FROM TRADITIONAL WORK TO HYBRID WORK: A NARRATIVE REVIEW OF EVOLUTION, ANTECEDENTS, DIMENSIONS, OUTCOMES, AND SCHOLARLY DEBATES

Manoj Kumar[1], Suriati Akmal[1], Razi Luqman[2], Zainab Hussain[3]

[1]Institute of Technology Management & Entrepreneurship
Universiti Teknikal Malaysia, Melaka, Malaysia

[2]Enpro Consultants, Sindh, Pakistan

[3]Denning Business School, Sindh, Pakistan

Corresponding Author's Email: manojneel951@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The nature of work has undergone profound transformation over the past century, driven by technological advancements, economic restructuring, and shifting societal expectations. Most recently, the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated a global transition toward flexible work arrangements, culminating in the widespread adoption of hybrid work environments that combine on-site and remote work. This narrative review synthesizes interdisciplinary scholarship to examine the historical evolution of work from traditional, location-bound models to telework, remote work, and contemporary hybrid configurations. Drawing on organizational, sociological, and psychological literatures, the review explores the emergence of hybrid work as a response to technological enablement, organizational needs, and employee expectations. The paper further analyzes the key dimensions of hybrid work, its antecedents at individual, organizational, and societal levels, and its outcomes for employees, teams, and organizations. Particular attention is given to ongoing scholarly debates regarding the benefits and drawbacks of hybrid work, including productivity, well-being, equity, and organizational control. The review also integrates major theoretical perspectives—such as sociotechnical systems theory, job demands–resources theory, and boundary theory—to explain how hybrid work reshapes contemporary employment relationships. By consolidating fragmented research across disciplines, this review contributes a comprehensive conceptual foundation for understanding hybrid work environments and identifies critical gaps to guide future research and evidence-based organizational practice.

Keywords: Hybrid work environment; Telework; Remote work; Work evolution; Flexible work arrangements; COVID-19; Organizational outcomes; Digital transformation

1. Introduction

Work has never been a static phenomenon. Rather, it has continuously evolved in response to economic systems, technological innovations, and prevailing social norms. For much of the twentieth century, dominant models of work were characterized by physical co-location, fixed schedules, and hierarchical supervision within organizational premises (Fayol, 1949; Weber, 1947). This traditional paradigm reflected industrial-era assumptions that productivity depended on direct oversight and spatial proximity. However, the gradual transition toward knowledge-intensive economies began to challenge these assumptions, paving the way for more flexible forms of work organization (Bell, 1973). The emergence of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the late twentieth century marked a critical turning point in how work could be performed. Early conceptualizations of *telework* or *telecommuting* envisioned a future in which employees could perform tasks remotely, reducing commuting time and organizational overheads (Nilles, 1975). Although telework initially remained peripheral and unevenly adopted, advances in personal computing, broadband internet, and mobile technologies steadily expanded their feasibility (Allen et al., 2015). Over time, telework evolved into broader forms of remote work, enabling employees to work from locations outside the traditional office on a more regular basis (Messenger & Gschwind, 2016).

Despite these technological possibilities, widespread adoption of remote work remained limited prior to 2020, often constrained by managerial resistance, cultural norms, and concerns about productivity and control (Kurland & Bailey, 1999). The COVID-19 pandemic dramatically altered this trajectory. As governments-imposed lockdowns and physical distancing measures, organizations across sectors were compelled to implement large-scale, often unplanned, remote work arrangements to ensure business continuity (Kniffin et al., 2021). This period of "forced remote work" represented an unprecedented natural experiment, fundamentally reshaping employer and employee perceptions of where and how work could be performed. As organizations transitioned into the post-pandemic era, few returned fully to pre-COVID work arrangements. Instead, many adopted hybrid work environments, combining remote and on-site work in varying configurations (Choudhury et al., 2021). Hybrid work has since emerged as a dominant and enduring organizational model rather than a temporary crisis response. This shift reflects not only lessons learned during the pandemic but also broader structural changes in employee expectations, talent competition, and digital transformation strategies (OECD, 2023).

Although research on hybrid work has expanded rapidly, the literature remains fragmented across disciplines and often lacks historical integration. Existing studies tend to focus on isolated outcomes such as productivity, job satisfaction, or work–life balance without situating hybrid work within its broader evolutionary context. Moreover, scholarly debates persist regarding its long-term implications, with contrasting findings on performance, collaboration, employee well-being, and organizational culture (Bloom et al., 2023). These inconsistencies highlight the need for a comprehensive synthesis that traces how hybrid work emerged, why it persists, and how it reshapes contemporary employment relationships. Accordingly, the purpose of this narrative review is threefold. First, it traces the historical evolution of work arrangements, from traditional office-based work to telework, remote work, and contemporary hybrid work environments. Second, it synthesizes existing scholarship to identify the key dimensions, antecedents, and outcomes associated with hybrid work. Third, it critically examines ongoing scholarly debates regarding the benefits and drawbacks of hybrid work, drawing on established theoretical frameworks to explain divergent findings. By integrating insights across time, theory, and empirical evidence, this review aims to provide a robust conceptual foundation for future research and informed organizational decision-making.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. The next section outlines the methodological approach underpinning this narrative review. Subsequent sections examine the historical evolution of work, the theoretical underpinnings of hybrid work, its core dimensions, antecedents, and outcomes, followed by a critical discussion of scholarly debates. The paper concludes by identifying research gaps, practical implications, and directions for future inquiry.

1.1 Theoretical and Practical Contributions

This review makes several important contributions to the literature on contemporary work arrangements. Theoretically, it situates hybrid work within a long-term historical and conceptual

evolution of work, integrating insights from sociotechnical systems theory, job demands–resources theory, and boundary management perspectives to address fragmentation in existing research. By synthesizing antecedents, dimensions, and outcomes of hybrid work across multiple levels of analysis, the paper advances a coherent framework for understanding hybrid work as a distinct and enduring organizational form. Practically, the review provides evidence-based insights for managers and policymakers on designing, implementing, and sustaining hybrid work arrangements, highlighting both opportunities and challenges related to productivity, employee well-being, collaboration, and equity in post-pandemic organizations.

1.2 Justification for Using a Narrative Review

A narrative review approach is adopted because the objective of this study is to trace the historical evolution, conceptual development, and theoretical foundations of hybrid work rather than to evaluate effect sizes or test specific hypotheses. Hybrid work research spans multiple disciplines and terminologies, with heterogeneous methods and outcomes, making strict inclusion criteria of systematic reviews less suitable for capturing its conceptual richness. A narrative review allows integration of classic foundational works with recent empirical studies, enabling theory development and critical synthesis across time and contexts. This approach is therefore appropriate for clarifying definitional ambiguities, identifying dominant themes, and advancing a coherent framework for future research.

