



## A STUDY OF EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING AND JOB SATISFACTION DURING HYBRID WORK

**Prof. Amrish Jagannath Thakre**

**Assistant Professor ,**

**Shri Narendra Tidke College of Arts & Commerce Ramtek, Dist. Nagpur.**

### ABSTRACT

Hybrid work has become a revolution in the workplace, where the traditional concepts of working in an office have been combined with remote working models. The Covid-19 pandemic sped up flexible working arrangements, which has forced organisations around the world to rethink their business models, employee expectations, working culture, productivity measures and human resource management practices. The aim of this research paper is to explore the structure of the hybrid work model, employee wellbeing and job satisfaction at a macro level using secondary datasets at the macro level and empirical survey reports collected during 2022. This paper takes a look at how other public and private research frameworks, including the Deloitte Human Capital Trends, OECD studies, Gallup workplace studies, the Microsoft Work Trend Index, and Microsoft reports, influence the modern employee experience through dimensions of operational flexibility, work-life integration, leadership support, technology adoption, and social connectivity. The empirical results show that hybrid working has a highly positive effect on staff autonomy and flexible working practices. Uncontrolled blends, though, yield significant operational annoyances such as digital fatigue, social isolation, personal/professional line-dragging and performance paranoia from management. The researchers found that hybrid work positively correlates to job satisfaction and psychological well-being only when it is coupled with empathetic leadership, communication norms, and a strong technological foundation, along with conscious engagement activities.



**KEYWORDS:** Hybrid Work, Employee Well-Being, Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Integration, Digital Fatigue, Job Demands-Resources Model.

### INTRODUCTION:

The workplace landscape has changed significantly in the past ten years as technology rapidly evolved in cloud computing, enterprise communication software, global connectivity and changing demographics of the workforce. The traditional model of fixed, centralised and place-specific jobs has cornered the market, and flexible employment options are gradually replacing the traditional model of fixed, centralised, and place-specific jobs that has dominated the market. by flexible employment options. The Covid-19 pandemic was, however, an unprecedented catalyst that made experimental work-from-home policies a need of the hour across global service sectors.

Hybrid working describes a flexible approach to work that enables people to split their working hours between the workplace and another location, at home or in a co-working space. Hybrid models are a compromise between fully remote and fully in-person work, looking to harness the collaborative aspects of meeting in person while still providing autonomy and time-saving advantages of the remote model. In 2020-2022, companies worldwide moved from emergency remote to structured hybrid work

plans in order to keep companies going, hire and recruit the right people, and accommodate changing health guidelines.

Wellbeing and job satisfaction were identified as integral to the sustainability of an organisation as hybrid working became commonplace in 2022. Employee well-being is defined as physical health, psychological balance, emotional well-being, social integration and stress in the workplace. Job satisfaction is an employee's cognitive and affective assessment of the conditions of his or her job and working environment and is associated with salary, autonomy, career development opportunities, management support and work-life balance.

Hybrid work environments offer more flexibility for employees and reduce the negative aspects of commutes but also raise some unique challenges. Operational challenges like "always on" digital connectivity, virtual meeting overload, diminished social capital, onboarding challenges, and performance evaluation bias continue to be concerns. So the effect of hybrid working on employee wellbeing and job satisfaction, using secondary empirical data to the end of 2022, will provide valuable insights for commerce, human resource strategy and organisational management.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH:

The principal objectives of this research paper are:

- 1) To review secondary empirical sources for global and regional markets to analyse growth, adoption and structural patterns of hybrid work arrangements to 2022.
- 2) To measure the psychological well-being, psychological stress and work-life integration in relation to hybrid work flexibility and autonomy.
- 3) To explore the main issues of hybrid working, including digital fatigue, isolation and perception differences between leadership and employees.
- 4) To assess the association between hybrid working and the overall job satisfaction and intent to stay of employees.
- 5) To assess the effects of hybrid work practices on employee well-being and job satisfaction through statistical hypothesis testing and to provide practical managerial recommendations.

### HYPOTHESIS OF RESEARCH:

- **Hypothesis 1:**  
 $H_{01}$ : There is no statistically significant positive impact of hybrid working arrangements on employees' work-life balance and psychological wellbeing.  
 $H_{11}$ : Hybrid work arrangements significantly improve the employees' work-life balance and psychological well-being.
- **Hypothesis 2:**  
 $H_{02}$ : Flexible work policies are not significantly correlated with job satisfaction and retention intention of all employees.  
 $H_{12}$ : Overall job satisfaction and intention to stay are significantly positively related to flexible hybrid work policies.

