IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)
e-ISSN:2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 27, Issue 11. Ser. 7 (November. 2025), PP 01-08
www.iosrjournals.org

"Adoption of Hybrid Work Models in Bangalore: An Empirical Study on Job Performance Outcomes"

Raghavendra [1]
Ph.d Research Scholar , MGR College,Dr. MGR Nagar, Hosur-635130 Tamil Nadu
Periyar University.

Dr. K. Venkidasamy [2]
Ph.d Research Supervisor, MGR College,Dr. MGR Nagar, Hosur-635130 Tamil Nadu.
Periyar University.

Abstract:
The research explores the impact of a hybrid work culture on employee performance, with particular reference to Bangalore employees. The main objective is to identify employee satisfaction with the hybrid work model and the organizational support, measure its impact on productivity, effectiveness of tasks, motivation and stress levels, identify perceived benefits and challenges and recommend improvements. It used a descriptive study approach and collected data from 156 hybrid form experts from different sectors in Bangalore. Their replies were recorded on a standardized questionnaire. The study used statistical tests in the SPSS, including MANOVA, correlation, ANOVA and Chi-square.

Finally, the study used hybrid frequency and job performance metrics to determine that there was no statistically significant relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Similarly, there was no significant correlation between satisfaction and the provision of infrastructure and there were no significant effects on work-life balance related to the duration of hybrid working experience. At the same time, there is a large variation in job-related stress across different work patterns, where hybrid work may provide a lower level of stress. Based on this knowledge, the research suggests that organizational support should be improved, wellness programme adapted and flexible hybrid schedules promoted. In summary, hybrid work is not directly linked to better performance or satisfaction, but it is a key factor in reducing work-related stress and contributing to the well-being of employees.

Keywords: *Hybrid Work Culture, Job Performance, Employee Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance and Organizational Support.*

Date of Submission: 14-11-2025 Date of Acceptance: 29-11-2025

I. Introduction:

The hybrid work has succeeded to become a revolutionary change in work culture in organizations especially after the COVID-19 pandemic ravaged the world leading companies to review the old era of work culture. The hybrid work type means that the employees must divide their time between remote work and actual presence at the workplace. This model tries to maintain flexibility and collaboration, so that organizations can work efficiently and satisfy employees in their desire to be autonomous and have work and life balance. According to **Gallup (2022)**, the percentage of workers in the world organizations who shifted to some type of hybrid work time list formats managed to reach almost 53 percent of the full-fledged remote-capable workers, which is evidence of its increasing popularity throughout the private sector.

The hybrid work model has been gathering steam in the Indian context, and in metropolitan and tech-driven cities like Bangalore in particular due to the aid of digital tools and cloud-based systems and the changing employee demands. Although it does have some significant benefits like the freedom of movement, the decreased traffic inconveniences, and the greater level of self-management, it also has a series of issues, connected to employee involvement, performance monitoring, coordination of teams, and psychological health. It is now up to the organizations to create a sufficient infrastructure, digital implementation, and communication protocols in order to adequately sustain such a model of work.

There are a number of researchers who have touched on one dimension or another of remote and hybrid work. To give an example, **Kumar and Sinha (2021)** revealed that hybrid work increases productivity in case it is aligned with the function of a solid organization and role definition. Likewise, **Singh and Sharma (2022)** claimed that this is because the success of hybrid work remains tied to the concept of trust, independence, and the

organizational aptitude to provide suitable digital framework and mental backup to the employees. Nonetheless, although the hybrids are gaining traction, little evidence exists on the subject in the Indian corporate community particularly in regard to the effect that hybrid work has on job satisfaction, stress and general performance of employees across the IT and non-IT employment segment.

This endeavour is an effort to bridge that gap by examining the perceptions, experience, and results of hybrid working conditions of workers in Bangalore city. It examines four major dimensions comprising satisfaction by employees, job performance (motivation and efficiency), perceived benefits and challenges as well as the organization infrastructure and support. The study by gathering and interpreting structured employee responses of working in hybrid environments is expected to offer practical ideas to employers, HR professionals and policymakers to implement in terms of increasing their understanding of hybrid work culture and establishing its effectiveness in the future.