2. Methodological Approach

2.1 Narrative Review Design

This study adopts a narrative review methodology to synthesize and interpret the multidisciplinary body of literature on the evolution of work arrangements and the emergence of hybrid work environments. Narrative reviews are particularly suitable for topics that span long historical periods, involve diverse theoretical perspectives, and exhibit conceptual fragmentation across disciplines (Green et al., 2006; Snyder, 2019). Unlike systematic reviews that prioritize exhaustive coverage and statistical aggregation, narrative reviews emphasize conceptual integration, historical tracing, and theory development, making them appropriate for examining how hybrid work has emerged, evolved, and been debated over time.

The choice of a narrative approach is justified by the complex and evolving nature of hybrid work, which intersects organizational studies, human resource management, sociology, psychology, information systems, and public policy. Given that hybrid work research accelerated rapidly during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, a flexible review design allows for the integration of foundational pre-pandemic scholarship on telework and remote work with emerging post-pandemic evidence.

2.2 Search Strategy

A structured but flexible search strategy was employed to identify relevant peer-reviewed literature. Major academic databases were consulted, including Web of Science, Scopus, PsycINFO, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar, as these databases collectively cover high-impact journals in management, organizational behavior, psychology, and information systems. Search strings combined keywords related to work arrangements and temporal phases, including but not limited to: traditional work, telework, telecommuting, remote work, flexible work arrangements, hybrid work, COVID-19 and work, and post-pandemic work. Boolean operators and truncations were used to refine searches and capture variations in terminology (e.g., "telework*" OR "telecommute*").

To ensure historical depth, the search covered publications from the 1970s, marking the early conceptualization of telecommuting, through 2025, capturing the most recent post-pandemic scholarship. Reference lists of seminal articles and influential reviews were also manually examined to identify additional relevant sources, a technique commonly recommended to enhance coverage in narrative reviews (Booth et al., 2016).

2.4 Analytical and Synthesis Procedure

Following identification and screening, selected studies were analyzed through an iterative thematic synthesis process. First, articles were chronologically mapped to trace the historical evolution of work

arrangements from traditional office-based work to telework, remote work, and hybrid work. Second, studies were coded thematically to identify recurring constructs, including antecedents, dimensions, outcomes, benefits, and drawbacks of hybrid work. In parallel, attention was given to the theoretical frameworks employed across studies, such as sociotechnical systems theory, job demands–resources theory, boundary theory, and organizational support theory. This enabled the integration of empirical findings with theoretical explanations and facilitated the identification of areas of convergence and divergence within the literature. Rather than aggregating effect sizes, findings were synthesized narratively, emphasizing patterns, contradictions, and contextual moderators. This approach aligns with best practices for narrative reviews seeking to build conceptual clarity and advance theory in emerging research domains (Snyder, 2019).

2.5 Rigor and Trustworthiness

To enhance rigor and transparency, multiple strategies were employed. First, reliance on high-impact journals ensured the inclusion of theoretically and methodologically robust studies. Second, triangulation across disciplines reduced the risk of field-specific bias. Third, explicit documentation of the search strategy and analytical process supports the credibility and replicability of the review. While narrative reviews are inherently interpretive, this study prioritizes balanced representation of competing perspectives, particularly in areas of scholarly debate concerning productivity, employee well-being, and organizational control in hybrid work environments. Limitations associated with publication bias and rapidly evolving post-pandemic research are acknowledged and addressed in the discussion section.

5. Historical Evolution of Work

Understanding contemporary hybrid work environments requires situating them within the broader historical evolution of work. Hybrid work did not emerge in isolation; rather, it represents the culmination of long-term transformations in economic structures, organizational design, and technological capability. This section traces the evolution of work from traditional, location-bound arrangements to telework, remote work, and ultimately hybrid work environments.

5.1 Pre-Industrial and Industrial Foundations of Work

Prior to industrialization, work was largely integrated into domestic and community life. Agricultural and craft-based labor was typically performed within or near the home, with minimal separation between work and non-work domains (Thompson, 1967). The Industrial Revolution fundamentally altered this arrangement by introducing centralized production facilities, standardized working hours, and hierarchical management structures. Factories and later offices became the dominant sites of economic activity, reinforcing the spatial separation between work and home.

Industrial-era work organization emphasized efficiency, predictability, and managerial control. Classical management theories, such as Taylor's (1911) principles of scientific management and Fayol's (1949) administrative theory, institutionalized the idea that productivity depended on close supervision and standardized processes. Weber's (1947) model of bureaucracy further reinforced the legitimacy of centralized authority, formal rules, and physical co-location as mechanisms for organizational control. These foundational assumptions shaped work practices throughout much of the twentieth century. The office emerged as a symbolic and functional center of organizational life, facilitating coordination, oversight, and socialization. Presence at the workplace became equated with commitment and performance, a norm that persisted even as the nature of work gradually shifted away from manual labor toward cognitive and knowledge-based tasks.

5.2 Post-Industrial Transition and the Rise of Knowledge Work

The latter half of the twentieth century witnessed a structural shift toward post-industrial economies characterized by service sectors, professional occupations, and knowledge-intensive work (Bell, 1973). Advances in education, computing, and information processing transformed the content of work, reducing reliance on physical machinery and increasing dependence on cognitive skills, collaboration, and information exchange. This transition began to challenge the necessity of strict spatial and temporal constraints. Knowledge work, by its nature, could often be performed independently of specific

locations, provided that workers had access to relevant information and communication channels (Drucker, 1999). Nonetheless, organizational practices were slow to adapt. Despite growing technological capabilities, most organizations continued to rely on traditional office-based models, reflecting cultural norms, managerial preferences, and concerns about monitoring and coordination. During this period, early forms of flexible work arrangements began to emerge, including part-time work, flextime, and compressed workweeks. These arrangements primarily addressed temporal flexibility rather than spatial independence. However, they signaled growing recognition that rigid work structures were increasingly misaligned with the realities of modern employment and workforce diversity.

5.3 Emergence of Telework and Telecommuting

The conceptual foundations of telework can be traced to the 1970s, when Nilles (1975) introduced the term *telecommuting* to describe work performed remotely using telecommunications technologies. Initially framed as a response to urban congestion and energy crises, telecommuting proposed substituting physical travel with electronic communication. Although technologically limited at the time, this idea marked a critical departure from the assumption that work must be performed at a centralized location. Early empirical research on teleworks in the 1980s and 1990s focused on feasibility, cost savings, and employee attitudes. Studies suggested that telework could reduce commuting time, increase job satisfaction, and improve work–life balance, particularly for knowledge workers (Bailey & Kurland, 2002). However, adoption remained limited and uneven, often restricted to specific roles or implemented on an experimental basis.