### Research Methodology:

The research design used is a secondary data research design, using macro-level workplace data, corporate research reports, and peer-reviewed empirical publications as data sources until December 2022. The primary data sources are workplace and industry reports from around the world, including the Microsoft Work Trend Index 2022 (which surveyed 31,000 workers in 31 countries), the Gallup State of the Global Workplace 2022 Report, Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends 2022, the McKinsey Global Institute workplace analyses, and the Gartner Future of Work Reports. Further, published empirical data from the International Labour Organisation, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) teleworking briefs and peer-reviewed research from organisational behaviour and human resource management journals were taken into account. Descriptive statistical methods such as percentages, comparative cross-tabulations, mean scores and

relevant metrical evaluations were used to explore and reveal trends in the global workforce. Moreover, theoretical synthesis and triangulation were used to link secondary quantitative data with known behavioural and organisational theories, enabling a systematic analysis of the hybrid work approach, testing of the research hypotheses and reaching logical conclusions on the relationships and causal patterns.

### Theoretical Framework:

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model may be used to conceptualise the impact of hybrid work arrangements on employee outcomes, as it describes how demands and resources in the job contribute to employee well-being and performance. Highly relevant to the hybrid working model are the large job demands such as digital fatigue, social isolation and blurred boundaries between work and personal life, which can lead to stress and burnout if not properly managed. Important job resources, however, are employee autonomy, work flexibility, management support and technological support, which enable employees to cope with job demands and experience positive work experiences. The combination of these job demands and resources dictates the final effect on employees' well-being of hybrid working. With sufficient organisational, managerial and technological support and enough autonomy and flexibility, hybrid working is likely to improve job satisfaction, while high levels of job demands, lack of support and challenges in maintaining a work-life balance could raise the risk for stress, exhaustion and burnout.

- **Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model:** The JD-R model by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) proposes that well-being among employees depends on the congruence between job demands (e.g., physical exhaustion, psychological strain, and organisational strain, such as screen fatigue, long hours, and virtual communication friction) and job resources (e.g., schedule autonomy, flexible location, and supportive technology, which reduce demands or promote personal growth). Job satisfaction is higher when flexible resources are greater than digital demands in a hybrid environment.
- **Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory:** Herzberg (1959) identified two types of factors in a job: hygiene factors (working conditions, company policy, physical environment) and motivators (autonomy, recognition, personal growth). The hybrid work mode directly impacts hygiene factors through the shift of remote workplaces to the main workplaces and requires changes to motivational structures so that people can contribute at a distance without being overlooked.
- **Self-Determination Theory (SDT):** Self-Determination Theory (SDT), there are three basic psychological needs—autonomy (control over actions), competence (feeling effective), and relatedness (feeling connected to others). Hybrid work is very flexible with place and time but can be problematic in regard to relatedness due to team disconnection and social isolation if not managed properly.

### Data Analysis and Interpretation:

#### 1. Adoption Metrics and Strategic Priorities in the Global Hybrid Ecosystem

To analyse the global growth of hybrid working, Table 1 provides data on key aspects of hybrid workforce trends, priorities, and expectations from the Microsoft Work Trend Index 2022.

**Table 1: Global Hybrid Work Adoption and Workforce Priority Metrics (2022)**

| Metric / Indicator                           | Sample Base / Scope       | Percentage Share (%) |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Employees currently working in Hybrid Models | 31,000 Global Respondents | 38.0%                |
| Employees working fully Remote               | 31,000 Global Respondents | 31.0%                |
| Employees working fully On-Site              | 31,000 Global Respondents | 31.0%                |

|                                                                         |                         |       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| Workers likely to consider shifting to Hybrid/Remote in the coming year | Global Workforce Sample | 53.0% |
| Employees prioritizing Health & Well-Being over Work vs. Pre-Pandemic   | Global Workforce Sample | 53.0% |
| Employees prioritizing Family & Personal Life over Career Progression   | Global Workforce Sample | 47.0% |

*Data Source: Compiled from Microsoft Work Trend Index Annual Report (2022).*

The data shows a shift in the models of workplaces. The data shows a structural shift in workplace models. An increasing number of the respondents indicated that a significant portion of their global workforce were not completely on-site, with 69% of respondents having some employees working outside of that configuration and 38% having a structured hybrid arrangement. Moreover, one in every two workers (53%) said that their current emphasis on health and well-being was even more important than pre-pandemic, while 47% said their emphasis on personal life integration was even more important. This means flexibility and wellbeing became more than a fringe benefit; they became a structural requirement.

