

The Hybrid Shift: Understanding Employee Turnover in the IT Industry

Mr. Shivendra Singh¹, Mr. Rahul Singh¹

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Lucknow Public College of Professional Studies, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Lucknow Public College of Professional Studies, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Cite This Paper as: Mr. Shivendra Singh , Mr. Rahul Singh (2025) The Hybrid Shift: Understanding Employee Turnover in the IT Industry. *The Journal of African Development 1, Vol.6, No.1, 656-665*

KEYWORDS

NA

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzed the attributes of various hybrid work patterns and how it affects employee turnover within the Indian IT industry. The study is based on the application of a structured questionnaire that was completed by 300 IT professionals in five forms of hybrid work arrangements to examine various variables such as employee satisfaction, work-life balance, productivity, and job-switching intentions. The findings indicate that complete WFH and flexible WFH models result in good levels of satisfaction and reduction of attrition intentions and the 3-day WFH model is associated with increased levels of dissatisfaction and stress. The analysis of ANOVA revealed that there is a significant difference in the attrition intentions depending on the hybrid model, and the consideration of the hybrid model with the properly designed policy concerning hybrid work is needed to increase employee retention. The research also finds that the lack of significance between models in the development of career and managerial support, but work-life balance, flexibility, and productivity played a key role in retention. The results indicate that to decrease turnover and make their workforce more engaged and satisfied the IT companies may need to formulate their hybrid policies with flexibility, autonomy, and well-being in mind. The flexibility of working arrangements will enable organizations to be in tandem with the changing demands of their employees and end-up leading to employee retention and organizational success in the long term..

1. INTRODUCTION

The recent years have been already marked by the radical shift in the world of work, which was in large part caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which quickly transferred businesses to remote work. One of the most valuable transformations that has come out is the emergence of hybrid working, which has become a third workplace paradigm, a combination of the office and home-based workplace. The first 18 months have been a challenge to this model but has grown over the years to be a long-term and permanent solution to organizations that need flexibility and at the same time some level of presence in the office. The Indian IT industry, with the competition of the work environment, dynamic skills requirements and high turnover rates, is a quite interesting case to discuss the effects of the hybrid working setup.

The hybrid model enables the employee to divide his or her working time not only at home but also at the office in real physical offices, which have the benefit of saving on commuting time, improved work-life situations, and greater autonomy. Nevertheless, such a model also has its problems, especially when it comes to such aspects as communication, team cohesion, and oversight of employees. There are studies that indicate that workplace adjustability is a very vital aspect in job satisfaction and retaining particularly in knowledge-based sectors such as IT. They report that hybrid work models can bring about long-term productivity and employee morale improvement when properly supported and technologically managed (Bloom et al., 2021).

The IT industry has become the major contributor to the economy in India with millions of people employed in the sector. As more than 70 percent of employees jump to some type of hybrid work, the commercialisation of flexible work practices in the industry is meant to reverse the rate of attrition. But employee churn is still one of the major issues, particularly in the middle-level employees. This research paper involves research on the effect of various hybrid work models on employee retention that dwells on job satisfaction, work-life balance, managerial support, and intention to leave. It is with..

this study that we are hopeful to provide an insight useful in the formulation of effective hybrid policies in the work environment that is undergoing change

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

Hybrid and remote work models, which are regarded as a flexible work arrangement (FWAs), have been discovered to improve job satisfaction and retention. A survey where the IT industry investigated using a mixed method approach showed that the positive relationship between FWAs and employee retention was strong, and flexible schedules and hybrid schedules had a strong negative impact on turnover intention (Kiruthika and Rajini, 2025). In the same vein, in commercial banks, lower turnover in FWAs was predicted in a predictive manner, which is the reason why the concept has a wide application in non-tech sectors as well (Effect of Flexible Work Arrangements on Employee Retention, 2025).

