2023). *The CNIL issues ten new sanctions under its simplified procedure*. Retrieved from <https://cnil.fr/en/cnil-issues-ten-new-sanctions-under-its-simplified-procedure>.
- [39] Nicotera, A.M. (2025). *Origins, traditions, and trends of organizational communication: A comprehensive introduction to the field*. New York: Taylor & Francis. doi: 10.4324/9781003484639.
- [40] Nirmal, V.R. (2016). *The role of storytelling in organisational change management*. (Doctoral thesis, University of Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia).
- [41] Occupational Safety and Health Convention of the International Labour Organization. (1981). Retrieved from [https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100\\_ILO\\_CODE:C155](https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C155).
- [42] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *OECD launches how's life? Report and digital well-being hub to foster more inclusive and sustainable well-being for all* [press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/en/about/news/press-releases/2024/11/oecd-launches-how-s-life-report-and-digital-well-being-hub-to-foster-more-inclusive-and-sustainable-well-being-for-all.html>.
- [43] Pisarska, A.M., Kryczka, A., & Castellone, D. (2025). Organizational trust as a driver of eudaimonic and digital well-being in IT professionals: A cross-cultural study. *Sustainability*, 17(11), 5124. doi: 10.3390/su17115124.
- [44] Polanco-Diges, L., Saura, J.R., & Pinto, P. (2022). Setting the relationship between human-centered approaches and users' digital well-being: A review. *Journal of Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being*, 10(3), 148-171. doi: 10.34623/8pjt-1c64.
- [45] Poyton, B. (2024). *Google's Project Aristotle: How psychological safety captured the world's attention*. Retrieved from <https://psychsafety.co.uk/googles-project-aristotle/>.
- [46] Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention of the International Labour Organization. (2006). Retrieved from [https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100\\_ILO\\_CODE:C187](https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C187).
- [47] Rahmi, K.H., Fahrudin, A., Supriyadi, T., Herlina, E., Rosilawati, R., & Ningrum, S.R. (2025). Technostress and cognitive fatigue: Reducing digital strain for improved employee well-being: A literature review. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 8(12), e2025380. doi: 10.31893/multirev.2025380.
- [48] Rangarajan, R., Kalyana Kumar, A.S., & Singh, S.V. (2024). *A study on the impact of enhancing employee well-being in the digital era: A conceptual analysis on the transformation in information technology (IT) sector*. *IPE Journal of Management*, 14(19), 138-142.
- [49] Resolution of the European Parliament No. 2021/2181(INL) “On the Right to Disconnect”. (2021, January). Retrieved from [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2021-0021\\_EN.html](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2021-0021_EN.html).
- [50] Salesforce. (n.d.). *Code of conduct*. Retrieved from <https://www.salesforce.com/company/legal/compliance/code-of-conduct/>.
- [51] SAP. (2024). *Global health, safety and well-being*. Retrieved from <https://www.sap.com/docs/download/investors/2024/sap-2024-integrated-report.pdf#page=118>.
- [52] Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn, T.R., & Kärreman, D. (2019). The communicative constitution of organization, organizing, and organizationality. *Organization Studies*, 40(4), 475-496. doi: 10.1177/0170840618782284.

- [53] Silchenko, K. (2025). Technology dualities and paradoxes in digital well-being: Analysis of discourses of digital well-being market offerings. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 45(4), 102-120. doi: [10.1177/02761467251356660](https://doi.org/10.1177/02761467251356660).
- [54] Singha, R., & Singha, S. (2025). Digital well-being and internet addiction across the lifespan. In M. Anshari, M. Nabil Almunawar & P. Ordóñez de Pablos (Eds.), *Impacts of digital technologies across generations* (pp. 112-133). London: IGI Global. doi: [10.4018/979-8-3693-6366-9.ch009](https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6366-9.ch009).
- [55] SOCAP Global. (2020). *Why Google and Microsoft obsess over psychological safety*. Retrieved from <https://socapglobal.com/2020/04/why-google-and-microsoft-obsess-over-psychological-safety/>.
- [56] Sode, R., Chenji, K., & Vijayaraghavan, R. (2024). Exploring workplace spirituality, mindfulness, digital technology, and psychological well-being: A complex interplay in organizational contexts. *Acta Psychologica*, 251, article number 104601. doi: [10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104601](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104601).
- [57] Stillman, J. (2017). *The most effective teams answer yes to these 5 questions*. Retrieved from <https://www.inc.com/jessica-stillman/the-most-effective-teams-answer-yes-to-these-5-questions.html>.
- [58] Unilever. (2025). *Employee health and wellbeing*. Retrieved from <https://www.unilever.com/working-at-unilever/employee-wellbeing/>.
- [59] Uslu, O. (2025). Understanding digital wellbeing: Impacts, strategies, and the path to healthier technology practices. *Discover Social Science and Health*, 5, 145. doi: [10.1007/s44155-025-00259-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s44155-025-00259-5).
- [60] Vanden Abeele, M.M., & Nguyen, M.H. (2022). Digital well-being in an age of mobile connectivity: An introduction to the special issue. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 10(2), 174-189. doi: [10.1177/20501579221080899](https://doi.org/10.1177/20501579221080899).
- [61] World Health Organization. (2022). *WHO guidelines on mental health at work*. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052>.
- [62] World Health Organization. (2024). *Mental health at work*. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work>.
- [63] Zheng, J., Hong, H., Wang, N., Sun, J., & Xu, X. (2025). Impact of mindfulness, emotional intelligence, and employee well-being on mental healthcare of workers' affectiveness: The mediating role of employee satisfaction and the moderating effect of digital leadership. *Health Care Analysis*, 33, 368-400. doi: [10.1007/s10728-025-00523-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-025-00523-4).
- [64] Zolak Poljašević, B., Gričnik, A.M., & Šarotar Žižek, S. (2025). The human side of digitalization: HRM's role in fostering digital well-being. In *9<sup>th</sup> FEB international scientific conference: Sustainable management in the age of ESG and AI: Navigating challenges and opportunities* (pp. 761-778). Maribor: University of Maribor Press. doi: [10.18690/um.epf.5.2025.69](https://doi.org/10.18690/um.epf.5.2025.69).