

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 12

Special Issue: 2

Month: July

Year: 2024

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

Received: 21.06.2024

Accepted: 18.07.2024

Published: 30.07.2024

Citation:

Lakshmi, J., & Archana, G. (2024). To Study on “Assessing the Impact of Hybrid Work Versus On-site Work Mode” with Respect to Employees. *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, 12(S2), 32–41.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v12iS2-July.7981>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To Study on “Assessing the Impact of Hybrid Work Versus On-site Work Mode” with Respect to Employees

Mrs. J. Lakshmi, MBA, M.Phil.,

*Assistance Professor, Rohini College of Engineering Technology
Kanyakumari, Palkulam, K. K. District, Tamil Nadu, India*

G.R. Archana, MBA.,

*Rohini College of Engineering Technology
Kanyakumari, Palkulam, K. K. District, Tamil Nadu, India*

Abstract

During the covid and after the covid, the emerge of remote work and hybrid model, changed most of the employee's interest. Now, recent years the employers want their employees back to office, the switching towards hybrid work and traditional office-based work seriously impacted employees in different ways. This study to assess the impact of hybrid work versus On-site work, within a single IT company employee. By focusing on the company employees, this study tries to find in-depth comprehension, of how well these models of work affect the productivity of employees, work-life balance, Job Satisfaction, Mental health and collaboration and communication. This study collects the quantitative data through structured surveys from 100 employees. The collected data was processed using SPSS tool for analysis such as ANOVA, Regression and Correlation). This study also inspects the demographics variables such as age, experience, gender etc. to distinguish and distinct impacts among the various employee groups. Through data analysis, the study aims to provide actionable understanding for employers seeking to optimize work arrangements. These understanding helps the employers to make informed decisions to enhance the employee productivity, satisfaction and well-being, collaboration and communication, eventually contributes to the company's overall success in the evolving work landscape.

Keywords: Employees Productivity, Work-life Balance, Mental Health, Collaboration and Communication, On-site Work, Hybrid Work.

Introduction

The concept of hybrid work, which involves employees working in both remote work as well as the physically present in the office. Hybrid work offers flexibility and the potential for improved work-life balance but also presents challenges in maintaining productivity, ensuring effective communication, and preserving company culture.

The Shift in Work Paradigm

Generally, work was synonymous with a physical office where representatives congregated to perform their obligations beneath coordinate supervision. This demonstrates given structure, encouraged real-time communication and collaboration. The appearance of advanced

innovation started to challenge the conventional work demonstrate, slowly empowering inaccessible work. Indeed, some time recently widespread, inaccessible work was getting to be more predominant, driven by advancements in communication tools, cloud computing, and mobile technologies

Understanding the Hybrid Work Model

The hybrid work, combines both the remote work and the in-office work, which has become a popular solution for the post-pandemic world. This model gives a blend of structure and flexibility, and permitting employees to split their time between being present in the office and working from home.

Understanding in-Office Work

Today, with so many organizations trying different work models, commuting to a physical office every day is uncommon, but some companies prefer it and are most productive and perform best this way. It is important to remember that not everyone has the ability or the luxury to work from home. Some may not have the space to set up an office, lack the right working environment such as strong Wi-Fi and air conditioning, and may not feel comfortable working from home.

Industry Profile

The financial development of India has been fueled, in large part, by the Information Technology (IT) sector. The industry hasn't exactly improved India's reputation abroad, but it has also stimulated financial growth by energizing the higher education sector (especially in computer science and design). It has employed around 10 million Indians, which has made a significant contribution to the country's socioeconomic transformation. Additionally, Indian businesses rely heavily on IT and its suppliers to design efficient and successful commerce forms, more so than any other sector. The automotive, chemical, and consumer goods industries have the highest IT investment levels, followed by the Indian manufacturing sector. Indian groups are looking to IT to help them grow their business in the present economic climate. According to a VM ware survey, 85% of respondents saw IT as a source of trade esteem and an enabler for associations. The Indian IT industry's major outsourcing market, which includes the trades and home segments, is growing from quality to quality and seeing high levels of mobility both seaward and coastal.