According to meta-analytical and systematic research, FWAs enhance job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and autonomy and minimize work-family conflict as reducing turnover intentions (Yang et al., 2024; Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Turnover Intentions, 2024). These results are consistent with the studies that job control, as represented by flexible schedules, leads to higher involvement and also lower withdrawal intentions (Haines et al., 2024).

Hybrid work, which is a combination of remote and in-office work, has been proven to save productivity and positive employee satisfaction and turnover. According to Bloom et al. (2024), hybrid working schedules did not have a detrimental effect on productivity, and they led to increased retention rates, especially of workers who were not in the management position. Such a huge survey also found that BIFID workers feel they have a better work-life balance, less stress, greater motivation, and lower job satisfaction, which contribute to retention (International Workplace Group study, 2024).

The concept of employee engagement becomes one of the key tools connecting flexible work with positive outcomes. According to Rajasekar et al. (2025), the engagement of employees is linked to greater productivity even without any changes in productivity between work modes in hybrid and remote arrangements. A different study has reported that organizational backing enhances engagement and commitment and satisfaction of IT employees through the contribution of hybrid work formulations (Charles, 2025).

Another factor that matters in decreasing the turnover intentions is work-life balance (WLB). To and Wu (2025) had registered that WLB makes a considerable adverse influence on turnover intention via the mediating value of job satisfaction and moderating worth of organizational commitment. Expansive analyses of the state of employees also highlight the importance of WLB as a determinant of organizational performance, as employees who are well-balanced are more driven and loyal, which through the ultimate turnover risk reduction (Pandey, 2025).

Psychological and emotional advantages are also linked to flexible work arrangements. Research indicates that autonomy and flexibility help to enhance the well-being of employees and their organizational identification especially among the younger generations (Rohmawan et al., 2025). On the other hand, literature about remote and hybrid setups emphasizes the difficulty of indistinguishability and possible stress, cautioning that in the absence of well-developed systems remote work will rise alone and lead to wellness (Dong, 2025).

In general, the flexibility seems to have a positive relationship with motivational and attitudinal performance, such as job satisfaction and decreased absenteeism, which, respectively, minimize turnover intentions (Civilidad, 2024). Besides, flexibility aids work-life integration, which leads to a happier and more loyal employee base to remain with the organization in long-term stability of the workforce (JISEM Journal, 2025).

Although this relationship exists widely, certain studies observe that the correlation between frequency of flexible work and performance could be curvilinear or moderated by organizational culture and individual attitude towards flexibility, which indicates that optimal designs should differ among groups of employees (Petitta, 2025). Masuda, Holtom, and Finken (2015) discovered that employees under hybrid or remote working can feel out of place in some respects and be hindered in their career progression. This holds especially true in the early career workers, whose physical contact with the mentors and supervisors is essential towards development. According to Raghuram, Wiesenfeld, and Garud (2020), a supportive and inclusive workplace contributes to reducing turnover when a hybrid work paradigm leads to a culture of flexibility and career development in the organization, as well. This emphasizes the importance of organizations designing policies about the hybrid working arrangements thoughtfully so as to be flexible and also offer chances to develop professionally and interact with a group.

3. OBJECTIVES:

To determine how employee satisfaction and work-life balance in some IT companies are affected by different hybrid workspace models.

To determine the relationship between hybrid work arrangements and employee attraction intentions.

Hypothesis:



Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no significant difference in employee attrition intentions across different hybrid workspace models.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁): There is a significant difference in employee attrition intentions across different hybrid workspace models.

