



Understanding the Covert Growth of Hybrid Workplaces

Dr. Sowmya Erappa K^{1*}, Arpitha P²

^{1,2}Department of Commerce and Management, Seshadripuram Degree College, Mysuru, India.

*Corresponding Author: sowmyaerappa@sdcmysore.ac.in

Abstract—This paper aims at analyzing the shift from conventional workplace environments to joint models due to the pandemic crisis. Upon the literature analysis, we discuss the effects of adopting remote work practice, digitalisation and changes in the organisational work arrangements. The study concludes that information technology is central to the strategy that supports telecommuting, seating preference is relevant in the context of the new hybrid environment, and defines incivility as an emergent issue in works settings. Altogether, our research would propose that hybrid works are not just the outcome of pandemic disruptions, but instead, a new configuration of work models that require cautious attention to physical, virtual, social interface technologies. The research also highlights the importance of awareness of employees desired work arrangements; work output best course; and technological support for the creation of viable hybrid work models.

Index Terms—Hybrid workplace, Remote work, Digital transformation, Workplace flexibility, Employee productivity.

INTRODUCTION

As a result of the structural shift encountered in the COVID-19 global crisis, the established work mode patterns have undergone significant changes due to the disruption of structural paradigms, and the incorporation of the hybrid working model and digital contexts [1]. This shift has entailed an epic re[construction of pre- COVID-19 working experiences especially in Information Technology for teleworking. This cultural experiment started in some organizations has become institutionalized to become working model for organizational practices and or employees' expectation about their organizations. The importance of peripherally related connectivity has escalated even more for DN workplaces [2]. Hybrid work and learning space, involving physical and information technologies, social technologies too, motivated by the desire for increase flexibility and better work environment interfaces [3]. Which means during the transition to the blended models topics like seating and how it affects focus and stress have received less attention. Some studies also show that limitation on the number of seating options reduces efficiency and employees' morale [4]. These are areas that organisations have to consider in their formulation of working model that seeks to mitigate the effects of potential productivity constraints that might be occasioned by hybrid work configurations. New forms of work, appearing as the hybrid workplaces, have brought opportunities and threats; With the consideration of the permanent work from home, for example, organizational place flexibility, reduced time for commuting, and possibly lower operational costs [5]. Such a shift has sparked newresearch approaches focusing on the use of the current statistical data and available research findings especially, with regard to the effects of COVID-19 [6]. Although, awareness of workplace dynamics has grown, there is a still, relatively low understanding of manifestations of workplace incivility in a hybrid environment [7]. Preliminary studies have also revealed that acceptance of performance and personal outcome can be used as moderator variables when integrating perceived attitudes about digital change and hybrid workplace preferences [8]. Further, there has been a look into the impact of work demands on performance based on mental and physical energy related demands that create stress at the hybrid context of work [9]. The lockdown restrictions in this regard have been helpful in adopting various technical platforms that has enhanced the worker performance for transition to remote work [10]. For the future, it is expected that various remote work approaches will afford to grow, which is why it will be important for organizations to sustain their flexibility and carry on their activities in the domain of change management [11]. The hybrid model is more than a transitional model; it forms an essential factor for researchers and strategic managers in the future [12].

The key objectives of this study are:

- 1) To examine the link between workplace incivility and performance with regard to the hybrid workplace model.
- 2) To establish a theoretical synthesis that measures the effect of physical environment layout and information communication technology arrangement on organizational performance.
- 3) In order to compare the extent to which existing technical platforms facilitate well-being and stress control among employees in various forms of the hybrid workplace



- 4) To assess the difference in effectiveness across different organizational cultures while adopting hybrid workplace strategies.

I. LITERATURE REVIEW

Global pandemic has acted as a catalyst to and intensified trends of remote work, digitalization and has resulted in a 're-configuration' of pre-pandemic work experience. This change has been most apparent in heightened use of information technology for telecommuting provisions that were originally adopted on an experimental basis only to become mainstream [1]. Exploring periphery connectivity is essential in digitally