The following are some of the most significant conjectures in the Indian IT industry and its sector: Over the course of three years, Tata Communications intends to invest more than \$200 million to double its information center capacity in India to one million square feet. Wipro has hidden a US\$ 1.2 billion outsourcing deal from ATCO, a significant Canadian utility company. As part of the agreement, Wipro will pay US\$ 195 million in cash to take over ATCO's IT backup, ATCO I-Tek. To strengthen its aviation business, L&T Innovation Administrations purchased a 74% value ownership in Thales Program India Pvt Ltd.

Objectives of the Study

Primary Objective

To study on Assessing the impact of Hybrid work and on-site work mode with respect to employees.

Secondary Objective

- To find out the quantitative difference in employee productivity working in hybrid vs in office work.
- To examine the mental health among employees in hybrid and in-office work.

- To evaluate how different work models influence employee's ability to balance professional responsibilities with personal life commitments.
- To comprehend how cooperation, communication, and teamwork are affected by hybrid work.
- To enhance the productivity level better than existing system

Limitation

- Owing to temporal constraints, the primary data was highly restricted and localized.
- There were official restrictions that prevented the collection of certain data.

Need for the Study

- The employees are the main source for every company and also, they are asset to the company by this study it helps the management to make decision
- This study helps to a positive and supportive work environment for the employees.

Scope of the Study

- To consider qualitative aspects impacting productivity, including team dynamics, leadership styles, workflow flexibility in both work environments.
- To explore the employee perceptions of job satisfaction through surveys and interviews, by focusing on factors.

Review of Literature

Randa Diab-Bahman and Abrar Al-Enzi (2020)- In order to provide insight into the general feelings around the sudden changes to the workplace, this study compares the previous working circumstances to the current working situation. Methods of virtual crowd sourcing were used in this study. According to this survey, the majority of workers felt that the outdated working conditions needed to be reviewed, and opinions on how effective the present working environment is in comparison to the outdated work mode were nearly evenly divided. However, the majority of workers also expressed satisfaction with the flexible work mode. Moreover, most respondents found that the general qualities of traditional labor had either remained unchanged or had improved, instead of changing adversely. Additionally, a significant majority of respondents said that if given the option to choose a hybrid model that mixes remote and on-site labor,

Edfel G. Santillan, Joel B. Doringo, Kevin Jamir F. Pigao and Von Francis C. Mesina (2023)- This study's primary focus is on the opinions and experiences of employees in the hybrid work paradigm. According to the study, 84.4% of respondents said the hybrid work paradigm could be used in a variety of contexts. This covers cooperation and communication, job satisfaction and work-life balance, performance and teamwork, and overall experience. The survey's findings indicate that the model is widely praised for its versatility, ability to provide job satisfaction, and potential to support work-life balance. Despite workloads and management expectations, respondents concur that the hybrid approach balances personal and professional well-being. The significance of communication for hybrid collaborative work is also emphasized by the study. While noting the advantages of remote communication technologies, the study places a strong emphasis on the value of face-to-face contact, cooperation, and group projects. The study's findings can help the business grow and attract fresh perspectives, which will enable it to generate creative ideas and raise employee satisfaction. Accepting the idea of a hybrid workplace guarantees the welfare of all parties and promotes success.

Birimoglu Okuyan and Begen (2022)– A study on Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic, its effects on health, and recommendations: The pandemic and beyond. This study

provides an overview of recommendations for professionals to minimize the adverse effects of home offices during COVID-19. Recommendations are mainly directed at physical and mental well-being: creating a working environment at home that is ergonomically similar to the one at work, such as having an adjustable work chair and desk.

Research Methodology

Research involves exploring and studying to find new information and understanding. It helps us solve problems, make decisions, and improve our knowledge in various fields.

This study collects the quantitative data through structured surveys from 100 employees This research provides a comprehensive understanding of the effects on productivity, job satisfaction, work-life balance, mental health, communication, and collaboration

Sampling Techniques: Convenience sampling was used to complete the survey.

Sample Size-The sample size chosen for the survey is 100 employees. 50 employees under hybrid mode and 50 employees under on-site work model.

Sample Area: The sampling area refers to the place where the survey is to be conducted. In this research the sample were collected from the employees of Saasvaap Techies Private Limited.

Data Collection

Primary data and secondary data were used to collect the data for this study.

Primary Data

The newly acquired and first-hand data are known as primary data. And as a result, possess unique character.