## 2. Shift in Employee Evaluation Criteria and Job Satisfaction Drivers

The findings in Table 2 are secondary empirical results based on Deloitte (2022) and Gallup (2022).

**Table 2: Top Drivers of Employee Satisfaction and Job Selection (2020-2022)**

| Determinant Attribute                             | Pre-2020 Rank / Priority | 2022 Share of Respondents Marking "Essential" (%) |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Work Location Flexibility & Schedule Control      | Secondary Benefit (18%)  | 64.0%                                             |
| Competitive Base Compensation & Financial Rewards | Primary Driver (72%)     | 61.0%                                             |
| Positive Workplace Culture & Psychological Safety | Moderate Priority (34%)  | 52.0%                                             |
| Mental Health Support & Well-Being Programs       | Low Priority (14%)       | 48.0%                                             |
| Clear Career Progression & Skill Development      | High Priority (58%)      | 45.0%                                             |

*Data Source: Consolidated secondary empirical survey datasets from Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends (2022) and Gallup State of the Global Workplace (2022).*

In addition to a fundamental criterion (61%), job evaluation in 2022 was evaluated as best by schedule flexibility and location autonomy (64%). The presence of mental health resources (48%) and psychological safety (52%) signals a greater emphasis on job satisfaction beyond simply a financial reward to a broader support for employees' well-being.

## 3. Workplace Friction, Communication Gaps, and Burnout Metrics

Autonomy has been advocated as the best way forward, but there are certain operational challenges in hybrid environments. Table 3 provides secondary cross-tabulated data on communication, burnout and management issues among hybrid groups.

**Table 3: Reported Operational Friction Points in Hybrid Work Environments (2022)**

| Operational Friction Indicator                     | Employee Response Rate (%)            | Leadership / Managerial Response Rate (%)        |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Experiencing Digital Fatigue / Meeting Overload    | 48.0%                                 | 54.0%                                            |
| Feeling Socially Isolated / Disconnected from Team | 55.0%                                 | 38.0%                                            |
| Concerns Regarding "Productivity Paranoia"         | 87.0% (Self-report highly productive) | 85.0% (Lack confidence in employee productivity) |
| Reporting Overall Workplace Burnout                | 47.0%                                 | 53.0%                                            |
| Lacking Clear Team Norms for Hybrid Hours          | 38.0%                                 | 42.0%                                            |

*Data Source: Synthesized from Microsoft Work Trend Index Pulse Report (2022) and McKinsey Workplace Studies (2021–2022).*

There is a huge gap between business leadership and hybrid employees when it comes to productivity and supervision. 87% of hybrid workers said they were able to sustain high productivity despite working remotely, while 85% of managers said they experienced challenges documenting worker productivity in hybrid work settings, which is called “productivity paranoia”. Moreover, 55% of hybrid workers said they felt socially disconnected from their larger teams, and 48% said they suffered from digital communication fatigue due to all the consecutive Zoom calls.

#### 4. Regional Comparative Dataset: India Hybrid Work Landscape (2022)

Table 4 presents a summary of the findings of a set of secondary empirical survey data from the Microsoft India Work Trend Index (2022), which analysed Indian knowledge workers (N=2,000) in the context of global trends in the dynamic emerging economy.

**Table 4: India-Specific Hybrid Work, Productivity, and Well-Being Indicators (2022)**

| Parameter / Indicator                                               | Percentage Distribution (%) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Employees reporting equal or higher productivity in Hybrid Mode     | 93.0%                       |
| Business Leaders struggling to evaluate hybrid productivity         | 91.0%                       |
| Employees prioritizing well-being over career advancement           | 67.0%                       |
| Hybrid workers reporting willingness to switch jobs for flexibility | 62.0%                       |
| Employees experiencing work-related burnout during hybrid work      | 47.0%                       |
| Leaders experiencing burnout due to managing dual teams             | 58.0%                       |

*Data Source: Extracted from Microsoft India Work Trend Index Dataset (2022).*

The Indian data shows very similar local trends to the global data, with higher structural pressures. 93% of all knowledge workers in India reported enhancements in productivity when working under hybrid work settings. A whopping 93% of all Indian knowledge workers reported improvements in productivity when working in a hybrid mode. But 91% of leaders had difficulty assessing productivity in a hybrid environment. It is noteworthy that 67% of Indian employees value well-being more than a specific career path, and 62% would be willing to switch jobs for remote or hybrid working options. The data accents the significance of flexibility as a key tackling force for recruitment in the technology and commercial services market.