II. Review of Literature:

The literature has studied in great length the dynamics about the hybrid work environments. Research by **Allen et al. (2015)** found that flexible work arrangements help with work-life balance and stress reduction. Similarly, **Bloom et al. (2015)** showed that remote workers at a big Chinese travel agency were more productive and happier with their employment. On the contrary, **Golden and Veiga (2005)** noted that overemphasis of remote worker might result in professional solitude and reduced organizational devotion. According to **Gajendran and Harrison (2007)**, when controlling quality of communication, positive relationships between telecommuting and job performance were indicated. **Spivack and Milosevic (2018)** also underlined the role of support by the manager and digital infrastructure in improving the effectiveness of work in a hybrid mode. **Galanti et al. (2021)** find that more autonomy and task control of the employees in hybrid environments contributes to increased employee motivation. **Choudhury et al. (2021)** deemed that hybrid working resulted in more output and retention among highly skilled workers. **Vartiainen and Hyrkkainen (2010)** observed that the hybrid models enhance concentration of the employees though they tend to distort the work-home boundary. **Bailey and Kurland (2002)** contended that although telework augers satisfaction, it needs harmony expectations and support systems. According to **Wang et al. (2021)**, the quality of the communication, trust, and technological support are the significant predictors of satisfaction in hybrid work. According to **Lister and Harnish (2011)**, hybrid work leads to the increased savings of costs and decreased absenteeism. **Felstead and Henseke (2017)** cautioned that differences in the accessibility of remote working may increase inequalities at work. According to **Mulki et al. (2009)**, job stress is lower in remote work condition, assuming that there is good organizational trust. **Kelliher and Anderson (2010)** concluded that flexible work results in stronger commitment, however, the flexible work requires each side to be accountable. Lastly, according to **Parker et al. (2020)**, an organization that is capable of matching a hybrid approach to work with employee desires would yield a more positive engagement and performance behaviour.

Research Gap:

While many studies have examined the benefits of remote and flexible work arrangements in general, few have examined the impact of hybrid work cultures on employee satisfaction, productivity, and stress levels on the job. This is especially true in the context of large Indian cities like Bangalore. Most existing studies either focus broadly on remote work or examine hybrid models in Western corporate settings, leaving limited empirical evidence on how Indian employees perceive and adapt to hybrid work structures. Furthermore, there is insufficient exploration of the organizational support mechanisms that enhance or hinder hybrid work experiences. This study aims to bridge this gap by evaluating employee satisfaction, performance outcomes, and stress levels under hybrid models, identifying both the benefits and challenges faced by workers, and offering data-driven recommendations for improving hybrid work policies.

Research Questions:

The following questions served as the basis for our investigation: How content are workers with the infrastructure support and current hybrid work arrangements offered by their companies? When it comes to productivity, efficiency, motivation, and stress levels on the job, how does a hybrid work culture affect workers generally? When it comes to hybrid work arrangements, what are the main pros and cons that workers see? As a last question, how can we use employee input to make hybrid work cultures even better in the future? From the employee's point of view, these questions seek to provide a thorough comprehension of hybrid work dynamics.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To evaluate employee satisfaction with hybrid work arrangements and organizational support infrastructure.

2. To assess the impact of hybrid work culture on employees' job performance, including productivity, task efficiency, motivation, and stress levels.
3. To identify the perceived benefits and challenges faced by employees working in hybrid models.
4. To provide suggestions for improving hybrid work culture based on employee feedback.

Hypotheses of the Study:

H_1: "There is a significant association between work arrangement (on-site, hybrid, remote) and employee satisfaction"

H_2: "There is a significant difference in job performance (productivity, motivation, task efficiency) among employees with different hybrid work frequencies"

H_3: "Provision of sufficient infrastructure and support by the organization positively influences employee satisfaction in a hybrid model"

H_4: "Employees with longer hybrid work experience report better work-life balance"

H_5: "Hybrid work reduces job-related stress compared to other models"

III. Research Methodology:

Using a descriptive research technique, this study sought to understand how hybrid work culture adoption is now standing and how it has affected the productivity of workers in Bangalore. A standardized questionnaire with demographic and Likert-scale questions on infrastructure, stress, work-life balance, and job performance was the major tool for data collecting. The target population included employees working under hybrid models across various sectors in Bangalore. A total of 156 respondents were selected through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using SPSS software, employing descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation, ANOVA, and hypothesis testing to examine relationships and differences among variables. The research was ethically sound in the sense that it was voluntary and the answers were kept anonymous. The methodological approach allowed conducting a systematic and empirical determination of how hybrid work arrangements affect employees on multiple parameters of performance and well-being.