Several barriers constrained the diffusion of telework during this period. Technological limitations, including unreliable connectivity and limited access to digital tools, posed practical challenges. More importantly, managerial skepticism regarding supervision, performance evaluation, and organizational culture hindered broader acceptance (Kurland & Bailey, 1999). Telework was frequently perceived as a privilege rather than a legitimate work arrangement, reinforcing its marginal status within organizations. Despite these constraints, telework research laid the groundwork for later developments by identifying key issues that continue to shape hybrid work debates today, such as autonomy, trust, social isolation, and boundary management. Importantly, early telework studies began to challenge the equation of physical presence with productivity, opening conceptual space for alternative models of work organization.

5.4 Expansion into Remote Work

The late 1990s and 2000s marked a significant expansion of remote work capabilities, driven by rapid advancements in digital technologies. The proliferation of personal computers, broadband internet, mobile devices, and cloud-based platforms transformed how work could be coordinated and performed across distance (Messenger & Gschwind, 2016). Unlike early telework, which was often occasional and home-based, *remote work* encompassed more sustained and diverse forms of working outside the traditional office, including working from multiple locations and across time zones. Remote work gained traction in specific sectors, particularly information technology, consulting, and creative industries. Globalization further reinforced this trend by enabling distributed teams and cross-border collaboration. However, remote work remained far from mainstream. Many organizations adopted hybrid-like arrangements informally, allowing limited remote days while maintaining the office as the default work setting.

Scholarly research during this period has increasingly examined the relational and social dimensions of remote work. Studies highlighted both positive outcomes, such as increased autonomy and reduced work–family conflict, and negative consequences, including professional isolation, reduced visibility, and career penalties (Allen et al., 2015). These findings underscored the contingent nature of remote work outcomes, influenced by organizational support, job characteristics, and individual preferences.

5.5 COVID-19 as a Critical Turning Point

The COVID-19 pandemic constituted an unprecedented disruption to established work arrangements. Unlike previous gradual or voluntary transitions toward remote work, the pandemic forced organizations worldwide to implement large-scale remote work almost overnight (Kniffin et al., 2021). This sudden shift blurred the distinction between telework and remote work, as employees across occupations and industries were compelled to work from home regardless of prior experience or preference. Research emerging from this period documents both resilience and strain. On one hand, organizations demonstrated remarkable adaptability, leveraging digital tools to maintain operations. On the other hand, employees faced intensified workloads, blurred boundaries, and unequal working conditions, particularly along lines of gender, caregiving responsibilities, and socio-economic status (Eurofound, 2020).

Crucially, the pandemic altered collective perceptions of work feasibility. Tasks previously assumed to require physical presence were successfully performed remotely, challenging long-standing managerial assumptions. This experiential learning process laid the foundation for reimagining work arrangements beyond the crisis.

5.6 Post-COVID Emergence of Hybrid Work Environments

As pandemic restrictions eased, organizations confronted decisions about the future of work. Rather than reverting fully to pre-pandemic norms or maintaining fully remote arrangements, many adopted hybrid work environments, combining on-site and remote work in structured or semi-structured ways (Choudhury et al., 2021). Hybrid work thus emerged as a negotiated compromise between organizational needs for coordination and employee demands for flexibility. Hybrid work is distinguished from earlier forms of telework and remote work by its intentional design and institutionalization. It involves deliberate choices regarding where, when, and how work is performed, often codified in organizational policies. Importantly, hybrid work redefines the role of the office itself from a default work location to a space for collaboration, socialization, and symbolic connection.

The rapid normalization of hybrid work has elevated it from a peripheral practice to a central organizational concern, prompting renewed scholarly attention to its implications for productivity, culture, equity, and sustainability. As the next sections demonstrate, understanding hybrid work requires not only historical insight but also robust theoretical frameworks capable of explaining its complex and sometimes contradictory outcomes.

6. Conceptual Foundations and Theoretical Underpinnings of Hybrid Work

The emergence of hybrid work environments has prompted renewed scholarly attention to foundational theories of work, organization, and technology. Hybrid work is not merely a logistical arrangement but a complex socio-organizational phenomenon that reshapes relationships between individuals, tasks, technologies, and institutions. Accordingly, understanding hybrid work requires a multi-theoretical lens capable of explaining how flexibility, digitalization, and organizational design interact to influence work experiences and outcomes. This section synthesizes key theoretical perspectives that underpin contemporary hybrid work research.

6.1 Sociotechnical Systems Theory

Sociotechnical systems (STS) theory provides one of the earliest and most enduring frameworks for understanding hybrid work. Originating from the Tavistock Institute, STS theory posits that organizational effectiveness depends on the joint optimization of social systems (e.g., people, roles, relationships) and technical systems (e.g., tools, technologies, workflows) rather than privileging one over the other (Trist & Bamforth, 1951).

Hybrid work exemplifies this interdependence. Digital collaboration tools, cloud platforms, and communication technologies enable spatial flexibility, but their effectiveness is contingent upon complementary social arrangements such as trust, autonomy, leadership practices, and organizational culture. Research grounded in STS theory suggests that failures in hybrid work implementation often stem from misalignment between technological capabilities and social structures for example, when advanced digital tools are introduced without corresponding changes in managerial practices or performance evaluation systems. From an STS perspective, hybrid work represents a reconfiguration

rather than a replacement of traditional work systems. Offices, technologies, and human interactions continue to coexist, but their roles are redistributed. This theoretical lens highlights the importance of intentional design in hybrid work environments, emphasizing that technological adoption alone is insufficient to produce positive outcomes.

6.2 Job Demands–Resources Theory

Job demands–resources (JD–R) theory offers a robust framework for understanding how hybrid work affects employee well-being and performance. According to JD–R theory, all jobs involve demands (e.g., workload, emotional strain, role ambiguity) and resources (e.g., autonomy, social support, feedback), which jointly influence burnout, engagement, and performance (Demerouti et al., 2001). Hybrid work alters the balance between demands and resources in complex ways. On the resource side, hybrid arrangements often increase autonomy, flexibility, and perceived control over work schedules, which are consistently linked to higher engagement and job satisfaction. On the demand side, hybrid work may intensify cognitive load, blur work–life boundaries, and increase coordination complexity, particularly in digitally mediated collaboration.

