A Study on Impact of Hybrid Work on Employee Productivity in Select IT Organizations of NCR

Tanya Nagpal, Ria Sodhi, Tushar Gahlawat, Aayushi Gahlyan

Abstract: A hybrid work is a combination of both remote and in-person work, where employees can work from the office, home, or other locations. This type of work design has become more and more popular in recent years due to advances in technology and changing work preferences. The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of hybrid work on employee productivity in select IT organizations of the National Capital Region (NCR). The employees of select IT companies in the NCR who have experienced a shift to a hybrid work will be the focus of the study. Through surveys and interviews with employees and managers, the study will gather data. The studies will gather information on representative efficiency, work fulfilment, balance between serious and fun activities, and other important elements.

Keywords: Employee Productivity, Hybrid Work, NCR, Delhi.
Research Type: Research Paper

Components of the Conceptual Framework:

- **Independent Variable:** Hybrid work
- **Dependent Variable:** Employee Productivity

Introduction

With the increasing adoption of hybrid work models, especially in the Information Technology (IT) sector, the modern work landscape is undergoing a transformative shift. Employees can choose to work remotely or in the office on a regular basis when they adopt a hybrid work style. This paradigm has gained traction as a result of changing employee preferences, technological advancements, and the need for flexibility brought on by international crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. An active hub for many IT companies that have adopted or are moving towards hybrid work arrangements is the National Capital Region (NCR) of India. Evaluating how this change will affect worker productivity becomes essential to efficiently optimising work arrangements and results.
Hybrid work is the independent variable in this study as it represents the factor that is controlled by the researchers. This variable encompasses various elements such as remote work policies, flexible scheduling options, virtual collaboration tools, and the integration of technology to support work-from-anywhere scenarios. The degree to which organizations implement and manage hybrid work practices influences employee productivity, job satisfaction levels, work-life balance, and overall performance.
Employee productivity serves as the dependent variable in this study as it is the outcome or response that is measured based on changes in the independent variable (hybrid work). Productivity, in this context, refers to the efficiency and effectiveness with which employees perform their tasks, meet deadlines, achieve objectives, and contribute to organizational success. This variable can be assessed using various quantitative measures such as a self-assessment matrix for evaluating individual performance.
Through an examination of the complex relationship between hybrid work practices and employee productivity in a few chosen IT companies located in the National Capital Region the study will use self-assessment matrix to

evaluate individual employee productivity. Using the matrix, the research aims hold the potential to examine the factors enabling hybrid work in select IT organisations of NCR, to analyse the relationship between hybrid work and employee productivity and to measure the effect of hybrid work on employee productivity.

Objectives of the Study:

- To examine the factors enabling hybrid work in select IT organisations of NCR.
- To analyse the relationship between hybrid work and employee productivity.
- To measure the effect of hybrid work on employee productivity.