Secondary Data

The data that have already been gathered by another party and processed statistically are known as secondary data.

Data Analysis

- Percentage Analysis
- One way ANOVA
- Regression Analysis
- Correlation Analysis

Data Analysis and Interpretation

ANOVA

To find the relation between the productivity level with the departments

Ho = There is no significance difference between the productivity level of hybrid as far as their department is concerned.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Productivity level of hybrid	Between Groups	5.927	6	.988	.953	.468
	Within Groups	44.573	43	1.037		
	Total	50.500	49			

Productivity level of in office	Between Groups	8.707	6	1.451	1.846	.113
	Within Groups	33.793	43	.786		
		42.500	49			

Ho= There is no significance difference between the productivity level of on-site as far as their department is concerned.

Inference

The F value 0.953 which is significant at 0.463 which is more than 0.05. The null hypothesis is accepted; thus, it is concluded as there is no significant difference with the productivity level as far as the department in hybrid work mode.

The F value of 1.451 which is significant at 0.113 which is more than 0.05. The null hypothesis is accepted, thus it concluded as there is no significant difference with the productivity level as far as the department in on-site work mode.

The average score of productivity in hybrid work mode is 3.5 and the average score of productivity in work from office mode is 3.7. Therefore, the productivity level of on-site work mode is better than the hybrid work mode.

Regression

To determine the influence of social interaction over isolation of respondents using regression analysis.

Hybrid Work

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.293a	.086	.067	.9914

a. Predictors: (Constant), social interaction

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.443	1	4.443	4.520	.039 ^b
	Residual	47.177	48	.983		
	Total	51.620	49			

a. Isolation is the dependent variable.
 b. Predictors: social contact (constant).

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.806	.461		6.087	.000
	Social interaction	.257	.121	.293	2.126	.039

a. Dependent Variable: isolation

Inference

$$Y=2.806+0.257X$$

Therefore, it can be inferred that one unit increase in social interaction scores will increase the increase the isolation by 0.257 units. The R square value is 0.086 which is about 8.6% of the

variability in isolation explained by social interaction. This shows the weak relationship. The F value is 4.520 with a p-value of 0.039 is less than 0.05, this is significantly significant, this gives the social interaction has a significant effect on isolation.

On-Site Work

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.243a	.059	.040	.934

a. Predictors: (Constant), social interaction

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.630	1	2.630	3.016	.089 ^b
	Residual	41.870	48	.872		
	Total	44.500	49			

a. Dependent Variable: isolation
b. Predictors: (Constant), social interaction

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.943	.566		5.197	.000
	Social interaction	.239	.138	.243	1.737	.089

a. Dependent Variable: isolation

Inference

$$Y = 2.943 + 0.239X$$

Therefore, it can be inferred that one-unit increase in social interaction scores will increase the isolation by 0.239 units.

The R square value is 0.059 about 5.9% of the variability in isolation explained by social interaction, this shows very weak relationship. The F value is 3.016 with a p-value is more than 0.05, this is not statistically significant, this gives that social interaction does not have a significant effect on isolation in the context of on-site work

Correlation Analysis

To Find Out the Relationship between the Flexibility and the Personal Responsibilities for Both Hybrid Work and On-site Model
Hybrid Work Model

Correlations			
		Flexibility	Personal responsibilities
Flexibility	Pearson Correlation	1	.223
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.119
	N	50	50

Personal responsibilities	Pearson Correlation	.223	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.119	
	N	50	50

Inference

The correlation coefficient between flexibility and personal responsibilities is .223 which indicates weak positive linear relationship between flexibility and personal responsibilities. The p-value is 0.119 which is more than 0.05. Stating that the correlation is not statistically significant.

On-Site

Correlations			
		Flexibility	Personal commitments
Flexibility	Pearson Correlation	1	.148
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.305
	N	50	50
Personal commitments	Pearson Correlation	.148	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.305	
	N	50	50

Inference

The correlation coefficient between flexibility and personal responsibilities is .148 which indicates weak positive relationship. The p-value for the correlation is 0.305.

Conclusion for Correlation Analysis

The correlation coefficient values for hybrid and on-site, respectively, are 0.223 and 0.143, indicating a significant degree of connection between the variables. Flexibility and personal obligations have weakly positive relationships in both work models; comparing the two reveals that the hybrid work model has a better correlation than the on site work model.