JD–R theory helps explain the mixed empirical findings in hybrid work research. Positive outcomes are more likely when hybrid work increases resources without disproportionately increasing demands, whereas negative outcomes emerge when demands outweigh available resources. This framework underscores the role of organizational support, leadership, and job design as critical moderators shaping hybrid work experiences.

6.3 Boundary Theory and Work–Life Integration

Boundary theory focuses on how individuals manage the boundaries between work and non-work domains (Ashforth et al., 2000). Traditional office-based work reinforced strong spatial and temporal boundaries, whereas telework and hybrid work blur these boundaries by enabling work to permeate domestic and personal spaces. Hybrid work occupies a distinctive position within boundary theory. Unlike fully remote work, hybrid arrangements reintroduce periodic physical separation between work and home, potentially allowing individuals to recalibrate boundaries. However, this flexibility also increases boundary management complexity, as employees must navigate shifting expectations across days, locations, and communication channels.

Research informed by boundary theory highlights individual differences in boundary preferences, with some employees favoring integration and others preferring segmentation. Hybrid work may benefit those who can actively manage boundaries but disadvantage those lacking autonomy, adequate space, or organizational norms that respect non-work time. This theoretical perspective is particularly relevant to debates about work–life balance, burnout, and gendered impacts of hybrid work.

6.4 Organizational Support Theory and Social Exchange

Organizational support theory (OST) posits that employees form global beliefs regarding the extent to which their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In hybrid work contexts, perceived organizational support becomes especially salient due to reduced face-to-face interaction and increased reliance on mediated communication. Hybrid work arrangements can signal trust and support when implemented transparently and equitably. Conversely, inconsistent policies, surveillance technologies, or implicit expectations of constant availability may erode perceptions of support. Social exchange theory suggests that employees reciprocate perceived support with higher commitment and discretionary effort, linking hybrid work design to organizational outcomes such as retention and performance. This theoretical lens emphasizes that hybrid work is not inherently empowering or exploitative; rather, its effects depend on how it is embedded within broader organizational relationships and norms.

6.5 Technology Acceptance and Media Theories

Technology acceptance models (TAM) and related frameworks explain how perceived usefulness and ease of use influence individuals' adoption of digital technologies (Davis, 1989). In hybrid work environments, employee acceptance of collaboration tools, virtual meeting platforms, and monitoring

systems shape both efficiency and satisfaction. Complementing TAM, media richness and media synchronicity theories address how communication effectiveness varies across media depending on task complexity and ambiguity (Daft & Lengel, 1986; Dennis et al., 2008). Hybrid work increases reliance on mediated communication, making appropriate media selection critical for coordination, trust-building, and knowledge sharing. These theories help explain why hybrid work may enhance productivity for some tasks while hindering collaboration and innovation for others. They also highlight the importance of aligning communication practices with task requirements rather than assuming digital equivalence to face-to-face interaction.

6.6 Integrative Theoretical Implications

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives underscore that hybrid work is a multidimensional and contingent phenomenon. No single theory fully captures its complexity. Sociotechnical systems theory emphasizes design alignment; JD–R theory explains variability in well-being and performance outcomes; boundary theory addresses work–life dynamics; organizational support theory highlights relational and normative dimensions; and technology-focused theories illuminate communication and adoption processes. Integrating these perspectives allows for a more nuanced understanding of why hybrid work produces divergent outcomes across contexts. This integrative framework provides the foundation for the subsequent analysis of hybrid work dimensions, antecedents, and outcomes, as well as for resolving ongoing scholarly debates regarding its long-term sustainability.

7. Key Dimensions of Hybrid Work Environments

Although hybrid work has rapidly become a dominant organizational model, conceptual ambiguity persists regarding what constitutes a hybrid work environment. Hybrid work is often used interchangeably with telework or remote work, despite important differences in structure, intent, and institutionalization. This section clarifies the concept of hybrid work by identifying its key dimensions and distinguishing it from earlier flexible work arrangements. Drawing on interdisciplinary literature, hybrid work is conceptualized as a multidimensional work system defined by the structured combination of on-site and remote work.

7.1 Spatial Dimension: Where Work Is Performed

The spatial dimension is central to hybrid work and distinguishes it from both traditional office-based work and fully remote arrangements. Hybrid work involves deliberate variation in work location, typically combining organizational premises with home-based or third-space locations such as coworking spaces. Unlike telework, which was often occasional and informal, hybrid work institutionalizes spatial flexibility through formal policies or norms (Allen et al., 2015). This spatial plurality redefines the role of the office. Rather than serving as the default site for individual task completion, offices increasingly function as hubs for collaboration, social interaction, and symbolic identification with the organization. Research suggests that the effectiveness of hybrid work depends on how spatial arrangements align with task interdependence and collaboration needs, reinforcing insights from sociotechnical systems theory.

7.2 Temporal Dimension: When Work Is Performed

Hybrid work also introduces temporal flexibility, enabling employees to vary not only where but also when work is performed. This dimension includes flexible scheduling, asynchronous communication, and reduced emphasis on standardized working hours. Temporal flexibility has long been associated with improved work–life balance and job satisfaction; however, in hybrid contexts, it also increases coordination complexity (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Temporal flexibility interacts with boundary management processes. While it can empower employees to align work with personal responsibilities, it may also blur boundaries and extend working hours if organizational expectations remain ambiguous. Thus, the temporal dimension of hybrid work highlights the importance of clear norms regarding availability, responsiveness, and performance evaluation.

7.3 Autonomy and Control Dimension

Hybrid work redistributes autonomy and control between organizations and employees. Greater discretion over location and scheduling typically enhances perceived autonomy, a key motivational resource linked to engagement and well-being. However, increased autonomy is often accompanied by new forms of digital monitoring and performance measurement, which may undermine trust and perceived organizational support. This tension reflects a broader shift from input-based control (presence and hours worked) to output-based control (results and deliverables). The extent to which hybrid work enhances or constrains autonomy depends on how control mechanisms are designed and communicated, reinforcing the relevance of organizational support and social exchange theories.

7.4 Technological Dimension

Technology constitutes the infrastructural backbone of hybrid work environments. Digital collaboration platforms, videoconferencing tools, cloud-based document sharing, and project management systems enable coordination across locations and time zones. However, technology is not a neutral enabler, its design and implementation shape communication patterns, power dynamics, and inclusion. Research grounded in media richness and media synchronicity theories suggests that hybrid work effectiveness depends on aligning communication media with task requirements. Overreliance on lean media for complex or ambiguous tasks may impair shared understanding and relational quality. Consequently, technological competence and digital literacy emerge as critical individual and organizational capabilities in hybrid work environments.