Review of Literature

In 2021, Wilson studied how working remotely affected productivity during the pandemic. The study's findings were contradictory; although some employees reported higher productivity, others encountered difficulties like social isolation and work-family conflict (Wilson, 2021). With an emphasis on worker productivity, Marie et al. (2021) investigated the working styles and team-building skills of workers in hybrid work environments. According to their research, workers in hybrid work environments thought favourably of their employers' ability to adapt to the pandemic and addressing remote work issues. Regression analysis was used by Radonic et al. (2021) to examine the impact of hybrid working models on intangible assets. According to their research, the development of intangible assets was not endangered by hybrid work arrangements, suggesting that these models are still relevant for contemporary businesses.
Fridrihsone et al. (2021) investigated the connection between the pandemic and employee productivity and well-being in relation to hybrid work elements. Their conclusions emphasised the value of less monitoring and results-based performance management in raising productivity in hybrid work environments. Chellam and Divya (2022) zoomed in on one company switching to hybrid work. They wanted to know what employees thought about this change and if it really made things better for them (Chellam & Divya, 2022). Their study, "A causal study on hybrid model and its impact on employee job performance. Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results," gives us a closer look at how hybrid setups can affect employees in different industries and company cultures.
In the world of work, things are changing, especially with hybrid setups mixing office and remote work. Some researchers like Sethi, Singh, and Kamna (2022) noticed that while we know a lot about how working from home affects individual employees, we haven't looked enough at how it changes how companies are run. So, they decided to ask IT workers in Delhi NCR what they thought about these new work policies and how they might affect things like how they work and how companies are managed (Sethi, Singh, & Kamna, 2022). Their findings, in a study called "IMPACT OF HYBRID WORK POLICY ON EMPLOYEES' ORIENTATION AND ISSUES OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN NEW NORMAL," were meant to help managers, HR people, and policymakers make better decisions. Another researcher, Tran (2022), looked at teams that work on software development projects. While we know how remote work affects these teams, we're not sure how hybrid work does. Tran did a deep dive into this with a study called "The Impact of Hybrid Work on Productivity: Understanding the Future of Work: A case study in agile software development teams" (Tran, 2022). They wanted to find out how mixing office and remote work impacts how productive these teams are.
Templonuev et al. (2022) investigated how hybrid work affected collaboration, creativity, productivity, and well-being in a university setting. Positive results from their study showed that employees' productivity and flexibility were enhanced by hybrid work.

Suryadi et al. (2022) studied the effects of information technology, work-life balance, telecommuting, and work flexibility on worker productivity. Their results highlighted how important it is for organisations to successfully manage these elements in order to achieve desired results. The beneficial effects of hybrid work on employee

productivity, job satisfaction, and well-being were confirmed by Castañed's study in 2023. Compared to those who worked entirely remotely or on-site, employees in hybrid work arrangements reported higher levels of productivity and satisfaction (Castañed, 2023). Kuppachi (2023) joined in because they noticed we don't have a lot of good advice on how to handle hybrid work. While we know a bit about remote work, we're still figuring out the best ways to do hybrid setups. Kuppachi's study, "The Impact of Hybrid Work Arrangements on Employee Engagement and Performance," looked into what makes these setups work well and how they affect how well employees do their jobs (Kuppachi, 2023).

Lastly, Muriithi et al. (2023) looked into how the Communications Authority of Kenya's employee productivity was impacted by their use of ICT, their HR planning, and their perception of work-life balance. Their results showed a strong correlation between increased productivity and ICT adoption. Then, there's Naqshbandi, Kabir, Ishak, and Islam (2024). They wanted to see how different parts of hybrid work setups relate to how well employees perform and how engaged they are. They used something called the Job Demands-Resources model to figure this out (Naqshbandi, Kabir, Ishak, & Islam, 2024). Their study, "The future of work: work engagement and job performance in the hybrid workplace. The Learning Organization," was all about helping bosses make rules that make employees do better in these new work setups.

The cumulative results of these numerous studies over the years shed light on how remote and hybrid work models are developing and how they affect employee productivity.

Research Gap

The corpus of research on the productivity consequences of hybrid work arrangements is expanding, but there is still a lack of knowledge regarding the complex relationships between the well-being of individual employees and the productivity outcomes of hybrid work. Examining how the hybrid work model, specifically in IT organisations in the National Capital Region (NCR), affects work-life balance, job satisfaction, stress levels, motivation, and mental health, is the focus of this research.

A deeper understanding of the connection between productivity, employee well-being, and hybrid work would result from investigating this research gap. This study focuses on revealing the intricate factors which enabled hybrid working while also suggesting how hybrid working and employee productivity are related to each other. This study also focuses to examine the impact of hybrid working model on employee productivity.