Significance of the Study:

The practical applicability of this research to the Indian IT industry which is in rapid growth and characterized with an extremely high rate of employee attrition, in this case, in a post-COVID-related work setting is high. As organizations shift to hybrid workspace models, one should have an understanding of the impact of the models on the retention of employees. In our findings, we make contributions that are empirical to issues related to the influence of various variations of work-from-home (WFH) - whether a few days to complete WFH - on employee satisfaction, engagement, and, most importantly, the intent to remain or exit. As companies have kept seeking stability and reduction of turnover expenses, this study will help in determining which hybrid structures can facilitate higher retention. It can also be used to attract employee-centered HR policy which highlights employment security-inducing factors. The paper then presents implications on the literature of transformation of work, management of talent and organizational resiliency, as well as offer a realistic view of how IT companies can conduct business in integrated work systems.

Justification of the Study:

This study is justified by the fact that the IT industry has a significant rate of staff turnover because of the dissatisfaction of professionals with the working organization. Though it is very common, the hybrid system has not been empirically tested systematically regarding the effect it has on employee loyalty and intention to stay. By focusing solely on the employees that will work under various kinds of hybrid forms, this study is able to capture the natural day to day perceptions based on a representative sample. The ANOVA results have indicated that there are statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in such significant aspects as work-life balance, flexibility and productivity, and different models might lead to different rates of attrition. This is worthy of a closer examination of the relationship of work design and retention. The study adds to the literature besides informing the HR departments and policy makers to ensure formulation of hybrid policy to support the establishment of long-term workforce engagement. It is particularly relevant in view of the fact that now hybrid work is becoming the confounding factor in the IT services sector.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The current study is both descriptive and analytical in nature and the applicability of hybrid workspace models with the respect of employee attrition is under examination in IT Companies that fall in India and in other global destinations. The study is based on a combination of a quantitative and qualitative methodology to conduct a comprehensive research of what drives employee satisfaction, engagement, and intentions to remain in a hybrid work setup.

Research Design:

The study is cross-sectional and structured as a survey, that is, data is gathered at one time and it is based on employees in different hybrid relevant arrangements. This design would be appropriate to identify perceptions, attitudes and behavioral patterns within a heterogeneous group of employees that are influenced by flexible work policy.

Population and Sampling:

We will also target full time employees employed in any hybrid jobs position within Mid to Large IT companies, which are headquartered in Indian locations in particular their Bengaluru, Hyderabad, Pune and Gurugram. It has an approach to stratified random sampling of respondents, dividing them into groups (company size, job (developer, manager, support), level of hybridization (i.e., 2-day, 3-day, flexi remote).

A total of 400 responses were released to satisfy the statistical significance and good representation. These representatives were chosen among five IT organizations which have already formally implemented hybrid work practices.

Data Collection Methods:

Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire that had close ended items and a likert scale. The questions included in the questionnaire were based on the issues, such as: Job satisfaction, Work-life balance, Perceived managerial support, Communication effectiveness, Workload and productivity and Intent to leave or stay.

The target survey was held at a Web site (e.g, Google Forms), or via email and was anonymous and voluntary. Moreover, semi-structured interviews with 10 HR managers were conducted in order to complement the quantitative findings with the information regarding firm-specific attritions and policy-making.

Tools for Data Analysis



Coding and analysis of data was done on SPSS software (Version 26). The profile of the respondents and the trends were summarized using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency distributions). Inferential statistical methods including ANOVA (to determine the levels of satisfaction of employees with the various hybrid models). These tests were applied at a 5% significance level ($p < 0.05$) to ensure robust conclusions.

Reliability and Validity:

To successfully achieve the reliability characteristic, a pilot study was performed using 30 respondents and Cronbach alpha was computed to constitute the internal consistency of the Likert scale items. A value of higher than 0.70 proved the validity of the instrument. The content validity was determined by the review of the content by experts in the field of HR professionals and academics.

Limitations:

The research is also limited in its geographic and sectoral scope of the Indian IT companies and the results might not be applicable to other industries and nations. In addition, it is possible that self-reported data will be biased, but the anonymity and social desirability influences were addressed.