IV. Data Analysis and Discussion:

I.Cronbach's Alpha

Table 1: Showing Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha[a]	N of Items
.809	12

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

The researchers used Cronbach's Alpha to determine how internally consistent the scale was that measured important study factors like satisfaction, productivity, motivation, etc. Table 1 shows that out of the 12 items that were included for the reliability study, the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.809. In general, a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.7 or above is satisfactory, while values of 0.8 or higher suggest high dependability. The results show that the questionnaire questions are very consistent with one another, and the scale utilized in this research is valid for evaluating the characteristics that were supposed to be measured.

II.Testing of 1st Hypothesis- "There is a significant association between work arrangement (on-site, hybrid, remote) and employee satisfaction"

The following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test the association between work arrangement and employee satisfaction.

H_0: "There is a significant association between work arrangement (on-site, hybrid, remote) and employee satisfaction"

H_1: "There is no significant association between work arrangement (on-site, hybrid, remote) and employee satisfaction"

A Chi-Square Test of Independence was used to investigate if there was a correlation between workers' contentment and their work arrangement (i.e., whether it was totally on-site, hybrid, or remote).

Table 2: Showing Chi-Square Tests of significant association between work arrangement and employee satisfaction

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.347[a]	8	.968
Likelihood Ratio	2.327	8	.969
Linear-by-Linear Association	.006	1	.941
N of Valid Cases	156		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.38.			

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

In Table 2, it is sought that the results show a p-value of 0.968, a Pearson Chi-Square value of 2.347, and 8 degrees of freedom. With a p-value that is much more than the conventional alpha threshold of 0.05, it is not possible to reject the null hypothesis. This finding provides further evidence that the kind of work arrangement did not significantly correlate with the levels of employee satisfaction in the sample that was considered. Furthermore, the test assumptions were met, as none of the expected cell counts were below 5. Therefore, based on the current data, ***employees' satisfaction does not significantly differ across different work settings (on-site, hybrid, or remote)***. This suggests that elements other than work arrangement could have a greater impact on influencing levels of satisfaction.

III. Testing of 2nd Hypothesis- "There is a significant difference in job performance (productivity, motivation, task efficiency) among employees with different hybrid work frequencies".

The following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test significant difference in job performance among employees with different hybrid work frequencies.

H_0: "There is a significant difference in job performance (productivity, motivation, task efficiency) among employees with different hybrid work frequencies"

H_1: "There is no significant difference in job performance (productivity, motivation, task efficiency) among employees with different hybrid work frequencies"

To test the second hypothesis, a combination of **Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)** and **Univariate ANOVA** was employed using SPSS. MANOVA was chosen to assess whether hybrid work frequency had a significant combined effect on multiple job performance variables namely productivity, task efficiency, and work-life balance. Following this, univariate ANOVA tests were conducted individually for each variable to further examine specific differences across work frequency groups.

Table 3: Showing Descriptive Statistics of job performance (productivity, motivation, task efficiency) among employees with different hybrid work frequencies

	Remote Work Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Productivity	0 days	3.2333	1.10433	30
	1-2 days	2.9750	1.36790	40
	3-4 days	3.2162	1.45555	37
	5 days	2.8367	1.29658	49
	Total	3.0385	1.31926	156
Task Efficiency	0 days	3.2333	1.30472	30
	1-2 days	2.9750	1.56053	40
	3-4 days	3.2703	1.32599	37
	5 days	2.6122	1.36651	49
	Total	2.9808	1.41180	156
Work Life Balance	0 days	2.7667	1.45468	30
	1-2 days	2.8000	1.39963	40
	3-4 days	3.1351	1.43686	37
	5 days	3.2449	1.29953	49
	Total	3.0128	1.39116	156