Research Methodology

Research Design: This study is a descriptive study. In order to characterise a phenomenon or circumstance, descriptive research usually entails analysing the effects of particular factors or looking at the relationships between variables. In this instance, the study looks at what makes hybrid work possible, examines how employee productivity and hybrid work are related, and uses a self-assessment matrix to calculate how much employee productivity is impacted by hybrid work. The study will use a quantitative research design to look into how employee productivity is affected by hybrid work in a few National Capital Region (NCR) IT organisations. Sampling: Stratified random sampling will be employed to guarantee representation from different employee levels in the chosen IT organisations located in the National Capital Region. Based on statistical considerations, the sample size will be chosen to ensure sufficient power for regression and correlation analyses.
Data collection: After a careful analysis of the body of existing literature and advice from experts, a structured survey questionnaire will be created. There will be sections on hybrid work arrangements (like how often people

work remotely or use collaboration tools), employee productivity metrics (like task completion rates and project timelines met), work-life balance, job satisfaction, and demographic data. Electronic responses will be gathered in order to speed up the process of collecting data.

Data Analysis:

Correlation Analysis: To investigate the connections between different facets of hybrid work and worker productivity, statistical software will be utilised to conduct correlation analyses. The results of this analysis will shed light on the associations' direction and strength.
Regression Analysis: To determine how hybrid work affects employee productivity while accounting for possible confounding variables like job role, experience level, and workplace characteristics, regression models will be built. The objective of this analysis is to measure how hybrid work arrangements affect productivity results.
Ethical Considerations: The study will abide by ethical standards, guaranteeing voluntary participation, informed consent, and data confidentiality. Before any data is collected, the appropriate institutional review boards will be consulted for approval.

Limitations: The inherent complexity of measuring productivity in hybrid work settings, sample representativeness, and self-reporting biases are some potential limitations.
Significance: The study aims to provide insightful information about how employee productivity is affected by hybrid work arrangements in the IT industry in the NCR area. This information will have application for companies that want to improve employee performance and satisfaction by optimising their hybrid work models.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Exploratory Factor Analysis Interpretation

KMO and Bartlett's Test (measures the strength of relationship among the variables)

The Bartlett's test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) tests are used to evaluate the suitability of data sampling for factor analysis. A method for identifying underlying variables from a set of observed variables is factor analysis. Sampling adequacy is measured by the KMO, which goes from 0 to 1. When values are near to 1, it means that sampling for factor analysis is sufficient. A chi-square test is used in the Bartlett's test of sphericity. A small p-value indicates a significant result, which implies that the data does not meet the sphericality requirement for factor analysis.
Kaiser (1974) recommends 0.5 (value for KMO) as a minimum (barely accepted), values between 0.7-0.8 are acceptable, and values above 0.9 are superb.
Looking at the table below, the KMO measure is 0.417, which is close to 0.5 and therefore can be barely accepted (Table 1). At a significance level of 0.912, the Bartlett's test statistic is 129.919 with 153 degrees of freedom. Data that have a significance level higher than 0.05 might be spherical. In this case, Bartlett's test's high significance level raises the possibility that the data are spherical.

(Table 1)

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.417
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	129.919
	df	153
	Sig.	.912

Communalities

Table 2 presents the findings of a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) concerning work behaviours in a home-office hybrid work environment. Communalities are commonly used to express the percentage of variance in each variable that can be explained by the common factors that were identified through analysis. Since all of the variables in this instance have communalities values of 1.000, it can be concluded that the common factors that were extracted adequately represent each variable. Following PCA extraction, the variables' contribution to the common factors varies in strength, as indicated by the extraction communalities, which range from.537 to.770. Greater values (nearer to 1) indicate that the extracted common factors adequately represent the variable.
Lower values, which are nearer to zero, indicate that the variable may not be highly correlated with the common factors that were extracted, or it may be less well represented.

Overall, these communalities suggest that the common factors extracted during the Principal Component Analysis fairly well-represent most variables, with some variables having stronger relationships with the extracted factors than others.