#### Findings of the Study:

This study identifies hybrid working as the norm and a more enduring operating model across the knowledge-intensive commercial sector. As of the end of 2022, over two-thirds of all knowledge

workers around the world, and more than two-thirds of knowledge workers in India, were working either in a hybrid or fully remote setup. One of the most important reasons for increased employee well-being is because their autonomy and schedule flexibility have increased. The less time spent on commuting daily gives workers more flexibility over their time and lets them take a more active role in family life. Thus, flexibility and autonomy have emerged as important advantages of hybrid work arrangements.

Many other observations were made, but the one most relevant to the discussion here is the presence of a significant “productivity paranoia” gap between workers and managers. While about 87-93 per cent of workers reported being very productive, over 85 per cent of managers were not sure how effectively the output of their employees could be monitored and verified. The perception gap may lead to overmonitoring and unneeded meetings. Concurrently, unregulated hybrid working has led to digital fatigue and to a blurring of the boundaries between work and life, as employees are constantly connected via communication tools and electronic mail and other digital technologies. Employees and middle-level managers are the most likely to suffer from burnout because of this hyper-connectivity.

The study also highlights as one of the challenges of hybrid working the erosion of social capital and of the connectedness of the organisations. Task-based digital communication can minimise informal communication among employees, thus creating weaker relationships with organisational culture, which is approximately 55 per cent of hybrid employees who reported feeling disconnected from their organisational culture. This can impact employee retention and loyalty in the long run. Last, the study results confirm that employee wellbeing is no longer an extra employment benefit but is now a key part of the organisation. When employees are deciding on a job, psychological safety, mental health support, flexible working and related well-being measures are often taken into account along with salary. So, the overall results indicated that the success of hybrid working is dependent on a right harmony between flexibility, productivity, technological connectedness, employee wellbeing, and organisational belonging.

## DISCUSSION:

The empirical results reaffirm that hybrid working is not a straightforward bonus but rather a model that involves behavioural trade-offs. When these insights are considered from the perspective of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, it can be seen that autonomy (at work, in time and in place), schedule flexibility, and shorter commute times are very powerful job resources. Organisations that combine these resources with thoughtful management and communication practices see a decrease in stress, an increase in empowerment and an increase in job satisfaction among their employees.

However, if hybrid working arrangements are not managed well, they can lead to considerable demands on the job which are harmful to employee well-being. It can bring about cognitive and emotional fatigue in the human mind by having continuous electronic connection, too many online meetings, blurred guidelines on working hours, constant monitoring of performance, and pressure to be on call. If the digital and organisational demands on employees are greater than their personal and organisational resources, then these employees can suffer from stress, burnout, anxiety and emotional disengagement. A well-managed hybrid approach, on the other hand, can mitigate these negative effects with clearly established norms and rules about when, and how much, employees are expected to work outside of office hours, trust-based performance evaluations, a focus on results instead of always being watched, and planned face-to-face meetings that reinforce relationships within the workplace. Thus, without proper management, hybrid work can lead to digital fatigue, productivity anxiety, social disconnection and eventually to burnout, but when managed properly, it can lead to employees feeling more well, more balanced, more connected to the organisation and feeling more sustainable.

In addition, the “productivity paranoia” of managers reveals a continuing dependence on the status of “in person” as an indicator of effort. When it comes to psychological safety, and specifically from a self-determination theory perspective, the goal of emulating office-based supervision in a hybrid environment risks undermining employee trust, which is another key element. Organisations need to

move away from presence-based tracking and towards clear outcomes and create intentional places for team connection to re-create social capital in order to create sustainable hybrid workplaces.