7.5 Social and Relational Dimension

Hybrid work fundamentally alters social interaction patterns. Reduced face-to-face contact may weaken informal communication, social learning, and organizational identification, particularly for new employees or those working remotely more frequently. Conversely, hybrid arrangements can foster more intentional and inclusive interactions when designed thoughtfully. This dimension highlights the importance of leadership behaviors, team norms, and organizational culture in sustaining cohesion and trust. Social processes play a crucial role in mediating the relationship between hybrid work arrangements and outcomes such as collaboration, innovation, and commitment.

7.6 Policy and Institutional Dimension

Hybrid work is increasingly formalized through organizational policies governing eligibility, scheduling, performance evaluation, and use of space. These policies reflect institutional pressures, including labor regulations, health and safety considerations, and societal expectations regarding flexibility and equity. Importantly, hybrid work policies are not uniformly experienced. Differences in role requirements, managerial discretion, and access to resources may create perceptions of inequality. This institutional dimension underscores the need for transparent and equitable policy design to ensure the sustainability of hybrid work arrangements.

7.7 Integrative Perspective on Hybrid Work Dimensions

Taken together, these dimensions illustrate that hybrid work is not a single practice but a configuration system comprising interrelated spatial, temporal, technological, social, and institutional elements. Variations in how these dimensions are combined produce diverse hybrid work models, each with distinct implications for employees and organizations. Conceptualizing hybrid work as a multidimensional system provides a foundation for analyzing its antecedents and outcomes, as well as for explaining the mixed empirical findings in the literature. The next section builds on this framework by examining the antecedents that drive organizations and individuals to adopt hybrid work arrangements.

8. Antecedents of Hybrid Work

The adoption of hybrid work environments is not the result of a single catalyst but rather the convergence of multiple antecedents operating at technological, organizational, individual, and societal levels. Understanding these antecedents is critical for explaining both the rapid diffusion of hybrid work

following the COVID-19 pandemic and its persistence beyond the crisis. This section synthesizes existing literature to identify the key drivers that have shaped the emergence of hybrid work.

8.1 Technological Antecedents

Technological advancement represents the most fundamental enabler of hybrid work. The widespread availability of high-speed internet, cloud computing, mobile devices, and digital collaboration platforms has made location-independent work technically feasible for a broad range of occupations. Tools such as videoconferencing, shared digital workspaces, and real-time messaging systems allow employees to coordinate tasks and exchange information across distance with minimal latency. Prior research on teleworks and remote work consistently identifies technology readiness as a prerequisite for flexible work arrangements (Allen et al., 2015). However, hybrid work differs in that technology must support not only remote work but also seamless integration between on-site and off-site employees. This requirement elevates the importance of interoperability, cybersecurity, and digital literacy. As organizations invest in increasingly sophisticated digital infrastructures, hybrid work becomes a viable and attractive option rather than an emergency solution.

8.2 Organizational Antecedents

Organizational drivers have played a decisive role in institutionalizing hybrid work. One prominent antecedent is the need for cost efficiency, particularly in relation to office space and operational expenses. Hybrid work allows organizations to optimize real estate usage and reduce overhead costs, a consideration that gained urgency during the economic uncertainty of the pandemic. Talent attraction and retention constitute another major organizational driver. In competitive labor markets, flexible work arrangements have become a key differentiator, particularly for knowledge workers who value autonomy and work–life balance. Empirical studies suggest that organizations offering hybrid options are better positioned to attract diverse talent pools, including caregivers, individuals with disabilities, and geographically dispersed professionals (Choudhury et al., 2021).

Additionally, organizational learning during the pandemic reshaped managerial attitudes toward remote and hybrid work. The successful maintenance of productivity under forced remote work conditions challenged entrenched assumptions about supervision and performance, reducing resistance to flexible work models.

8.3 Individual-Level Antecedents

At the individual level, employee preferences and needs have strongly influenced the adoption of hybrid work. Research consistently highlights employees' desire for greater control over when and where they work, driven by considerations such as commuting time, family responsibilities, and personal well-being (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Hybrid work appeals to employees seeking flexibility without complete detachment from the workplace. For many, fully remote work is associated with social isolation and reduced visibility, whereas hybrid arrangements offer a balance between autonomy and social connection. Individual differences in personality, career stage, and boundary management preferences further shape receptivity to hybrid work, reinforcing the importance of choice and customization.

8.4 Societal and Demographic Antecedents

Broader societal trends have also contributed to the rise of hybrid work. Urbanization, environmental concerns, and demographic shifts have increased awareness of the costs associated with daily commuting, including congestion, pollution, and time loss. Hybrid work aligns with sustainability agendas by reducing travel-related emissions and supporting more flexible urban planning. Demographic changes, such as increased workforce participation by dual-earner households and aging populations, have heightened demand for work arrangements that accommodate diverse life circumstances. Hybrid work offers a partial response to these challenges by allowing employees to adjust work patterns without existing the labor market.

8.5 Institutional and Regulatory Antecedents

Institutional and regulatory environments shape the feasibility and form of hybrid work adoption. During the COVID-19 pandemic, public health regulations mandated remote work where possible, effectively accelerating experimentation with flexible work arrangements. In the post-pandemic period, labor regulations concerning occupational health, data protection, and the "right to disconnect" have influenced how hybrid work is designed and governed. National and cultural contexts further moderate hybrid work adoption. Variations in labor laws, social norms, and infrastructure contribute to cross-country differences in hybrid work prevalence and implementation. These institutional antecedents underscore that hybrid work is embedded within broader socio-political systems rather than solely determined by organizational choice.

8.6 Integrative Perspective on Antecedents

Collectively, these antecedents illustrate that hybrid work is the product of structural alignment between technological capability, organizational strategy, individual preferences, and societal expectations. The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a catalyst, accelerating processes already underway rather than creating entirely new dynamics. Understanding these antecedents provides a foundation for examining the outcomes of hybrid work, which are shaped by how these drivers interact in specific organizational contexts.

9. Outcomes and Organizational Impacts of Hybrid Work

Hybrid work environments have wide-ranging implications for employees, teams, and organizations. While early research on teleworks and remote work suggested generally positive outcomes, more recent studies on hybrid work reveal a complex and sometimes contradictory pattern of effects. These outcomes are shaped by the interaction of work design, organizational support, technological infrastructure, and individual differences. This section synthesizes empirical findings across levels of analysis to provide a nuanced understanding of hybrid work impacts.