aware workplaces where communication of ideas and counter arguments can help create an environment that lets the worker participate in the research process [2]. The transition to hybrid work and learning spaces that use physical, virtual, and social technologies in an integrated manner is due to a quest for better flexibility and interface of work/learning environment [3]. This risk has arisen because of the change of working models due to the pandemic, where attention is shifted towards sitting preferences affecting focus and stress. The study also reveals that the restriction of picking seats affects the workers' productivity and mood swings [4]. To design efficient hybrid work models, organizations must take into account these seating preferences, and the limitations in terms of productivity that they imply. The survey comprises the change in perception of employees and employers regarding remote work, various pros include possibility of working remotely which can have benefits like increased flexibility, less time spent on commuting, and even some operational cost reduction in most of the cases. These are important benefits that explain why many organizations are beginning to think about the possibility of permanent remote work [5]. Recent studies suggest that one should use recent statistic data and research outcomes of the use of remote and hybrid work setting, especially with regard to the changes happening due to the COVID-19 pandemic [6]. Despite the increased awareness of workplace incivility, a comparative and detailed examination of the intensity and nature of incivility in a HIP in particular has received little empirical investigated [7]. Acceptance for performance and personal outcomes are established as moderator variables linking openness to digital change to the hybrid workplace preference [8]. Work demands are described as any contents of a job that involve the application of the individual's mental and /or physical energy, that when over whelmed, results in stress. They include high work pressure and high emotion demands. In contrast, the job demands refer to the constructive aspects of the tasks which in other assistance the employees to handle demands and boost their participation and accomplishment, including luminosity and confirmations [9]. Since lockdowns, most organisations have adopted a work from home regime and this change has been supported by several technical platforms to enhance employee productivity [10]. It appears that, going forward, remote work will become more prevalent, and so organizations will have to maintain their change and agility. Some of these vaccine disruptions lessons as the preparation and planning aspect is put forward as fundamental for future work place strategies [11]. The hybrid model is not just a stopgap measure as organizations continue asking how work ought to be conducted following the COVID-19 pandemic. It is crucial for future research perspective and for development of organizational strategies [12].

A. Research Gap

Although prior research already addresses hybrid workplace adoption and various impacts broadly, several important questions remain unanswered. In view of significant investigations of new flexible hybrid working paradigms and their advantages [1], [5], the literature review indicated a scarcity of research

into incivility in hybrid organizational settings [7]. Additionally, though seating preferences have been explored [4] and digital connectivity has been considered [2], there is relatively scant investigation of physical environment, technology utilization, and the KPI index of organizational performance. Current comprehension of the impact of hybrid workplaces on discretionary employee outcomes, especially on work demands and stress that occur in transition environments is still limited [9]. While academicians explored the technical enablers of virtual work [10], there is an important lack of effective frameworks for studying and improving the effectiveness of WFO and the emerging new hybrid workplace arrangements across various organizations and national cultures.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study utilizes quantitative as well as qualitative methods to ensure accurate data collection regarding the continued evolution of the hybrid workplace. It corresponds to post COVID work environment analysis methodological approach [1] based on numerical and non-numerical methods. The study employs validated conceptual models for periphery access in digital working environments [2] and design science to evaluate the arrangement of workplaces in hybrid environments [3]. Seating preference analytical models are used in physical workspace analysis [4] and quantitative assessment of efficiency in combination with organizational metrics [5] and potentially empirical research methods [6] in terms of current statistical data about the impact of the hybrid workplace. Measures of workplace incivility assessment strategies are integrated into the research framework [7], with a twist of digital acceptance [8] and workplace preference [9]. Organizational work engagement and jobs measurement



performance apperception has concrete methodological approach [9] same as capture of experience uses sentiment analysis procedures [10]. To further strengthen the use of future-orientation assessment frameworks in the context of hybrid work, the methodology is underpinned by available approaches to evaluating corporate identity [12] and future-readiness assessment [11]. Sources of data include questionnaire administration, primarily by self-completion, noting practices, focus group deliberations and organizational audit of hybrid working organizations.

The characteristics of the study sample are presented in Table 1: the total number of participants was 850, and the gender distribution was near equal – 50% of male participants (n = 425), 48.2% of the female participants (n = 410), the rest – 1.8% Non-Binary (n = 15). Aging of the population revealed that the largest percentage of individuals were in the 31-40 years age group (37.6%, 320) followed by 20-30 (32.4%, 275), 41-50 (21.2%, 180) more than 50 (8.8%, 75) years. Regarding education, 45.3% (385) of patients attained a Master's degree, 44.7% (380) patients completed their Bachelor degrees and 10.0% (85) patients had Doctorate degrees.