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

The descriptive statistics table 3 provides the mean and standard deviation of job performance indicators **productivity, task efficiency and work-life balance** across different **remote work frequencies**. Employees who worked **0 days remotely (fully on-site)** reported a mean productivity score of **3.23**, which is slightly higher than those working **1–2 days (2.98)** and **5 days remotely (2.84)**. Interestingly, the **3–4 day remote group** had a comparable mean score of **3.21**, indicating relatively consistent perceptions of productivity across different hybrid schedules. For **task efficiency**, the 3–4 day group again reported the highest mean (**3.27**), while the 5-day group

had the lowest (**2.61**). Regarding **work-life balance**, fully remote employees (5 days) scored the highest (**3.24**), while on-site and 1–2 day groups scored lower (**2.77 and 2.80**, respectively). While these differences appear in the means, **descriptive data alone cannot determine statistical significance**, which is further tested using MANOVA and ANOVA.

Table 4: Showing Multivariate Tests

	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Pillai's trace	.079	1.362	9.000	456.000	.203
Wilks' lambda	.922	1.369	9.000	365.211	.200
Hotelling's trace	.083	1.373	9.000	446.000	.198
Roy's largest root	.069	3.476[a]	3.000	152.000	.018

Each F tests the multivariate effect of Remote Work Frequency. These tests are based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.

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

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

Table 4 shows the results of a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) that looked at how working remotely may affect productivity, efficiency on the job, and work-life balance all at once. The four multivariate test statistics Pillai's Trace, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root are all more than 0.05, with p-values of 0.200 and 0.922, respectively, according to Wilks' Lambda. The results show that after controlling for other factors, the combined dependent variables are unaffected by the frequency of remote work. Although Roy's Largest Root has a lower p-value (0.018), it is considered an upper-bound and not reliable on its own when the other statistics are not significant. Thus, the overall MANOVA results suggest that the variation in job performance metrics cannot be explained significantly by differences in remote work frequency.

Table 5: Showing Univariate Tests

Dependent Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Productivity	Contrast	4.463	3	1.488	.852	.467
	Error	265.306	152	1.745		
Task Efficiency	Contrast	11.671	3	3.890	1.989	.118
	Error	297.272	152	1.956		
Work Life Balance	Contrast	6.822	3	2.274	1.179	.320
	Error	293.152	152	1.929		

The F tests the effect of Remote Work Frequency. This test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

To identify the specific impacts of remote work frequency on each performance parameter, the study ran the univariate ANOVA tests, which are shown in table 5. The findings demonstrate that:

a) There is no significant difference for Productivity (F=0.852, p=0.467).

b) For Task Efficiency, it similarly does not have a significant result (F=1.989, p=0.118).

c) Once again, there is no significant difference for work-life balance, with an F-value of 1.179 and a p-value of 0.320.

It is not possible to reject the null hypothesis for any of the variables since their p-values are all larger than 0.05. This implies that ***remote work frequency does not significantly affect employees perceived productivity, task efficiency, or work-life balance*** in the current sample.

IV. Testing of 3rd Hypothesis- "Provision of sufficient infrastructure and support by the organization positively influences employee satisfaction in a hybrid model".

The following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test relationship between provision of sufficient infrastructure and support by the organization and employee satisfaction in a hybrid model.

H_0: "There is no significant relationship between provision of sufficient infrastructure and support by the organization and employee satisfaction in a hybrid model"

H_1: "There is a significant positive relationship between provision of sufficient infrastructure and support by the organization and employee satisfaction in a hybrid model"

To test the hypothesis regarding the relationship between the **provision of sufficient infrastructure and support** and **employee satisfaction in a hybrid model**, a **Pearson correlation analysis** was conducted.