To find out the correlation between the professional relationships and the team effectiveness for both Hybrid and On-site work model.

Hybrid Work Model

Correlations			
		Professional relationships	Team effectiveness
Professional relationships	Pearson Correlation	1	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)		1.000
	N	50	50
Team effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	.000	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.000	
	N	50	50

Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

Inference

The correlation coefficient between the team effectiveness and professional relationships is 0.00. This shows that there no linear relationship between these two variables. The p value for the

correlation between professional relationships and team effectiveness is 1.00. This shows that the result there is no correlation between the variables

On-Site Work Model

Correlations			
		Professional relationships	Team effectiveness
Professional relationships	Pearson Correlation	1	.365
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.009
	N	50	50
Team effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	.365	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	
		50	50

Inference

The correlation co-efficient professional relationships and team effectiveness is 0.365, which indicates 36% of positive linear relationship. The p-value for the correlation between professional relationships and team effectiveness is 0.009. This result is statistically significant at the 0.01.

Conclusion for Correlation Analysis

In the hybrid model, there is no significant correlation between team effectiveness. Moreover, in the On-site model, there is a positive correlation. This gives that compared to a hybrid work environment, the professional relationships have a more substantial effect on team effectiveness in on-sit environment.

Suggestions

Setting clear goals can make stay focused and motivated, establish it daily and weekly. For managing time, it is better to utilize tools such as to-do list, calendars, and time blocking tricks to manage the task effectively. Flexible schedules, like allowing employees to pick their productive hours and implementing measurable performance metrics, and training can be provided on time management, productivity tools, and practices for both on-site and hybrid work. Regular breaks to reduce burnout, access to mental health services and stress management programs and mainly work-life boundaries can be established to prevent overworking and stress. Managers should conduct the regular basis check with the employees to identify any offer support and concerns.

Conclusion

The onsite work provides countless benefits that lend to both individual and organizational success. This study high points many advantages of on-site work, strengthening its positive effect on employee productivity, work-life balance, mental health and communication. In this study based on the average score, the productivity level is more in on-site work mode compared to the hybrid mode. And also, when comes to mental health, this study finds that without social interaction, one can feel isolated which hinders their work as well as mental health.

This study shows that hybrid work offers more flexibility and personal commitments, but at the same time the complete physical separation of the work and home environments helps the employees into a clear boundary, make sure that personal life commitments are not dominated with work responsibilities. When comes to communication and collaboration on-site work mode always wins, the relation between the professional relationships and team effectiveness gives values to

both employees and employers. By encouraging a positive and engaging work environment, a complete work from office helps employees boom and guide organizational success.