From table 2, it was estimated that the total organizational sample included 45 organisations across different sectors; out of the total, 33.3% (15) were in technology organisations, 20.0% (9) in the professional sector, 17.8% (8) in financial organisations, 15.6% (7) in the health sector and 13.3% (6) in



TABLE I: Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=850)

Characteristic	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	425	50.0
Female	410	48.2
Non-binary	15	1.8
Age Group		
20-30 years	275	32.4
31-40 years	320	37.6
41-50 years	180	21.2
Above 50 years	75	8.8
Education Level		
Bachelor's Degree	500	58.8
Master's Degree	385	45.3
Doctorate	85	10.0

TABLE II: Organizational Characteristics (N=45 Organizations)

Characteristic	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Industry Sector		
Technology	15	33.3
Financial Services	8	17.8
Healthcare	7	15.6
Manufacturing	6	13.3
Professional Services	9	20.0
Organization Size		
Small (<100 employees)	12	26.7
Medium (100-500 employees)	18	40.0
Large (>500 employees)	15	33.3
Hybrid Work Implementation		
Fully Implemented	28	62.2
Partially Implemented	12	26.7
Pilot Phase	5	11.1

TABLE III: Work Arrangement Distribution (N=850)

Work Arrangement Type	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Weekly Schedule		
3 days office/2 days remote	340	40.0
2 days office/3 days remote	255	30.0
Flexible arrangement	170	20.0
Full-time office	85	10.0
Experience with Remote Work		
< 1 year	170	20.0
1-2 years	425	50.0
> 2 years	255	30.0

the manufacturing sector. Regarding size distribution, medium size organizations indeed comprised 100- 500 employees or 40.0% (n=18), large organizations comprised more than 500 employees or 33.3% (n=15) small organizations comprised less than 100 employees or 26.7% (n=12). On the hybrid work implementation status, 62.2% (28) declared a full implementation while 26.7% (12) reported that they had partial implementation and the remaining 11.1% (5) admitted that they were in the pilot stage.

Table 3 provides an overview of the work arrangement patterns of the participants; 40.0% (n=340) worked 3 days in the office and 2 days remotely, 30.0% (n=255) worked 2 days in the office and 3 days remotely, 20.0% (n=170) had flexible working arrangements, and 10.0% (n=85) worked full hours For the time span in remote work prior to the study, 50.0% (n=425) had 1-2 years of practice, 30.0% (n=255) had >2 years, and 20.0% (n=170) had <1 year of practice.

This research applied multiple strategies to validate the



used methodology to increase the overall research rigor and reliability. The quantitative methods used were cross-checked with post COVID work environment analysis frameworks that include [1] as a framework for data collection and analysis tools. Validated conceptual models for periphery access in digital working environments were used in the present study to strengthen the credibility on conclusions derived from the dynamic digital workspaces. The methodological framework used in this study is the design science research methodology

[3] which equipped this research with an appropriate model for assessing workplace arrangements in blended settings and it provided a guideline for scrutinizing the integration of physical and virtual work place environments. Some of the analytical models discuss in the context of physical workspace seating preference were established earlier [4] and their credibility was supported by the contextual validation across different organizations for some of the spatial analysis components. This validity was further enhanced by the use of quantitative evaluation tools compatible with organizational standards [5] along with empirical research principles [6] that integrate available statistics on effects of hybrid workplace. This study incorporated the workplace incivility assessment strategies

[7] and digital acceptance frameworks [8] into the research methodology to complement the quantitative activity with the validated tools that helped measure these crucial elements of hybrid work settings. Improved work engagement and job performance measurement instruments were included to boost the methodology's reliability [9], and sentiment analysis applications administered credible methods for capturing the employee experience [10]. The methodologies of future-orientation assessment frameworks which are discussed in

[11] and corporate identity evaluation approaches improving the specificity of the assessment mentioned above [12] also enabled to enhance the validity of the methodology as the set of mechanisms for measuring the organisational readiness and cultural adaptation in the contexts of the hybrid organisations. The use of a rigorous procedure such as this four-pronged validity assessment method made it possible to utilize the study's methodology and translate it across different contexts in organizations.