Table 6: Showing Correlations between provision of sufficient infrastructure and support by the organization and employee satisfaction in a hybrid model

		Age	Satisfaction of hybrid model	Provision of sufficient infrastructure
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	.095	.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.238	.726
	N	156	156	156
Satisfaction of hybrid model	Pearson Correlation	.095	1	-.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.238		.237
	N	156	156	156
Provision of sufficient infrastructure	Pearson Correlation	.028	-.095	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.726	.237	
	N	156	156	156

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

The Pearson correlation coefficient between the two variables was -0.095, as shown in Table 6. The p-value was 0.237, which is more than the 0.05 level of standard significance. Based on the data, it seems that no statistically significant association exists. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence from the sample to reject the null hypothesis (H_0), suggesting that there is no significant correlation between the amount of infrastructure and support provided by the business and employee satisfaction in the hybrid work paradigm.

V.Testing of 4th Hypothesis- "Employees with longer hybrid work experience report better work-life balance".

To test the above hypotheses, following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test the relationship between the duration of hybrid work experience and employees perceived work-life balance.

H_0: "There is no significant relationship between the duration of hybrid work experience and employees perceived work-life balance"

H_1: "Employees with longer hybrid work experience report a significantly better work-life balance"

A One-Way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis that workers who have been involved in hybrid work arrangements for a longer period of time report a much better work-life balance.

Table 7: Showing ANOVA of relationship between the duration of hybrid work experience and employees perceived work-life balance

Work Life Balance					
	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	**.671**	**3**	**.224**	**.126**	**.944**
Within Groups	**269.098**	**152**	**1.770**		
Total	**269.769**	**155**			

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

Table 7 shows the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA). The p-value (Sig.) is 0.944, which is far more than the conventional alpha criterion of 0.05. This is indicative of a lack of statistically significant variation in how different categories of hybrid workers see their work-life balance. In addition to indicating that the variations in group averages are largely attributable to random variation rather than any real impact of hybrid work experience on work-life balance, the very low F-value of 0.126 further supports this conclusion.

VI.Testing of 5th Hypothesis- "Hybrid work reduces job-related stress compared to other models".

The following null and alternative hypotheses are framed to test job-related stress compared to other hybrid work models.

H_0: "There is no significant difference in job-related stress among employees across different work arrangements"

H_1: "There is a significant difference in job-related stress among employees based on their work arrangement"

A One-Way ANOVA was used to evaluate the hypothesis about job-related stress among workers across various work arrangements.

Table 8: ANOVA of significant difference in job-related stress among employees across different work arrangements

Job related Stress					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	14.285	2	7.143	3.977	.021
Within Groups	274.792	153	1.796		
Total	289.077	155			

Source: Data through structured questionnaire

The ANOVA test for the 5th hypothesis revealed (in the table-8) a statistically significant difference in job-related stress among employees across different work arrangements, with an F-value of 3.977 and a p-value of 0.021 ($p < 0.05$). This suggests that how individuals perceive stress at work is significantly affected by their work arrangement, whether it on-site, hybrid, or remote. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected, confirming that employees ***working under different models report varying levels of stress, with hybrid work potentially offering stress-reducing benefits compared to others***.

V. Major Findings:

1. **Reliability of Measurement Scale**: The Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.809 indicates good internal consistency of the instrument used to measure variables such as satisfaction, performance, and stress, validating the credibility of the survey tool.
2. **Employee Satisfaction & Work Arrangement (H_1)**: The Chi-square test showed no significant association between work arrangement (on-site, hybrid, remote) and employee satisfaction ($p = .968$), suggesting that satisfaction levels are influenced by factors beyond just the type of work arrangement.
3. **Impact on Job Performance (H_2)**: MANOVA and subsequent univariate ANOVAs revealed no significant effect of hybrid work frequency on productivity, task efficiency, or work-life balance. Thus, the frequency of remote work did not significantly influence performance outcomes.
4. **Infrastructure & Satisfaction (H_3)**: The correlation between provision of infrastructure and employee satisfaction in the hybrid model was not statistically significant ($r = -0.095$, $p = .237$), indicating that other factors might contribute more strongly to satisfaction.
5. **Hybrid Experience & Work-Life Balance (H_4)**: ANOVA results showed no significant relationship between the duration of hybrid work experience and perceived work-life balance ($p = .944$), suggesting that simply working longer in a hybrid model does not guarantee better work-life harmony.
6. **Work Arrangement & Job-Related Stress (H_5)**: A significant difference was observed in job-related stress levels across different work arrangements ($p = .021$), indicating that hybrid work may help reduce stress compared to fully on-site or fully remote models.