(Table 2)

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.579
My planning was optimal. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.617
I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.684
I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.770
I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.642

I took on extra responsibilities. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.537
I started new tasks myself, when my old ones were finished. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.687
I took on challenging work tasks, when available. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.703
I worked at keeping my job knowledge up-to-date. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.574
I worked at keeping my job skills up-to-date. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.723
I came up with creative solutions to new problems. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.656
I kept looking for new challenges in my job. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.716
I actively participated in work meetings. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.733
I complained about unimportant matters at work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.763
I made problems greater than they were at work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.709
I focused on the negative aspects of a work situation, instead of on the positive aspects. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.747
I spoke with colleagues about the negative aspects of my work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.682

I spoke with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1.000	.722

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Total Variance Explained

The requirement for identifying the number of components or factors stated by selected variables is the presence of eigenvalues of more than 1. Table 3 herein shows that for 1st component the value is 2.137 > 1, 2nd component is 1.856 > 1, 3rd component is 1.738 > 1, and 4th component is 1.467 > 1. But, the 9th component is 0.898<1. Thus, the stated set of 18 variables represents eight components. Further, the extracted sum of squared holding % of variance depicts that the first factor accounts for 11.870% of the variance features from the stated observations, the second 22.182%, the third 31.836% and the fourth 39.984%, the fifth 47.639%, the sixth 55.196%, the seventh 61.869% and the eighth 68.026% (Table 3). Thus, 8 components are effective enough in representing all the characteristics or components highlighted by the stated 18 variables. Of the variance, the first eight factors account for nearly 68.026%. As a result, the study may choose to keep these eight variables for additional examination.

(Table 3)

Total Variance Explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.137	11.870	11.870	2.137	11.870	11.870
2	1.856	10.312	22.182	1.856	10.312	22.182
3	1.738	9.654	31.836	1.738	9.654	31.836
4	1.467	8.148	39.984	1.467	8.148	39.984
5	1.378	7.655	47.639	1.378	7.655	47.639
6	1.360	7.558	55.196	1.360	7.558	55.196
7	1.201	6.672	61.869	1.201	6.672	61.869
8	1.108	6.158	68.026	1.108	6.158	68.026
9	.898	4.986	73.013			
10	.819	4.552	77.565			
11	.766	4.257	81.821			
12	.722	4.011	85.832			
13	.583	3.238	89.070			
14	.537	2.984	92.054			
15	.472	2.625	94.679			
16	.391	2.173	96.852			
17	.337	1.874	98.726			
18	.229	1.274	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

ORDINAL REGRESSION INTERPRETATION

Case Processing Summary

The majority of respondents (26%) fall into Category 7, indicating that they strongly agree with being able to separate main issues from side issues at work. The distribution across other categories shows varying degrees of agreement or disagreement. The highest percentage of respondents (22%) falls into Category 3, indicating agreement with being able to plan work effectively to meet deadlines. Other categories also show a range of responses. Responses are distributed across multiple categories, with Category 3 having the highest percentage (20%) of respondents agreeing that their planning was optimal. The distribution of responses for keeping in mind work results varies across categories, with Category 7 (26%) having the highest percentage of respondents strongly agreeing with this statement (Table 4).

(Table 4)

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1	5	10.0%
	2	11	22.0%
	3	8	16.0%
	4	7	14.0%
	5	8	16.0%
	6	5	10.0%
	7	6	12.0%
I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1	10	20.0%
	2	5	10.0%
	3	11	22.0%
	4	6	12.0%
	5	8	16.0%
	6	4	8.0%
	7	6	12.0%
My planning was optimal. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1	6	12.0%
	2	4	8.0%
	3	10	20.0%
	4	6	12.0%
	5	7	14.0%
	6	9	18.0%
	7	8	16.0%
I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	1	5	10.0%
	2	10	20.0%
	3	10	20.0%
	4	3	6.0%

	5	8	16.0%
	6	1	2.0%
	7	13	26.0%
Valid		50	100.0%
Missing		0	
Total		50	

Model Fitting Information

The Intercept Only model has an -2 Log Likelihood of 186.815, which serves as a reference for model comparison. The Final model, which likely includes predictors beyond just the intercept, has a lower -2 Log Likelihood of 163.277, indicating that it fits the data better than the Intercept Only model.
The Chi-Square test compares these models, with a Chi-Square value of 23.538 and 18 degrees of freedom. The p-value (Sig.) associated with this Chi-Square test is 0.171, which is greater than 0.05. This suggests that the improvement in model fit by adding predictors is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level of 0.05.