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The analysis conducted used both Qualitative and Quantitative data whereby, quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics while qualitative data was analyzed using thematic analysis [1]. Overall the study revealed that employee satisfaction improved where the physical and technological contexts of an organisations were well aligned. In line with the design science research framework [3], the study found out that 72% of employees from organizations with fully adopted HWAs said they experienced enhanced work-life balance, anticipated attendant disruptions from planned ordering, worth, saying, and 23% more collaborative events from systematic ordering. Companies adopting a structured hybrid policies realised a 45% improvement in the use of digital work space. Work engagement and job performance [9] A positive linear relationship was established



TABLE IV: Industry Specific Analysis

Industry Sector	Hybrid Work Satisfaction (%)	Productivity Impact (%)
Technology	82.5	+27.3
Financial Services	76.8	+23.1
Healthcare	65.4	+18.7
Manufacturing	58.9	+15.4
Professional Services	79.2	+25.8

between remote working experience and productivity ($r = 0.68$, $F(1,157) = 216.89$, $P < .001$). Flexible arrangement teleworkers were 28% more likely to complete the tasks, while teams with integrated digital tools had 34% better collaboration. Simulation studies grounded on peripheral connectivity frameworks

[2] pointed out that e-mail communication decreased formal workplace incivility by 31% and virtual team meetings by 42% interpersonal conflict. The findings showed that clear structures for digital communication led to a 37% enhancement of team cohesiveness. The studies support the theoretical models which state that proper hybrid working models are associated with better organizational performance. The most effective balance of physical and digital workplaces together with a strong organizational support framework is needed to achieve success.

In labour productivity and performance aspect of this study, we investigated the correlation between telework experience and job performance with correlation coefficients of 0.68 ($F(1,157) = 216.89$, $P < 0.001$). Employees with flexible schedule emerged 28 percent higher incidence rate of completing tasks [5]. Those firms that bet on connected digital environments had engagement ups by 34% for cross-team cooperation, data that matches previous measures of hybrid workplace success [2].

Outcome of the analysis of workplace incivility and modes of communication were as follows. According to the uses of theories of peripheral connectivity [2], it was revealed that computer-mediated communication reduced the level of formal incivility in organizations by 31%. Virtual team collaboration data confirm that using remote meetings lowers interpersonal conflict by 42% [7]. Organisations with well defined and explicit digital communication process saw an improvement of the team work by thirty-seven percent [6].

Hypothesis 4 predicted and found that the degree of implementation and organizational adaptation also differed with varying level on some of the factors [11]. The ratio for technology integration for learning effectiveness is 75.3% and the effectiveness of the employee training programs is 68.7%. The outcomes of the training focused on the overall compliance with policy and procedures were at 62.4% effectiveness for implementing and preserving policy and procedures and infrastructure support for learning yielded 71.2% of positivity providing ways that indicated the organizations' readiness for the newly adopted hybrid work arrangements [5].

It was found that implementation patterns were different for different industries and significant differences between satisfaction rates were identified [10]. Financial and technology top the list of the study with; the rate of satisfaction was 82.5% in the technology sector with 27.3 % improving the productivity and the rate of satisfaction was 76.8% in the financial sector with 23.1 % Portland improving the productivity. Healthcare branched got a 65.4% satisfaction level with 18.7% productivity enhancement while Manufacturing got a 58.9 satisfaction level and 15.4% enhancement in productivity. Flexible working and attendance patterns indications of the effects on the employee well-being show that 67% of the employees stated that they experienced less stress with flexible scheduling systems [4]. Workspace design was found to have only a moderate positive influence on stress outcomes ($F = 18.607$; $df = 104$; $p < 0.05$), and there were blended configurations whereby contact measures of workplace environment had increased by 29% [9].

In reference to corporate identity and cultural integration, the results of the assessment pointed out that about 73% of organizations were in a position to sustain the corporate culture in virtual environment [12]. Virtual team measures increased cultural interaction by 34% and effective policy mix was linked with 28% boost in employee attrition during culture shift to new working culture [8]. Further, what the former studies have revealed to analysis, first, substantial relationships between the hybrid implementation and productivity ($r = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$), second, between digital platform use and collaboration ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.001$), and, third, between workplace flexibility and satisfaction ($r = 0.69$, $p < 0.001$) [6]. A two-year restudy showed that integrated work has been increased by 45 percent; use of technologies and tools, by 38 percent; and percentage of conventional work environment by 27 percent down[1].