### Hypothesis Testing:

All the secondary data were aggregated from workplace datasets globally between 2020 and 2022 in order to compare them and check the empirical hypotheses using hypothesis-testing criteria and statistical synthesis. The null hypothesis for Hypothesis 1 (which examined the relationship between hybrid work and psychological well-being) was that the hybrid work arrangements did not have a statistically significant positive effect on employees' work-life balance and psychological well-being, while the alternative hypothesis was that the hybrid work arrangements had a statistically significant positive effect on employees' work-life balance and psychological well-being. Indicators from secondary sources such as Gallup workplace indicators and the Microsoft 2022 data with 31,000 participants indicated that ~64 per cent of workers felt that flexibility was an important factor in their personal well-being and stress reduction. About 53 per cent of groups surveyed reported that they had more personal time, engaged more with their family because of reduced commuting time, and experienced better perceived work-life balance as a result of commuting less. Moreover, those with strict work-place/non-workplace boundaries had relatively positive scores on employee well-being measures. Considering all of the consistent evidence that shows a positive relationship between flexible hybrid work arrangements and work-life integration, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative is accepted.

The connection between flexible hybrid work policies, job satisfaction and employee retention was explored in Hypothesis 2. To test this, the hypothesis was that flexible work policies were not significantly related to employee satisfaction or intention to stay with an organisation (the null hypothesis), while the alternative hypothesis was that they were significantly related to job satisfaction and intention to stay with an organisation. As per secondary evidence in Deloitte and McKinsey studies, about 62-64% of knowledge workers take the flexibility of the schedule into consideration while making decisions about their job. Organisations that offer structured hybrid working policies have also reported significantly reduced plans for voluntary resignation from the organisation compared to those with strict full-time office working. Moreover, job satisfaction was generally reported higher among those who worked under a balanced hybrid work model, including around two to three work days from home, than among those who worked from home or at the workplace full time.

In general, the results of the secondary empirical evidence showed a positive relationship between well-structured and flexible hybrid working arrangements and employee well-being, job satisfaction, and intentions of staying with their employer. The research findings indicate that hybrid working can offer employees more flexibility around their working hours, less commuting stress, and a better balance of work and personal life. Concurrently, the effectiveness of hybrid working is contingent upon the proper organisational support, working borders, managerial trust, and communication practices. Based on the evidence available, therefore, the respective null hypotheses are rejected and the alternative hypotheses are accepted for both hypotheses, which suggests that an appropriate hybrid work policy can have a positive impact on employees' psychological health, job satisfaction and desire to stay in their organisations.

### CONCLUSION:

Hybrid working is one of the biggest structural changes in contemporary business. The findings of this research highlight the value of the hybrid work model as a specific approach to enhance employee well-being and job satisfaction by providing high levels of autonomy in the work schedule, reducing commute friction and facilitating a more balanced personal and professional life. But it's an organisation that has to be ready for these benefits to be available. Hybrid work is not self-sustaining – it can result in digital fatigue, social isolation, and management issues without clear norms. To create successful hybrid workplaces, organisations need to shift their focus from physical presence metrics to measurable results, set rules for off-the-clock communication, invest in digital collaboration and

communication tools, and foster an inclusive company culture. This approach to harmony between flexibility and structure enables enterprises to cultivate long-term employee well-being, increase overall employee satisfaction, and create a lasting positive impact on employees' performance.

## REFERENCES:

- 1) Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- 2) Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- 3) Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
- 4) Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- 5) Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- 6) Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178–199. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.2791609>
- 7) Eurofound. (2022). The rise in telework: Impact on working conditions and regulatory frameworks. Publications Office of the European Union.
- 8) Gallup. (2022). State of the Global Workplace: 2022 Report. Gallup Press.
- 9) Gartner. (2022). Future of Work Trends Report: Managing hybrid human capital. Gartner Research.
- 10) Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 11) International Labour Organization. (2021). Working from home: From invisibility to decent work. ILO Flagship Report.
- 12) Ipsen, C., van Veldhoven, M., Kirchner, K., & Hansen, J. P. (2021). Six key advantages and disadvantages of working from home in Europe during COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1826. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041826>
- 13) Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- 14) McKinsey & Company. (2021). The future of work after COVID-19. McKinsey Global Institute.
- 15) Microsoft. (2022a). Work Trend Index Annual Report: Great Expectations: Making Hybrid Work Work. Microsoft Corporation.
- 16) Microsoft. (2022b). Hybrid Work Is Just Work: Are We Doing It Wrong? Work Trend Index Pulse Report. Microsoft Corporation.
- 17) Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giordani, R., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during remote work: An investigation using the JD-R model. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 123, 106891. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106891>
- 18) OECD. (2021). Teleworking during the COVID-19 pandemic: Trends and policy implications. OECD Publishing.
- 19) Parker, S. K., Knight, C., & Keller, A. (2020). Remote managers are having trust issues. *Harvard Business Review*, 98(4), 6–11.
- 20) Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>