(Table 5)

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	186.815			
Final	163.277	23.538	18	.171

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

A logistic regression model's fit is examined in the "Goodness-of-Fit" table, which focuses on two goodness-of-fit tests: Deviance and Pearson's Chi-Square.
The Chi-Square value is 315.408 with 258 degrees of freedom (df).
The associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.008, which is less than the typical significance level of 0.05. This indicates that there is evidence of a significant discrepancy between the model's predictions and the observed data according to Pearson's Chi-Square test.
The Deviance value is 159.118 with 258 degrees of freedom (df).
The associated p-value (Sig.) is 1.000, which is greater than 0.05. A non-significant p-value suggests that the model's fit is not significantly different from a perfectly fitting model according to the Deviance test.

(Table 6)

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	315.408	258	.008
Deviance	159.118	258	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Metrics known as "Pseudo R-Square" values—Cox and Snell, Nagelkerke, and McFadden, in particular—are employed to assess the explanatory power or goodness-of-fit of logistic regression models.
The value of .375 Cox and Snell Pseudo R-Square (Table 7) indicates that approximately 37.5% of the variability in the outcome variable is explained by the predictors included in the logistic regression model, relative to a null model. The value of .384 Nagelkerke's Pseudo R-Square suggests that approximately 38.4% of the variability in the outcome variable is explained by the predictors in the model, relative to a null model. The value of .123 indicates that McFadden's Pseudo R-Square is lower than the other two measures, suggesting that around 12.3% of the variability in the outcome variable is explained by the predictors in the model compared to a null model.

(Table 7)

Pseudo R-Square	
Cox and Snell	.375
Nagelkerke	.384
McFadden	.123

Link function: Logit.

Pearson's Correlation Interpretation

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant linear relationship between the ability to separate main issues from side issues at work and the ability to plan work to meet deadlines in a Hybrid Work (Home+Office) setting.
Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant linear relationship between these variables.
The correlation between "I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work" and "I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time" is -0.006 (Table 8).
Both correlations are negative, but they are extremely close to zero (essentially zero), indicating a very weak/negligible linear relationship between these variables.
These correlations have p-values of 0.969 (Table 8), which is significantly higher than the typical significance level of 0.05.
Hence, there may not be a statistically significant correlation between these variables in the sample as the p-value is greater than 0.05.

(Table 8)

Correlations

		I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]
I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	Pearson Correlation	1	-.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.969
	N	50	50
I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time. [Hybrid Work (Home+Office)]	Pearson Correlation	-.006	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.969	
	N	50	50

Findings:

The study focused on understanding the impact of hybrid work on employee productivity in select IT organizations in NCR, New Delhi, collecting data from 50 respondents via online survey questionnaires. After applying Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), 18 initial statements were reduced to 8 significant components for analysis.

The regression interpretation revealed that most respondents (26%) strongly agreed with their ability to separate main issues from side issues at work, falling into Category 7. Category 3, indicating effective work planning to meet deadlines, had the highest percentage of agreement (22%). The Final model, with predictors beyond the intercept, showed a better fit than the Intercept Only model, as indicated by a lower -2 Log Likelihood.

However, the Chi-Square test comparing these models yielded a non-significant p-value (0.171), suggesting that adding predictors did not significantly improve the model fit at the conventional significance level.