9.1 Employee-Level Outcomes

At the individual level, hybrid work is most consistently associated with increased job satisfaction and perceived autonomy. By allowing employees greater discretion over work location and scheduling, hybrid arrangements enhance feelings of control, a key motivational resource linked to engagement and well-being (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Reduced commuting time further contributes to improved work–life balance and lower daily stress levels. However, hybrid work also introduces new challenges for employee well-being. Boundary blurring between work and non-work domains can lead to extended working hours and difficulties disengaging from work, particularly when organizational norms around availability are unclear. Studies conducted during and after the COVID-19 pandemic report heightened risks of emotional exhaustion and burnout among employees lacking adequate support or suitable home working conditions (Kniffin et al., 2021).

Hybrid work outcomes also vary across demographic groups. Evidence suggests that hybrid arrangements may benefit employees with caregiving responsibilities, particularly women, by increasing flexibility. At the same time, unequal access to hybrid work or differential expectations regarding availability may exacerbate existing inequalities, underscoring the need for inclusive policy design.

9.2 Team and Collaboration Outcomes

Hybrid work fundamentally reshapes team dynamics and collaboration processes. Reduced physical co-presence can weaken informal communication, spontaneous knowledge sharing, and social cohesion, especially in teams with high task interdependence. Research indicates that employees working remotely more frequently may experience lower levels of social integration and professional visibility (Allen et al., 2015). Conversely, hybrid work can enhance collaboration when teams adopt intentional communication practices and leverage digital tools effectively. Structured meetings, shared documentation, and clear role expectations can compensate for reduced face-to-face interaction. Media richness and media synchronicity theories suggest that hybrid teams perform best when communication channels are aligned with task complexity and ambiguity.

The impact of hybrid work on team performance is therefore contingent rather than uniform. Teams characterized by trust, psychological safety, and strong leadership are better positioned to realize the benefits of hybrid arrangements, whereas poorly designed hybrid systems may amplify coordination costs and misunderstandings.

9.3 Organizational Performance Outcomes

At the organizational level, hybrid work has been linked to a range of performance-related outcomes, including productivity, innovation, and employee retention. Several large-scale studies report stable or modestly increased productivity under hybrid arrangements, particularly for knowledge-intensive tasks that require deep concentration (Bloom et al., 2023). Reduced turnover intentions and improved employer attractiveness further contribute to organizational performance by lowering recruitment and training costs. Nonetheless, concerns persist regarding the long-term implications of hybrid work for innovation and organizational culture. Innovation often relies on informal interactions and serendipitous encounters, which may be diminished in hybrid settings. Some scholars argue that prolonged reductions in co-located work could weaken shared identity, mentorship, and social learning processes, particularly for early-career employees. These findings suggest that hybrid work may enhance efficiency and retention while posing risks to creativity and cultural cohesion if not carefully managed. The net organizational impact depends on how hybrid work is integrated into broader strategic and cultural frameworks.

9.4 Moderators and Contextual Factors

A recurring theme in hybrid work research is the importance of contextual moderators. Leadership style, organizational culture, job characteristics, and individual preferences all influence how hybrid work affects outcomes. Supportive leadership and high perceived organizational support are consistently associated with more positive experiences, reinforcing insights from organizational support theory. Job characteristics also matter. Hybrid work tends to be more effective for roles involving independent, cognitively demanding tasks than for roles requiring frequent real-time collaboration or physical presence. These moderating effects help explain inconsistencies in the empirical literature and highlight the limitations of one-size-fits-all hybrid policies.

9.5 Synthesis of Outcomes

Overall, the evidence suggests that hybrid work is neither universally beneficial nor inherently detrimental. Instead, it functions as a context-dependent organizational arrangement whose outcomes depend on alignment between work design, technology, leadership, and employee needs. These mixed findings set the stage for ongoing scholarly debates regarding the benefits and drawbacks of hybrid work, which are examined in the next section.

10. Scholarly Debates on the Benefits and Drawbacks of Hybrid Work

Despite rapid growth in empirical research, hybrid work remains the subject of intense scholarly debate. While proponents emphasize its potential to enhance flexibility, productivity, and well-being, critics caution against unintended consequences for collaboration, equity, and organizational control. These debates reflect deeper theoretical disagreements, methodological challenges, and contextual variations across studies. This section critically examines the central points of contention in the hybrid work literature.

10.1 Productivity and Performance: Enhancement or Illusion?

One of the most prominent debates concerns the impact of hybrid work on productivity. A growing body of research suggests that hybrid arrangements can sustain or even improve individual productivity, particularly for tasks requiring concentration and autonomy. Reduced commuting time, fewer interruptions, and increased control over work schedules are frequently cited mechanisms underlying these gains (Bloom et al., 2023; Choudhury et al., 2021).

However, critics argue that productivity gains may be overstated or unevenly distributed. Some studies rely on self-reported productivity measures, which are susceptible to bias and short-term novelty

effects. Others caution that productivity improvements observed during pandemic-induced remote work may not persist in the long term, particularly as cognitive and emotional fatigue accumulate. Moreover, productivity at the individual level does not necessarily translate into collective or organizational performance, especially when coordination and innovation are critical. These divergent findings suggest that hybrid work may enhance task efficiency while potentially undermining collective effectiveness, depending on task interdependence and coordination demands.

10.2 Employee Well-Being: Flexibility Versus Exhaustion

Another central debate concerns the implications of hybrid work for employee well-being. Many studies report positive associations between hybrid work and job satisfaction, reduced stress, and improved work–life balance, largely attributable to increased autonomy and flexibility (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Hybrid work is often framed as a humane and employee-centered alternative to rigid office-based models.

Conversely, a growing literature highlights risks associated with boundary blurring, constant connectivity, and intensified workloads. Hybrid work can obscure the temporal limits of work, leading to extended working hours and difficulties disengaging from job demands. Employees lacking supportive leadership or adequate home working conditions appear particularly vulnerable to burnout and emotional exhaustion (Kniffin et al., 2021). These contradictory outcomes underscore the relevance of job demands–resources theory: hybrid work enhances well-being when it increases resources without proportionately increasing demands but becomes detrimental when flexibility translates into work intensification rather than empowerment.

10.3 Collaboration, Innovation, and Social Capital

Scholars also disagree on whether hybrid work supports or undermines collaboration and innovation. Proponents argue that digital collaboration tools and intentional meeting structures can compensate for reduced physical co-presence, enabling geographically diverse teams to collaborate effectively. Hybrid work may also democratize participation by reducing the dominance of office-centric communication norms. In contrast, critics emphasize the erosion of informal interaction, spontaneous knowledge exchange, and social learning in hybrid environments. Innovation processes often rely on unplanned encounters and rich, face-to-face communication, which are difficult to replicate digitally. Empirical evidence suggests that employees working remotely more frequently may experience weaker social ties and reduced access to informal networks, potentially constraining creativity and career development.