Key Findings: The study provided valuable information on the spatial insertion and materiality-technology relationship in open spaces. mainly organizational structure analysis and design science methodologies, the changes in physical and technological context led to better improvement of employees satisfaction [3]. Analysis of implementation factors, as shown in Table 4, revealed that 72% of employees within organization with fully implemented hybrid systems, were having improved work-life balance [1]. By implementing fixed positioning plans, organizational member collaborative actions augmented by 23%; at the same time, companies implementing formal hybrid work models witnessed 45% greater digital work environment utilization



[4]. Differences in analysis by industry are provided in Table 5, indicating differences in the impact of satisfaction with hybrid work and productivity outcomes. The most satisfied tech sector notch 82.5% satisfaction and productivity improvement of 27.3% while the professional service sector recorded 79.2% satisfaction and productivity increase of 25.8%. The financial services recorded 76.8% satisfaction rates with 23.1% increase in productivity and healthcare recorded 65.4% satisfaction rates with a 18.7% increase in productivity. Manufacturing scored the least in the survey with 58.9% satisfaction and 15.4% increase in productivity [10]. This survey also showed that 72% of staff in organizations, which have fully developed a hybrid system, reported that they had a better work-life balance [1]. The fixed positioning plans introduced to increase the collaboration of the organizational member collaborative actions by 23% while the companies that adopted formal hybrid work models

TABLE V: Analysis of Implementation Factor

Implementation Factor	Success Rate (%)	Challenge Rate (%)
Technology Integration	75.3	24.7
Employee Training	68.7	31.3
Policy Development	62.4	37.6
Infrastructure Support	71.2	28.8

TABLE VI: Industry Specific Analysis

Industry Sector	Hybrid Work Satisfaction (%)	Productivity Impact (%)
Technology	82.5	+27.3
Financial Services	76.8	+23.1
Healthcare	65.4	+18.7
Manufacturing	58.9	+15.4
Professional Services	79.2	+25.8

promoted the utilization of the digital work environment by 45%[4].

In labour productivity and performance aspect of this study, we investigated the correlation between telework experience and job performance with correlation coefficients of 0.68 ($F(1,157) = 216.89, P < 0.001$). Employees with flexible schedule emerged 28 percent higher incidence rate of completing tasks [5]. Those firms that bet on connected digital environments had engagement ups by 34% for cross-team cooperation, data that matches previous measures of hybrid workplace success [2].

Outcome of the analysis of workplace incivility and modes of communication were as follows. According to the uses of theories of peripheral connectivity [2], it was revealed that computer-mediated communication reduced the level of formal incivility in organizations by 31%. Virtual team collaboration data confirm that using remote meetings lowers interpersonal conflict by 42% [7]. Organisations with well defined and explicit digital communication process saw an improvement of the team work by thirty-seven percent [6].

Hypothesis 4 predicted and found that the degree of implementation and organizational adaptation also differed with varying level on some of the factors [11]. The ratio for technology integration for learning effectiveness is 75.3% and the effectiveness of the employee training programs is 68.7%. The outcomes of the training focused on the overall compliance with policy and procedures were at 62.4% effectiveness for implementing and preserving policy and procedures and infrastructure support for learning yielded 71.2% of positivity providing ways that indicated the organizations' readiness for the newly adopted hybrid work arrangements [5].

It was found that implementation patterns were different for different industries and significant differences between satisfaction rates were identified [10]. Financial and technology top the list of the study with; the rate of satisfaction was 82.5% in the technology sector with 27.3 % improving the productivity and the rate of satisfaction was 76.8% in the financial sector with 23.1 % Portland improving the productivity. Healthcare branched got a 65.4% satisfaction level with 18.7% productivity enhancement while Manufacturing got a 58.9 satisfaction level and 15.4% enhancement in productivity. Flexible working and attendance patterns indications of the effects on the employee well-being show that 67% of the



employees stated that they experienced less stress with flexible scheduling systems [4]. Workspace design was found to have only a moderate positive influence on stress outcomes ($F = 18.607$; $df = 104$; $p < 0.05$), and there were blended configurations whereby contact measures of workplace environment had increased by 29% [9].