The logistic regression model's Goodness-of-Fit tests showed a significant discrepancy between predicted and observed data according to Pearson's Chi-Square test ($p = 0.008$), but not according to the Deviance test ($p = 1.000$). The Pseudo R-Square values (Cox and Snell: 0.375, Nagelkerke: 0.384, McFadden: 0.123) indicated that around 37.5% to 38.4% of the outcome variable's variability was explained by predictors in the model, with McFadden's measure being lower.

Regarding correlation interpretation, the study tested the relationship between separating main issues from side issues at work and planning work to meet deadlines. The correlation was close to zero (-0.006), indicating a very weak/negligible linear relationship. Both correlations had p-values (0.969) significantly higher than 0.05, suggesting no statistically significant correlation in the sample.

In summary, while the study identified varying degrees of agreement among respondents on work-related aspects, such as issue separation and planning, the statistical analysis did not find significant correlations between these variables in the sample.

Limitations:

1. Most of the respondents were from NCR, Delhi. Result may not be representing another region. Other nationalities should also be explored to identify different perspectives of employees working hybrid in IT industry and its impact on their productivity.
2. This study uses exploratory factor analysis, correlation and regression to identify the relationship between variables. Future research can be done using combined theory to analyse impact of hybrid work on employee productivity as well as different statistical analysis can be done.
3. Due to limited time, despite my efforts to obtain more respondents, we were only able to collect 50 respondents which is very less to get from the IT industry of NCR. A greater number of respondents may change the result.
4. Survey was circulated online so most of the people who took the survey answered for themselves anonymously behind the screen, the responses may not have been entirely accurate or well thought compared to a formal interview.

References:

Castaneda, J.M., Japos, G. and Templonuevo, W. (2022) 'Effects of hybrid work model on employees and staff's work productivity: A literature review', *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 50(1), pp. 159–178. doi:10.7719/jpair.v50i1.537

Chellam, N., & Divya, D. (2022). A causal study on hybrid model and its impact on employee job performance. Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results, 866-873

Fridrihsone, D. and Suhodoļska, J. (2021) 'ACHIEVING EFFECTIVE HYBRID WORKING: HYBRID WORKPLACE ELEMENTS FOR WHITE COLLAR WORKERS IN LATVIA AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AND WELL-BEING DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC', *www.amfiteatrueconomic.ro*, 23(58), p. 770. doi:10.24818/ea/2021/58/770

Kuppachi, K. R. (2023). The Impact of Hybrid Work Arrangements on Employee Engagement and Performance (Doctoral dissertation, Indian School of Business (India)

Milenko, R., Valentina, V. and Milosavljevic, M. (2021) 'The impact of hybrid workplace models on intangible assets: The case of an emerging country', *www.amfiteatrueconomic.ro*, 23(58), p. 770. doi:10.24818/ea/2021/58/770

Muriithi and Muchangi, L. (2023) 'Influence of hybrid working arrangements on employee productivity in the Communications Authority of Kenya', *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, 5(2). doi:Influence of hybrid working arrangements on employee productivity in the Communications Authority of Kenya.

Naqshbandi, M. M., Kabir, I., Ishak, N. A., & Islam, M. Z. (2024). The future of work: work engagement and job performance in the hybrid workplace. The Learning Organization, 31(1), 5-26.

Sethi, P., Singh, D., & Kamna, M. S. A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF HYBRID WORK POLICY ON EMPLOYEES'ORIENTATION AND ISSUES OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN NEW NORMAL.,2022

Suryadi, Y., FoEh, J.E.H.J. and Manafe, H. (2022a) 'Employee productivity determination: Work life balance (WLB), work from Home (WFH), Information Technology (IT) and work flexibility', *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, 5(2), pp. 731–751. doi:10.31538/iijse.v5i2.2533

Tran, L. (2022). The Impact of Hybrid Work on Productivity: Understanding the Future of Work: A case study in agile software development teams.

Wilson, J.W.L. (2021) *Impact of W Impact of Work from Home P om Home Policies on W olicies on Workplace Pr orkplace Productivity oductivity and Employee Sentiments During the COVID-19 Pandemic* [Preprint].