This debate reflects differing assumptions about the nature of collaboration and the substitutability of digital communication for physical interaction. Media richness and sociotechnical systems theories suggest that hybrid work outcomes depend on the alignment between communication modes and task complexity rather than on location alone.

10.4 Equity, Inclusion, and Career Outcomes

Hybrid work has been promoted as a mechanism for enhancing inclusion by accommodating diverse needs and life circumstances. Flexible arrangements can support employees with caregiving responsibilities, disabilities, or geographic constraints, potentially reducing barriers to workforce participation. However, scholars warn of new forms of inequality emerging within hybrid work systems. Employees who spend more time on-site may benefit from greater visibility, informal access to decision-makers, and stronger social networks, leading to potential career advantages over remote colleagues. This phenomenon, often described as "proximity bias," raises concerns about fairness in performance evaluation, promotion, and developmental opportunities. These debates highlight the importance of transparent criteria, inclusive leadership, and deliberate efforts to mitigate bias in hybrid work environments. Without such safeguards, hybrid work may reproduce or exacerbate existing organizational inequalities.

10.5 Control, Trust, and Surveillance

A further point of contention concerns managerial control in hybrid work settings. Traditional management practices rely heavily on visual supervision and presence-based control, which hybrid

work disrupts. Advocates argue that hybrid work encourages a shift toward trust-based, outcome-oriented management, fostering empowerment and intrinsic motivation. Critics, however, note the increasing use of digital surveillance and monitoring technologies in hybrid and remote work contexts. Such practices may undermine trust, increase stress, and erode perceptions of organizational support. This tension reflects broader debates about the future of managerial authority and the balance between flexibility and control in digitally mediated work.

10.6 Explaining Divergent Findings

The persistence of scholarly disagreement suggests that hybrid work outcomes are highly contingent. Differences in research design, measurement, time horizons, and contextual variables contribute to inconsistent findings. Cross-sectional studies may capture short-term benefits, whereas longitudinal research reveals longer-term challenges. Similarly, sectoral, cultural, and occupational differences limit the generalizability of results. Rather than indicating theoretical failure, these inconsistencies underscore the complexity of hybrid work as an organizational phenomenon. Hybrid work does not produce uniform effects; instead, it amplifies existing organizational strengths and weaknesses. Recognizing this contingency is essential for advancing theory and informing practice.

11. Future Research Directions and Research Gaps

Despite the rapid expansion of research on hybrid work environments, significant gaps remain in theory, methodology, and empirical scope. Addressing these gaps is essential for advancing understanding of hybrid work as a sustained organizational model rather than a transient post-pandemic phenomenon. This section outlines key directions for future research.

11.1 Need for Longitudinal and Process-Oriented Research

Much of the existing hybrid work literature relies on cross-sectional or short-term data, often collected during or immediately after the COVID-19 pandemic. While these studies provide valuable insights into initial adaptation, they offer limited understanding of long-term consequences. Future research should adopt longitudinal designs to examine how hybrid work affects productivity, well-being, career progression, and organizational culture over time. Process-oriented studies are also needed to explore how hybrid work arrangements evolve, stabilize, or deteriorate within organizations. Such research could illuminate adaptation mechanisms, learning processes, and tipping points at which hybrid work shifts from being beneficial to burdensome or vice versa.

11.2 Multilevel and Configurational Approaches

Hybrid work operates simultaneously at individual, team, organizational, and institutional levels. However, much empirical research focuses on single levels of analysis, limiting explanatory power. Future studies should adopt multilevel designs that capture cross-level interactions, such as how organizational policies moderate individual outcomes or how team norms shape boundary management. Configurational approaches, including qualitative comparative analysis, may be particularly valuable for identifying effective hybrid work "bundles" that combine spatial, temporal, technological, and social elements. Such approaches align with the view of hybrid work as a multidimensional system rather than a uniform practice.

11.3 Equity, Inclusion, and Differential Experiences

Although hybrid work is often framed as inclusive, empirical evidence on its equity implications remains limited. Future research should examine how hybrid work affects different demographic groups, including gender, age, caregiving status, disability, and socio-economic background. Particular attention should be paid to proximity bias, career visibility, and differential access to developmental opportunities. Intersectional approaches are needed to understand how multiple identities interact with hybrid work arrangements. Without such analysis, claims regarding the inclusivity of hybrid work risk oversimplification.

11.4 Leadership and Managerial Capabilities

Hybrid work fundamentally reshapes leadership demands, yet leadership processes remain underexplored. Future research should examine which leadership styles and competencies are most effective in hybrid contexts, including trust-building, outcome-oriented performance management, and digital communication skills. Comparative studies between traditional, remote, and hybrid leadership models could further clarify how managerial roles are evolving and what forms of training and development are required to support this transition.

11.5 Emerging Technologies and the Future of Hybrid Work

Technological change continues to reshape hybrid work environments. Emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, virtual and augmented reality, and advanced analytics have the potential to transform collaboration, monitoring, and decision-making. Future research should examine how these technologies interact with hybrid work to influence autonomy, control, and employee experience. Importantly, scholars should critically assess not only the efficiency gains associated with new technologies but also their ethical, psychological, and social implications.

11.6 Cross-Cultural and Institutional Comparisons

Most hybrid work research is concentrated in Western, high-income contexts. Comparative studies across countries and institutional regimes are needed to understand how cultural norms, labor regulations, and infrastructure shape hybrid work adoption and outcomes. Such research would enhance the external validity of hybrid work theories and inform globally relevant policy and practice.

11.7 Toward Theory Development

Finally, future research should move beyond descriptive accounts toward theory refinement and development. Hybrid work offers an opportunity to revisit and extend foundational theories of work, organization, and technology. Scholars should explicitly articulate how hybrid work challenges existing assumptions and what new constructs or relationships may be required to capture its complexity.

12. Managerial and Practical Implications

The synthesis of research on hybrid work environments offers several important implications for organizational leaders, human resource professionals, and policymakers. Given the contingent nature of hybrid work outcomes, effective implementation requires deliberate design rather than ad hoc or symbolic adoption.