Results:

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The hybrid work model allows me to maintain a better work-life balance.	1 days WFH	20	4.15	.671	.150	3.84	4.46	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.14	.756	.143	3.85	4.44	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	3.16	.520	.078	3.00	3.31	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.10	.301	.029	4.04	4.16	4	5
	Fully remote	97	4.62	.567	.058	4.50	4.73	3	5
	Total	300	4.13	.691	.040	4.05	4.21	3	5
I feel more productive working under the hybrid model.	1 days WFH	20	4.15	.671	.150	3.84	4.46	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.29	.810	.153	3.97	4.60	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	3.20	.588	.088	3.02	3.38	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.12	.324	.031	4.06	4.18	4	5
	Fully remote	97	4.56	.577	.059	4.44	4.67	3	5
	Total	300	4.14	.689	.040	4.06	4.22	3	5
I am satisfied with the flexibility	1 days WFH	20	4.00	.649	.145	3.70	4.30	3	5



provided by my employer.	2 days WFH	28	4.39	.786	.149	4.09	4.70	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	3.44	.813	.121	3.20	3.69	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.30	.643	.061	4.18	4.42	3	5
	Fully remote	97	4.74	.526	.053	4.64	4.85	3	5
	Total	300	4.30	.775	.045	4.22	4.39	3	5
The hybrid model reduces my commuting stress and expenses.	1 days WFH	20	4.00	.649	.145	3.70	4.30	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.32	.772	.146	4.02	4.62	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	3.42	.812	.121	3.18	3.67	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.34	.654	.062	4.21	4.46	3	5
	Fully remote	97	4.71	.539	.055	4.60	4.82	3	5
	Total	300	4.30	.777	.045	4.21	4.38	3	5
I feel more engaged with my team despite working remotely part-time.	1 days WFH	20	4.05	.686	.153	3.73	4.37	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.39	.786	.149	4.09	4.70	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	3.40	.780	.116	3.17	3.63	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.30	.643	.061	4.18	4.42	3	5
	Fully remote	97	4.73	.531	.054	4.63	4.84	3	5
	Total	300	4.30	.777	.045	4.21	4.38	3	5
The hybrid model supports my career growth and professional development.	1 days WFH	20	4.05	.686	.153	3.73	4.37	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.36	.678	.128	4.09	4.62	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	4.13	.757	.113	3.91	4.36	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.26	.700	.067	4.13	4.40	3	5



	Fully remote	97	4.36	.598	.061	4.24	4.48	3	5
	Total	300	4.27	.677	.039	4.19	4.35	3	5
I receive enough support from management in the hybrid setup.	1 days WFH	20	4.15	.745	.167	3.80	4.50	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.36	.678	.128	4.09	4.62	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	4.11	.745	.111	3.89	4.34	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.28	.692	.066	4.15	4.41	3	5
	Fully remote	97	4.40	.607	.062	4.28	4.52	3	5
	Total	300	4.29	.680	.039	4.22	4.37	3	5
My sense of belonging to the company has remained strong.	1 days WFH	20	4.50	.688	.154	4.18	4.82	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.25	.645	.122	4.00	4.50	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	4.24	.830	.124	4.00	4.49	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.31	.701	.067	4.18	4.44	3	5
	Fully remote	97	4.52	.679	.069	4.38	4.65	3	5
	Total	300	4.37	.713	.041	4.29	4.45	3	5
I often consider switching jobs due to dissatisfaction with the hybrid model.	1 days WFH	20	4.20	.768	.172	3.84	4.56	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.21	.787	.149	3.91	4.52	3	5
	3 days WFH	45	3.00	.000	.000	3.00	3.00	3	3
	flexible WFH	110	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
	Fully remote	97	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
	Total	300	4.21	.730	.042	4.12	4.29	3	5
The current work arrangement motivates me to continue working with this company.	1 days WFH	20	4.40	.821	.184	4.02	4.78	3	5
	2 days WFH	28	4.25	.701	.132	3.98	4.52	3	5