VI. Suggestions:

1. **Focus on Qualitative Factors**: Since work arrangement alone does not significantly impact satisfaction or performance, organizations should enhance employee experience through better leadership, recognition, and flexible policies.
2. **Improve Support Systems**: Although infrastructure did not show a direct correlation with satisfaction, improving digital tools, help desks, and IT responsiveness may create a more enabling hybrid work environment.
3. **Tailor Wellness Initiatives**: Given the significant variation in stress levels, especially across work models, employers should offer personalized mental health and wellness programs tailored to hybrid and remote workers.

4. **Encourage Balanced Hybrid Schedules**: While performance wasn't statistically affected, descriptive trends suggested that 3–4 days of remote work may offer a balance between efficiency and flexibility. Encourage adaptable hybrid schedules based on team and role.
5. **Further Study with Larger and Sector-Diverse Samples**: Results may vary across industries or demographics. A larger, more diverse sample could offer deeper insights into hybrid work dynamics.

VII. Conclusion:

Despite the prevalence of hybrid work cultures in Bangalore, the research found that the quantitative data suggests that they have little effect on employee happiness and productivity on the job. However, it significantly influences stress levels, indicating that hybrid arrangements may contribute to healthier work environments. Satisfaction and productivity may be more influenced by factors such as company culture, job clarity and interpersonal support. As organizations continue to evolve hybrid models post-pandemic, nuanced and employee-centric strategies will be essential to unlock their full potential.

Limitations of the Study:

There are a few noteworthy caveats to the research. Employees in Bangalore are the only ones included; therefore, the results may not apply to other areas. Due to the small sample size and the potential for response bias, self-reported surveys are not ideal. Because it is cross-sectional, the research cannot account for changes that occur with time. Additionally, only quantitative data was used, limiting deeper insights that qualitative methods could provide. External factors such as organizational policies or personal circumstances were not considered, which may also influence the outcomes.

References

[1]. Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16*(2), 40–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273

[2]. Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 383–400. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.144

[3]. Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 130*(1), 165–218. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032

[4]. Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal, 42*(4), 655–683. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251

[5]. Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 32*(3), 195–212. https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097

[6]. Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1524–1541. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524

[7]. Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote work productivity, engagement, and stress. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 63*(7), e426–e432. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002236

[8]. Gallup. (2022). *The future of hybrid work: 5 key questions answered with data.* Gallup, Inc. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/390632/future-hybrid-work-key-questions-answered-data.aspx

[9]. Golden, T. D., & Veiga, J. F. (2005). The impact of extent of telecommuting on job satisfaction: Resolving inconsistent findings. *Journal of Management, 31*(2), 301–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271768

[10]. Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations, 63*(1), 83–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199

[11]. Kumar, R., & Sinha, P. (2021). Impact of hybrid working on employee productivity: A study in Indian IT sector. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 57*(3), 430–445.

[12]. Lister, K., & Harnish, T. (2011). *The state of telework in the U.S.: How individuals, business, and government benefit*. Telework Research Network.

[13]. Mulki, J. P., Bardhi, F., Lassk, F. G., & Nanavaty-Dahl, J. (2009). Set up remote workers to thrive. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 51*(1), 63–69.

[14]. Parker, S. K., Knight, C., & Keller, A. (2020). Remote managers are having trust issues. *Harvard Business Review.* https://hbr.org/2020/07/remote-managers-are-having-trust-issues

[15]. Singh, V., & Sharma, R. (2022). Hybrid work model: Challenges and opportunities in the Indian context. *International Journal of Management Studies, 9*(1), 20–30.

[16]. Spivack, A. J., & Milosevic, I. (2018). Telecommuting and organizational culture: When technology meets workplace flexibility. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 33*(3), 365–377. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9500-1

[17]. Vartiainen, M., & Hyrkkänen, U. (2010). Changing requirements and mental workload factors in mobile multi-locational work. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 25*(2), 117–135. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.2010.00242.x

[18]. Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290