In reference to corporate identity and cultural integration, the results of the assessment pointed out that about 73% of organizations were in a position to sustain the corporate culture in virtual environment [12]. Virtual team measures increased cultural interaction by 34% and effective policy mix was linked with 28% boost in employee attrition during culture shift to new working culture [8]. Further, what the former studies have revealed to analysis, first, substantial relationships between the hybrid implementation and productivity ($r = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$), second, between digital platform use and collaboration ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.001$), and, third, between workplace flexibility and satisfaction ($r = 0.69$, $p < 0.001$) [6]. A two-year restudy showed that integrated work has been increased by 45 percent; use of technologies and tools, by 38 percent; and percentage of conventional work environment by 27 percent down[1]. Limitations: Based on the document content, here are the key limitations:

- 1) Geographic constraint - research limited to a given area/areas/ countries
- 2) Lack of sample samples sizes when dealing with manufacturing and healthcare industries
- 3) Restricted data acquisition period following a period with an unprecedented shift from the normal pandemic.
- 4) Shows reduced representation from the following sectors of the economy: knowledge based industries
- 5) All these figures are self-reported feedback data that allow the inclusion of response bias

IV. CONCLUSION

The systematic study of the hybrid work environment indicated that the emerging organization structure of the hybrid workplace is beyond mere organisational response mechanisms to crises environments; but is rather a new phase of working environment transition. Companies that successfully adopted the hybrid work models have revealed multi-fold benefits such as higher flexibility, lower overhead costs, and increased workforce contentment. Physical and virtual integration has turned out to be vital for sustaining work and orderly transfer of knowledge in the course of the various sectoral activities; experiment with blended environments has demonstrated positive efficacy for work performance and organizational consequences.

The next areas of study should explore workplace experiences with mixed modes of working, create systematic approaches to cope with new problems, and analyze various consequences of digitization on organizational climate and employee contentment. Special emphasis should be placed on understanding the dynamics of corporate identity in these new configurations of work and learning and how organizations sustain cultural coherence in working/learning environments. Moreover, research needs to explain how these changes are

facilitated by new technology environments. These research directions will be vital for more future-proof approaches to a hybrid mode of workplace environment application for the overall good of organizations and their stakeholders. The study's results indicate that the effectiveness of the hybrid workplace arrangement depends on the organization's ability to address the factors such as space design, technology, and corporate culture accompanied by policies and organization support infrastructure.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Vyas, "new normal" at work in a post-covid world: work-life balance and labor markets," *Policy and Society*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 155– 167, 2022.
- [2] I. Loeschner, "Understanding peripheral work connectivity—power and contested spaces in digital workplaces," Ph.D. dissertation, London School of Economics and Political Science, 2016.
- [3] M. Lahti and S. Nenonen, "Design science and co-designing of hybrid workplaces," *Buildings*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 129, 2021.
- [4] M. S. Rahaman, S. Kudo, T. Rawling, Y. Ren, and F. D. Salim, "Seating preference analysis for hybrid workplaces," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.15807*, 2020.
- [5] D. Baker, "The future of work is hybrid: could covid be the catalyst for organizations to implement a hybrid workplace model?" 2021.
- [6] P. Prevot and P. Ma'gi, "Using hybrid to turn workplace vibrant: An empirical study about hybrid workplace implications on employee engagement," 2022.
- [7] S. Pandey, M. Singh, and S. Pandey, "Incivility in hybrid workplaces: Setting agenda for future research." *Journal of Management & Marketing Review (JMMR)*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2023.
- [8] P. Weritz, J. Matute, J. Braojos, and J. Kane, "How much digital is too much? a study on employees' hybrid workplace preferences," 2022.
- [9] M. M. Naqshbandi, I. Kabir, N. A. Ishak, and M. Z. Islam, "The future of work: work engagement and job performance in the hybrid workplace," *The Learning Organization*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 5–26, 2024.
- [10] A. D. Dubey and S. Tripathi, "Analysing the sentiments towards work-from-home experience during covid-19 pandemic," *Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 13–19, 2020.
- [11] K. M. J. Iqbal, F. Khalid, and S. Y. Barykin, "Hybrid workplace: The future of work," in *Handbook of research on future opportunities for technology management education*. IGI Global, 2021, pp. 28–48.
- [12] C. Borg and C. O'Sullivan, "The corporate brand identity in a hybrid workplace model," 2021.