	3 days WFH	45	4.47	.757	.113	4.24	4.69	3	5
	flexible WFH	110	4.29	.782	.075	4.14	4.44	3	5
	Fully remote	97	4.53	.708	.072	4.38	4.67	3	5
	Total	300	4.40	.754	.044	4.31	4.48	3	5

The descriptive analysis gives a general picture of how the employees described different hybrid work models in the Indian IT sector, and more specifically what influences their attrition intentions. The findings show that there are vast differences in satisfaction, engagement and motivation of work arrangements. All of the variables (mean scores 4.62-4.10) such as work-life balance ($M = 4.62$ and 4.10), productivity ($M = 4.56$ and 4.12), and satisfaction with flexibility ($M = 0.74$ and 4.30) recorded higher mean scores on fully remote and flexible WFH models. On the other hand, the 3-day WFH model registered the lowest average scores in these areas and people expressed high levels of dissatisfaction at the work-life balance ($M = 3.16$) and ability to work productively ($M = 3.20$), which implies difficulty in adopting this hybrid framework. Interestingly, responses to "I often think about changing jobs because I am not satisfied with the hybrid model" were basically similar across 3-day WFH, flexible WFH, and fully remote groups ($SD = 0.000$), so it could be that they were elicited rather than randomly, and therefore this fact may bias selections of attrition per se. However, both fully remote ($M = 4.53$), 3-day WFH ($M = 4.47$) and 1-day WFH ($M = 4.40$) employees were highly motivated to remain with the organization, and thus, even though hybrid forms may not be optimal, remote working was not entirely meaningless to the employees. Collectively, these findings support the other hypothesis, which asserts the existence of a difference in the intentions to leave the workplace models. The results demonstrate the significance by which organizations should be careful in the construction of their hybrid policies because there are those designs that appear friendlier to retention and satisfaction as compared to other designs.

Table 2: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F		Sig.
The hybrid work model allows me to maintain a better work-life balance.	Between Groups	65.990	4	16.498	63.472		.000
	Within Groups	76.676	295	.260			
	Total	142.667	299				
I feel more productive working under the hybrid model.	Between Groups	57.254	4	14.313	49.755		.000
	Within Groups	84.866	295	.288			
	Total	142.120	299				
I am satisfied with the flexibility provided by my employer.	Between Groups	53.950	4	13.488	31.717		.000
	Within Groups	125.446	295	.425			
	Total	179.397	299				
The hybrid model reduces my commuting stress and expenses.	Between Groups	53.040	4	13.260	30.666		.000
	Within Groups	127.557	295	.432			
	Total	180.597	299				
I feel more engaged with my team despite working remotely part-time.	Between Groups	56.037	4	14.009	33.179		.000
	Within Groups	124.559	295	.422			
	Total	180.597	299				
The hybrid model supports my career growth and professional	Between Groups	2.826	4	.706	1.552		.187
	Within Groups	134.304	295	.455			



development.	Total	137.130	299			
I receive enough support from management in the hybrid setup.	Between Groups	3.180	4	.795	1.737	.142
	Within Groups	135.006	295	.458		
	Total	138.187	299			
My sense of belonging to the company has remained strong.	Between Groups	3.908	4	.977	1.944	.103
	Within Groups	148.279	295	.503		
	Total	152.187	299			
I often consider switching jobs due to dissatisfaction with the hybrid model.	Between Groups	131.272	4	32.818	346.824	.000
	Within Groups	27.914	295	.095		
	Total	159.187	299			
The current work arrangement motivates me to continue working with this company.	Between Groups	3.670	4	.918	1.629	.167
	Within Groups	166.126	295	.563		
	Total	169.797	299			