12.1 Designing Hybrid Work as a System, Not a Perk

First, organizations should conceptualize hybrid work as an integrated work system rather than an individual benefit or temporary accommodation. Hybrid work arrangements must align spatial, temporal, technological, and social dimensions to avoid fragmentation and inequity. Clear articulation of the purpose of on-site presence such as collaboration, learning, or socialization can help employees understand when and why physical co-location is valuable. This system's perspective reinforces insights from sociotechnical systems theory: hybrid work succeeds when technical infrastructure and social practices are jointly optimized. Investments in digital tools should be accompanied by changes in workflows, performance management, and leadership behaviors.

12.2 Shifting from Presence-Based to Outcome-Based Management

Hybrid work challenges traditional assumptions equating physical presence with productivity. Managers should transition toward outcome-based performance evaluation, emphasizing clarity of goals, deliverables, and feedback rather than monitoring time or location. This shift requires developing managerial capabilities in trust-building, goal-setting, and remote communication. Organizations that fail to adjust management practices risk undermining the autonomy benefits of hybrid work and reinforcing employee stress through surveillance and ambiguity. Training programs for managers are therefore essential to support this cultural and behavioral transition.

12.3 Supporting Employee Well-Being and Boundary Management

Hybrid work policies should explicitly address boundary management to prevent work intensification and burnout. Establishing norms around availability, response times, and the right to disconnect can help employees manage temporal boundaries more effectively. Providing ergonomic support, mental health resources, and flexibility in scheduling further enhances employee well-being. Importantly, organizations should recognize heterogeneity in employee preferences and circumstances. Allowing some degree of choice within hybrid frameworks can accommodate diverse needs while maintaining organizational coherence.

12.4 Fostering Inclusion and Mitigating Proximity Bias

To ensure equity, organizations must proactively address proximity bias and differential access to opportunities. This includes standardizing evaluation criteria, ensuring remote participants are fully included in meetings, and designing career development processes that do not privilege physical presence. Leaders play a critical role in signaling that hybrid work does not equate to reduced commitment or ambition. Transparent communication and inclusive leadership practices are essential for sustaining trust and fairness in hybrid environments.

12.5 Rethinking the Role of the Office

Hybrid work invites organizations to reconsider the function of physical offices. Rather than serving as default workspaces, offices may be redesigned as collaboration hubs that support teamwork, innovation, and social connection. This shift has implications for real estate strategy, workplace design, and sustainability goals. Aligning office design with hybrid work objectives can enhance the value of on-site time and strengthen organizational culture.

13. Conclusion

This narrative review examined the evolution of work from traditional, location-bound arrangements to telework, remote work, and contemporary hybrid work environments. By tracing this historical trajectory, the review demonstrated that hybrid work is not a sudden innovation, but the outcome of long-term technological, organizational, and societal transformations accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Synthesizing interdisciplinary scholarship, the review identified hybrid work as a multidimensional system shaped by spatial, temporal, technological, social, and institutional factors. Drawing on established theoretical frameworks including sociotechnical systems theory, job demands resources theory, boundary theory, and organizational support theory the paper explained why hybrid work produces diverse and sometimes contradictory outcomes. While hybrid work can enhance flexibility, autonomy, and retention, it also introduces challenges related to collaboration, equity, boundary management, and organizational culture.

The review further highlighted ongoing scholarly debates and identified critical gaps in current research, emphasizing the need for longitudinal, multilevel, and cross-cultural studies. From a practical perspective, the findings underscore that hybrid work is neither inherently beneficial nor detrimental; its effectiveness depends on intentional design, supportive leadership, and alignment with organizational strategy. As hybrid work becomes a defining feature of the contemporary employment landscape, both scholars and practitioners must move beyond simplistic narratives toward a nuanced understanding of its complexities. By integrating historical insight, theoretical perspectives, and empirical evidence, this review provides a comprehensive foundation for advancing research and practice on hybrid work environments in the post-pandemic era.

References

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

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(3), 472–491. https://doi.org/10.2307/259305

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

Bell, D. (1973). *The coming of post-industrial society*. Basic Books.

Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2023). How hybrid working from home works out. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 37*(4), 165–190. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.37.4.165

Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2024). *Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance.* Nature, 630, 920–925. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07500-2 Nature

Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* (2nd ed.). Sage.

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

Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science, 32*(5), 554–571. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Dennis, A. R., Fuller, R. M., & Valacich, J. S. (2008). Media, tasks, and communication processes. *MIS Quarterly, 32*(3), 575–600. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148857

Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Knowledge-worker productivity: The biggest challenge*. California Management Review, 41(2), 79–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165987

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

Eurofound. (2020). *Living, working and COVID-19*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2806/467608

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. Pitman.

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

Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine, 5*(3), 101–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60142-6

Güçlü, Ö. (2024). (From *Procedia Computer Science*) *Healthy work environment ecosystems for teleworking and hybrid working.* Procedia Computer Science, 239, 1132–1140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2024.06.279

Kniffin, K. M., et al. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights. *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 63–77. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716

Kurland, N. B., & Bailey, D. E. (1999). Telework: The advantages and challenges of working here, there, anywhere. *Organizational Dynamics, 28*(2), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)80016-9

Messenger, J. C., & Gschwind, L. (2016). Three generations of telework. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 31*(3), 195–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12073

Nilles, J. M. (1975). Telecommunications and organizational decentralization. *IEEE Transactions on Communications, 23*(10), 1142–1147. https://doi.org/10.1109/TCOM.1975.1092687

OECD. (2023). *Hybrid work arrangements*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/6c1fdb04-en

Politeknik Unggulan Cipta Mandiri & Sabtohadi, J. (2023). *The future of work: Exploring the impact of remote and hybrid work models on employee productivity and well-being.* Brilliant International Journal of Management and Tourism, 5, 4724. https://doi.org/10.55606/bijmt.v5i2.4724

Setiyono, A., Rahmita, F., & Fuzail, M. (2024). *The effectiveness of hybrid working in improving employee work-life balance and performance.* Al Tijarah, 10(2), Article 13463. https://doi.org/10.21111/at.v10i2.13463

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.

Thompson, E. P. (1967). Time, work-discipline, and industrial capitalism. *Past & Present, 38*, 56–97. https://doi.org/10.1093/past/38.1.56

Toscano, F., González-Romá, V., & Zappalà, S. (2024). *The influence of working from home vs. working at the office on job performance in a hybrid work arrangement: A diary study.* Journal of Business and Psychology, 40, 497–512. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-024-09970-7

Toscano, F., González-Romá, V., & Zappalà, S. (2025). *Correction to: The influence of working from home vs. working at the office on job performance in a hybrid work arrangement.* Journal of Business and Psychology, 40, 1251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-025-10016-9

Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations, 4*(1), 3–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400101

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Oxford University Press.