References

1. Diab-Bahman, R. and Al-Enzi, A. (2020), "The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on conventional work settings", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 40 No. 9/10, pp. 909-927. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-07-2020-0262>.
2. Santillan, E. G., Santillan, E. T., Doringo, J. B., Pigao, K. J. F., & Mesina, V. F. C. (2023). Assessing the Impact of a Hybrid Work Model on Job Execution, Work-Life Balance, and Employee Satisfaction in a Technology Company. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 5(6), 13–38. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms.2023.5.6.2>.
3. Qais Ahmed Almaamari, Husain Isa Alaswad (2021)-Factors Influencing Employees Productivity- Literature Review. *Turkish online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, Volume 6, July 2021.
4. Eng, Ingela, Michaela Tjernberg, and Marie-France Champoux-Larsson. 2024. "Hybrid Workers Describe Aspects That Promote Effectiveness, Work Engagement, Work-Life Balance, and Health." *Cogent Psychology* 11 (1). doi:10.1080/23311908.2024.2362535.
5. Bodepudi, A., & Reddy, M. (2021). The Rise of Virtual Employee Monitoring in Cloud and Its Impact on Hybrid Work Choice. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Management*, 5(1), 25–50. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagescience.org/index.php/jamm/article/view/74>.
6. Subramanian V, Joyce S (2024). The impact of hybrid working conditions on employee productivity. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, Volume 12, Issue 4 April 2024.
7. Innstrand ST, Christensen M, Grødal K and Banks C (2022) Within- and between-person changes in work practice and experiences due to COVID-19: Lessons learned from employees working from home, hybrid working, and working at the office. *Front. Psychol.* 13: 948516. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948516 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948516>.
8. Gibson, Cristina B., Lucy L. Gilson, Terri L. Griffith, and Thomas A. O'Neill. "Should employees be required to return to the office?." *Organizational Dynamics* 52, no. 2 (2023): 100981. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2023.100981>.
9. Kumum, C. and Numprasertchai, H., Factors Influencing Work-Life Balance of PEA Head Office Workers during Hybrid Working under COVID-19 Pandemic. <https://toknowpress.net/ISBN/978-961-6914-30-7/33.pdf>.
10. Krajčík, Martin, Dušana Alshatti Schmidt, and Matúš Baráth. 2023. "Hybrid Work Model: An Approach to Work–Life Flexibility in a Changing Environment" *Administrative Sciences* 13, no. 6: 150. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13060150>.
11. Bergefurt, L., van den Boogert, P.F., Appel-Meulenbroek, R. and Kemperman, A., 2024. The interplay of workplace satisfaction, activity support, and productivity support in the hybrid work context. *Building and Environment*, 261, p.111729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2024.111729>.
12. Manjunath, S., A Comparative Analysis on Productivity and Performance with Respect to Employees Who Work From Home and Work From Office of Medical Transcriptionists, in Mysore, Karnataka. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Manjunath-Shivaramu/publication/332371816_.
13. Dey, R. and Mishra, S., 2024. A Comparative Analysis of Post-Pandemic Employee Perceptions and Practices of Work from Office and Remote Work. Available at SSRN 4787361. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4787361.
14. Yosunkaya, Merve. "Hybrid Employees Approaches Toward Hybrid Working and the Work-Life Balance: A Field Study". *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*, no. 85 (December 2023): 169-98. <https://doi.org/10.26650/jspc.2023.85.1271772>.

15. Thakkar, K. and Acharya, A., A Comparative Study of Remote Work and Hybrid Work Models: Adapting to. (2024) https://www.publications.scrs.in/uploads/final_menucript/7809d20bb8d0cce41ee4d07e91c98567.pdf.
16. Corral, R. (2024) Impact of Hybrid and On-Site Work Arrangements on Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction in the BPO Industry: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12, 205-230. doi: 10.4236/jss.2024.122013.
17. Kitagawa, R., Kuroda, S., Okudaira, H. and Owan, H., 2021. Working from home and productivity under the COVID-19 pandemic: Using survey data of four manufacturing firms. *PLoS One*, 16(12), p.e0261761. https://cepr.org/system/files/publication-files/101426-covid_economics_issue_74.pdf#page=147.
18. Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Kemperman, A., van de Water, A., Weijs-Perrée, M. and Verhaegh, J., 2022. How to attract employees back to the office? A stated choice study on hybrid working preferences. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 81, p.101784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101784>.
19. Wontorczyk, Antoni, and Bohdan Rożnowski. 2022. “Remote, Hybrid, and On-Site Work during the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic and the Consequences for Stress and Work Engagement” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19, no. 4: 2400. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042400>.
20. BirimogluOkuyan, C. and Begen, M.A., 2022. Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic, its effects on health, and recommendations: The pandemic and beyond. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 58(1), pp.173-179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12847>
21. Bloom, N., Han, R. & Liang, J. Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. *Nature* 630, 920–925 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07500-2>
22. Arata, S., Sugiuchi, M. and Kawakubo, S., 2024, June. Office environment and workers’ productivity in the era of hybrid work: analysis considering office environment and home environment. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 1363, No. 1, p. 012112). IOP Publishing. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/1363/1/012112/meta>.
23. Castaneda, J.M., Japos, G. and Templonuevo, W., 2022. The Effects of Hybrid Work Model on Employees and Staff’s Work Productivity: A Literature Review. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 50(1), pp.159-178. <https://www.philair.ph/index.php/jpair/article/view/537>.
24. Lina Vyas, “New normal” at work in a post-COVID world: work–life balance and labor markets, *Policy and Society*, Volume 41, Issue 1, March 2022, Pages 155–167, <https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puab011>.
25. Charpignon, M.L., Yuan, Y., Zhang, D., Amini, F., Yang, L., Jaffe, S. and Suri, S., 2023. Navigating the new normal: Examining coattendance in a hybrid work environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(51), p.e2310431120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2310431120>.