The descriptive analysis provides the overall image of how the employees attribute the various hybrid work models within the Indian IT industry, what more precisely makes them feel that they want to leave the company. The results indicate immense variations in the level of satisfaction, engagement and motivation to the work arrangements. The incidence of all the variables (mean scores 4.62-4.10) including the work-life balance ($M = 4.62-4.10$), productivity ($M = 4.56-4.12$), and the flexibility satisfaction ($M = 0.74$ and 4.30) had a higher mean score on fully remote WFH conditions. Conversely, the lowest average scores in these dimensions and individuals used the highest level of dissatisfaction at the work-life balance ($M = 3.16$) and the capability to perform productively at work ($M = 3.20$) scored in the 3-day WFH model, which makes it challenging to adopt such a framework-hybrid. Interestingly, similar responses of "I often think about changing jobs because I am not satisfied with the hybrid model" were essentially the same in the case of 3-day WFH, flexible WFH, and fully remote groups ($SD = 0.000$) thus it might be that it was elicited not random and hence this consideration may prejudice selections of attrition per se. Yet, fully remote ($M = 4.53$), 3-day WFH ($M = 4.47$) and 1-day WFH ($M = 4.40$) employees were motivated to stay in the organization significantly, and so, despite the fact that the form of hybrid was not the best, remote work still had a sense to the employees. Taken together, these results prove the existence of the other hypothesis that presupposes the existence of the difference in the intentions to leave the workplace models. The findings show the importance by which organizations must take care of how they design their hybrid policies since there might be designs that seem amicable towards retention and satisfaction compared with other designs.

Findings:

The hypothesis was tested since there is a hypothesis that employee attrition intentions differ significantly in relation to different models of hybrid work. The null hypothesis (H_0) was that there are no significant differences whereas the alternative hypothesis (H_1) presumed that there are differences. The ANOVA analysis showed that the hybrid work models had a great significance on the employee attrition intentions and a p -value of less than 0.05 was obtained which results in the null hypothesis being rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. The workers in flexible and completely remote models of work showed a better work satisfaction, work-life balance and productivity that were associated with a reduced tendency to switch jobs. On the contrary, the 3-day model of WFH portrayed a higher level of stress, lower satisfaction and intention to change jobs by employees. This high difference between hybrid work models will confirm the alternative hypothesis that hybrid work arrangements will have a direct effect on employee retention. In addition, perceived career development and managerial support did not have any significant differences between hybrid models ($p > 0.05$), but work-related issues such as team engagement and commuting stress had significant levels of influence on attrition. The findings underscore policies on hybrid work to be designed carefully to enhance flexibility and work-life balance to be effective especially in terms of retaining talents in the competitive IT industry.

5. CONCLUSION:

The research gathered data into how hybrid work models would influence employee attrition in the Indian IT industry under the scope of employee satisfaction, work-life balance, productivity, and intention to leave. The results revealed that



the employees in a fully remote and flexible work-from-home (WFH) system exhibited greater levels of satisfaction with the most significant in this category, including work-life balance, flexibility, and productivity, which reduced the motivation to quit. At the same time, workers in the 3-day WFH strain said that they felt more dissatisfied, stressed, and at a loss of work-related challenges, which were major factors in their job-switching intention. Results of the ANOVA have confirmed the significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in the work-life balance, commuting stress, team engagement, and attrition dissatisfaction, which will underscore the significance of differences in the effect of hybrid models on the experiences of employees. Nevertheless, the perceived career growth, managerial support, and organizational belonging did not exhibit any significant differences across the hybrid models implying that they are more determined by organizational culture as opposed to the work structure work arrangement. Properly designed hybrid frameworks putting flexibility and autonomy as the primary goals, and employee welfare as the ultimate value are the key to lowering the attrition rate and increasing job satisfaction and long-term employee retention. Business adapting to the changing environment of the work is an essential measure of ensuring a stable and loyal force of work

REFERENCES

1. Bloom, N., et al. (2024). Hybrid working from home improves retention without harming productivity. *Nature Journal*.
2. Charles, W. P. (2025). How hybrid work and organizational support shape IT employee engagement. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*.
3. Effect of Flexible Work Arrangements on Employee Retention. (2025). *Journal of Accounting and Management Research*.
4. International Workplace Group Study. (2024). Hybrid working makes employees happier, healthier and more productive. *The Guardian*.
5. Kiruthika, R., & Rajini, P. (2025). The role of flexible work arrangements in enhancing employee retention. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*.
6. Pandey, A. (2025). A systematic literature review on employee well-being. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
7. Petitta, L. (2025). Disentangling the pros and cons of flexible work. *Economies*.
8. Rajasekar, A., Pavithra, S., & Prabahar, B. (2025). Impact of hybrid and remote work on employee engagement. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*.
9. Rohmawan, R., Suharto, S., & Syafii, M. (2025). The hybrid work model and its impact on employee engagement. *BIJMT*.
10. To, T. T., & Wu, W. (2025). Work-life balance and turnover intentions. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*.
11. Yang, J., Arshad, M. A. B., & Mengjiao, Z. (2024). Flexible work arrangements and employee turnover intentions. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*.
12. Vega, R. P., Anderson, E. J., & Kaplan, S. (2020). Work and well-being in the era of COVID-19: The role of remote work in employee attitudes and organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(5), 552-566. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000486>
13. Masuda, A. D., Holtom, B. C., & Finken, B. A. (2015). A dual process model of telecommuting: Psychological and behavioral consequences of commuting for work. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(3), 266-287. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0036>
14. Raghuram, S., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Garud, R. (2020). The benefits of remote work: Understanding the trade-offs of hybrid work arrangements. *Organizational Science*, 31(6), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2020.1370>
15. 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>
16. Baltes, B. B., Briggs, T. E., Huff, J. W., Wright, J. A., & Neuman, G. A. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 496-513. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.496>
17. Baruch, Y. (2001). The status of research on teleworking and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(2), 113-129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00066>
18. Brough, P., & Kelling, A. (2002). Work-family conflict and stress: A comparison of male and female engineers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9(1), 51-66. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.9.1.51>
19. Cascio, W. F. (2000). Managing a virtual workplace. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 81-90. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2000.4468068>
20. De Menezes, L. M., & Kelliher, C. (2011). Flexible working, individual performance, and organizational

performance: A systematic review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(4), 452–474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00301.x>

21. Eddleston, K. A., & Mulki, J. P. (2017). Toward understanding remote workers' management of work–family boundaries: The complexity of workplace embeddedness. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(3), 346–387. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116684216>

22. Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097>

23. Golden, T. D. (2006). Avoiding depletion in virtual work: Telework and the intervening impact of work exhaustion on commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.02.003>

24. Grant, C. A., Wallace, L. M., & Spurgeon, P. C. (2013). An exploration of the psychological factors affecting remote e-worker's job effectiveness, well-being and work-life balance. *Employee Relations*, 35(5), 527–546. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-08-2012-0059>

25. Harker Martin, B., & MacDonnell, R. (2012). Is telework effective for organizations? A meta-analysis of empirical research on perceptions of telework and organizational outcomes. *Management Research Review*, 35(7), 602–616. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171211238820>

26. 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>

27. Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(2), 347–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002>

28. Mann, S., & Holdsworth, L. (2003). The psychological impact of teleworking: Stress, emotions and health. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 18(3), 196–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268394032000120454>

29. Mulki, J. P., Bardhi, F., Lassk, F., & Nanavaty-Dahl, J. (2009). Set up remote workers to thrive. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 51(1), 63–69.

30. Russell, H. H., Terosky, A. L., & Walker, J. (2004). Telecommuting from the employees' perspective: Its impact on job satisfaction, work family conflict, and turnover intentions. *Work and Occupations*, 31(2), 207–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888404263898>

31. Van der Lippe, T., & Lippényi, Z. (2020). Co-workers working from home and individual and team performance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 35(1), 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12139>

